1. **Call to Order:** The Faculty Senate Meeting was called to order at 2:38 p.m. by President Alan Grubb.

2. **Approval of Minutes:** The Faculty Senate Minutes dated December 11, 2001 were approved as written.

3. **"Free Speech":** None

4. **Special Order of the Day:** Patricia T. Smart, Faculty Representative to the Board of Trustees, described the history of this three-year position and explained that it is another faculty voice at the Board of Trustees meetings. This position is not to bring major issues to the Board as the Faculty Senate Presidents does but rather brings more day-to-day issues to the Board. She has been working to facilitate links between members of the Board and faculty members and, in general, encourage more networking between the two groups.

5. **Committee Reports**
   a. **Senate Committees**
      1) **Research Committee** – Senator Dan Warner, Chair, stated that there was no report.
      2) **Welfare Committee** – Chair Connie Lee presented highlights of activities of this Committee since December and submitted the Welfare Report dated December 18, 2001 (Attachment A). Next meeting will be January 11, 2002 at 3:30 p.m.
      3) **Finance Committee** – No report.
      4) **Policy Committee** – Senator Eleanor Hare reported that this Committee has not met since last month but will meet on January 22, 2002 at 3:30 p.m. A question was received from Senator Dale Linvill regarding the consulting policy. Senator Hare responded that the Committee will undertake this issue now that the break is over.
      5) **Scholastic Policies** – Senator Jim Zimmerman, Chair, stated that this Committee had not met since the last meeting. The Council of Undergraduate Studies did meet and plus/minus grading is inching forward. He further noted that the committee set up by the Council met and worked on their report but they are waiting for the faculty survey to be done. Since then it was stated that student should not be polling faculty but that faculty should be and that there was an administrative block. Results should be ready by the next meeting. The Provost noted that student confusion is due to
the fact that there are still several schemes and that they suggest knowing what proposal
the faculty liked. It was then noted by Senator Zimmerman that the Faculty Senate had
determined Schemes B & D at the last Senate meeting. President Grubb stated that we
will ensure that the survey will be faculty driven.

b. University Commissions and Committees
   a. Senator Brenda Vander Mey submitted the Fall 2001 Cooperative Study dated December 10, 2001 (Attachment B). Dave Fleming, Director of Institutional Research then briefly explained and noted particular items of interest within the Report. Mr. Fleming further noted that in addition to this Report, the Over-$50,000; $30-50,000; and the Classified Staff Report by Band are all on the Clemson University website under “Special Reports.” Any questions should be directed to the Office of Institutional Research at 656-4416 for answers and suggestions for improvement are welcome. Senator Vander Mey encouraged Senators to let their constituents know that this Report is now published and available.

7. Old Business:
   a. Following a two-thirds vote to permit issue to come to the floor of the Senate which was unanimous, Senator Vander Mey explained the history and submitted the Resolution to Recommit Support for the American Association of University Professor’s Statement on Discrimination for adoption. Motion to adopt was seconded. Much discussion was held during which friendly amendments were offered and accepted. Senator Linvill then moved to amend the resolution by striking the “further resolved” statement which encompassed the aforementioned friendly amendments. Vote was taken to approve the motion to amend by Linvill and unanimously passed. Vote was then taken to accept the amended resolution which passed unanimously (FS02-1-1 P) (Attachment C). This resolution will now go to the Policy Committee for discussion on language within the Faculty Manual.

8. President’s Remarks: President Grubb
   a. remarked on the success of the Class of ’39 Celebration last night;
   b. remarked on the ceremony to honor Jerry Waldvogel as the 2001 Class of ’39 Award for Excellence recipient;
   c. thanked those Senators who attended both events in addition to thanking those who plan to attend Provost Candidate Interviews. Senators were encouraged to attend as many interviews as possible;
   d. reminded Lead Senators to notify Cathy Sturkie of Department Chairs and Chairs of Promotion, Tenure, and Reappointment Committees who would like to attend the Grievance Forum in February; and
   e. reminded Senators that it is time to consider officers and senators for the next Faculty Senate session. Information is forthcoming.

9. New Business:
   a. Nominations were requested and received and elections to the Grievance Board were held by secret ballot. Elected to a two-year term were: Ed Moise (AAH), Brenda Vander Mey (BBS), Burt Lee and Eric Skaar (E&S), and Fran McGuire (HEHD).
10. **Announcements:**
   a. The Provost announced that the Governor's Budget came out earlier this morning and that he has indicated that K-12 and higher education are not cut.

   b. President Grubb reminded Senators of the upcoming Grievance Forum on February 7, 2002 from 8:00 a.m. until noon.

11. **Adjournment:** President Grubb adjourned the meeting at 4:20 p.m.

   [Signature]
   Kelly Smith, Faculty Senate Secretary

   [Signature]
   Cathy Toth Sturkie, Administrative Assistant

Absent: Grimes (Galyean for), K. Smith, Snyder, Huffman, Malloy, Brannan, Ogale, Dunston (Porter for), Linnell (K. Backman for)
MEMORANDUM

Date: December 18, 2001

To: Faculty Senate Executive/Advisory Committee

From: Welfare Committee (WC)

Subject: Monthly Written Report

Old Business:

1. Sick Leave for 9 Month Faculty Employees:

After a follow up letter was sent to President Barker on 11/26, the WC heard from him on 12/11. His memo stated that he asked Provost Doris Helms for her counsel on this matter. Clemson University's endorsement is required to pursue this issue at the legislatorial level.

2. Spousal/Partner Employment:

The WC met with Mr. Nail, Director of Clemson Chamber of Commerce, on 11/29. He was interested in working with the Faculty Senate on this issue. He will prepare a package in the near future that has information regarding industries, personnel information, contact person, telephone number, and such. The WC will get figures of a number of new faculty to Mr. Nail. The WC asked for the past 10 years from the Office of Institutional Research. Mr. Nail will coordinate a meeting among Clemson University representatives and the other Upstate Chambers of Commerce when it is time to coordinate.

The WC met with Ms. Michele Brinn, Vice President of the Greater Greenville Chamber of Commerce, on December 12. The WC will also get figures of new faculty to Ms. Brinn. She made several recommendations: working with the Department of PR on campus; inviting Mr. Sam Konduris from Upstate Alliance for his advice; utilizing the same contacts for student job placements for faculty recruitment; having Clemson University join nationjob.com/Greenville; coming up with some sort of "Welcome Wagon"; gearing things for single people; contacting School District Human Resources Director and Western Carolina Gas Company to help pull this together or at least advise; and asking the Deans at CU for information gleaned from exit interviews. Ms. Brinn will provide the WC a copy of the cost of living comparisons.

Meeting with Mr. Garman, Director of Anderson Chamber of Commerce, has been set for 12/21 at 10:30 am.
3. **Salary Inversion among Faculty Members:**

The WC has put this issue on hold until further notice.

**New Business:**

1. **Mandatory Deposit for new faculty and staff**

Cost and Security are the main concerns. Paycheck stubs will be available online in the near future. In addition, direct deposit for the reimbursement checks is in the works.

2. **Screening of the Applications**

The college/department search committee handles hiring faculty. However, staff hiring is handled differently at CU. It has been reported that some applications have not been looked at, because the applicant often failed to specifically state on the cover letter that he or she was qualified for the job applying for.

3. **Insurance coverage for preventive measures**

The State Health Plan that Clemson University has for its employees is a statewide program that is managed by the SC State Budget and Control Board; it is a self-supporting system. That means all claims must be paid out of premiums collected from Clemson University and the employees. If items are added or taken off, it must be done on a statewide basis. It appears to be a dead end. However, Senator Katsiyannis will join the next WC meeting in January to share his information from Nebraska in an effort to explore what the WC should do before pursuing this issue further.

4. **No Fees for Fike membership**

A faculty member at the Department of PRTM will be contacted to pursue this issue. This issue is to encourage faculty and staff to engage in exercise, in proactive health promotion, and disease management.

---

*The Next Welfare Committee meeting is scheduled on January 11 at 3:30 in Room 538 Edwards Hall*

Cwl/Written Report to Executive Committee/12/17/2001
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calendar Year</th>
<th>Total New</th>
<th>Professor</th>
<th>Associate Professor</th>
<th>Assistant Professor</th>
<th>Instructor</th>
<th>Lecturer</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1524</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>616</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Fall 2001 Cooperative Salary Study is an annual report prepared by the Office of Institutional Research for, and under the direction of, the Faculty Senate Budget Accountability Committee. The Senate Accountability Committee is comprised of representation from academics, administration, the Classified Staff Commission, and the Office of Institutional Research. This is the sixth year of this particular study, and represents an additional phase of the Personnel with Annual Base Salaries of $50,000 or More report kept on file in the University’s Cooper Library. The Cooperative Salary Study is organized into two major sections:

- **University Summaries**
- **Budget Center Summaries.**

Within each section is a detailed report of salary increases for all full-time, permanent employees of Clemson University during a period of time selected by the Faculty Senate Budget Accountability Committee members. The increases were tabulated from personnel system raise transactions for a period between September 15, 2000 (the ending date of last year’s study) and September 30, 2001 (OIR’s freeze date for employee information), plus performance raises awarded on November 23, 2001 funded by “Roadmap money”. The details contained in this presentation are as follows:

- Average Percent Increase for All Employees by Budget Center
- Average Percent Increase for All Employees in Group and Category – University Summary;
- Average Percent Increase for Employees Receiving Increases – University Summary;
- Average Dollar Increase for All Employees in Group and Category – University Summary;
- Average Dollar Increase for Employees Receiving Increases – University Summary;

Each report contains data compiled within Groups and Categories. Groups are determined by the employee’s home department code filed by departmental personnel when the employee is hired or changes positions. Category codes are determined by the employee’s title code whenever possible. The Accountability Committee made a determination four years ago that in some cases, title codes do not accurately reflect job duties. Therefore, an attempt was made to categorize these exceptions manually. This process could be considered to be somewhat less than desirable due to the subjectivity in determining the category for a particular employee.
The five groups determined by an employee’s home department code are Academic, Administrative, PSA, Athletics, and Auxiliaries. These groups tend to loosely follow funding lines within the University. Within the five groups are nine categories:

- Category 1 - General Administrative
- Category 2 - Academic Administration - Level 1 (Deans, Assoc., & Assist. Deans)
- Category 3 - Academic Administration - Level 2 (Chairs, County Extension Directors, & School Directors)
- Category 4 - Administrative Support - Level 1 (Band 6-8, County Extension Agents)
- Category 5 - Administrative Support - Level 2 (Band 1-5)
- Category 6 - Faculty
- Category 7 - Coaches
- Category 8 - Information Technology - Level 1 (Band 6-8)
- Category 9 - Information Technology - Level 2 (Band 1-5)

Each group has five columns of information with regard to the different types of increases tabulated by category:

- Summ - the average increase either based on the total number of employees in a particular section or the increases given within the section;
- Gen - the average general or cost of living increase;
- Perf/Merit - the average performance or merit based increase;
- Rec/Prom/Transf - the average increase for reclass, promotion, or transfer; and
- Pay Adj/Misc - the average amount given as a miscellaneous pay adjustment.

Each of the above columns contains an average increase. In the case of the summary column, the count of employees considered in the average for either the total or the number receiving increases for the section is noted above the average. On the reports of average increases received, each column contains the count of employees receiving a particular type of increase used to calculate the average.

Every effort was made to produce an accurate, understandable analysis of salary increases for the past year, but as this document attempts to answer many questions within a concise format, some further questions may occur. Please direct all questions either to the Office of Institutional Research or to a member of the Faculty Senate Accountability Committee.
Average Percent Salary Increase by Category
Salary Study Fall 2001

- Faculty: 5.33%
- Administrative: 5.40%
- Staff: 3.88%
Frequency of Faculty Pay Raises
September 2000 - September 2001

Number

Percent of Increase*

*1 percent is range of 1-1.99
Average Percent Increase by Category and Group

- Four
- Five
- Eight
- Nine

Categories:
- Academic
- Administrative
- PSA
- Auxiliaries
### Average Administrative and Faculty Percent Increase by College

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Admin-1*</th>
<th>Admin-2**</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AFLS</td>
<td>14.67 (2)</td>
<td>4.38 (18)</td>
<td>5.50 (212)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAH</td>
<td>6.14 (3)</td>
<td>8.20 (9)</td>
<td>5.85 (180)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BBS</td>
<td>3.46 (3)</td>
<td>4.37 (12)</td>
<td>5.70 (123)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COES</td>
<td>8.17 (3)</td>
<td>6.74 (16)</td>
<td>4.67 (266)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEHD</td>
<td>23.47 (2)</td>
<td>9.13 (12)</td>
<td>6.07 (94)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes deans, associate deans, and assistant deans.

** Includes chairs, county extension directors, and school directors.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Ctr</th>
<th>Admin Faculty</th>
<th>Univ Adv</th>
<th>Athletics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>11.97 (14)</td>
<td>3.68 (2)</td>
<td>4.14 (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEHD</td>
<td>6.07 (94)</td>
<td>4.45 (26)</td>
<td>5.70 (123)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COES</td>
<td>7.03 (19)</td>
<td>4.71 (93)</td>
<td>3.92 (166)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BBS</td>
<td>7.64 (12)</td>
<td>3.92 (166)</td>
<td>4.35 (40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAH</td>
<td>4.71 (93)</td>
<td>3.92 (166)</td>
<td>3.11 (37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFLS</td>
<td>5.53 (21)</td>
<td>5.50 (212)</td>
<td>4.09 (31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>7.31 (78)</td>
<td>7.64 (12)</td>
<td>5.00 (212)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ Adv</td>
<td>3.88 (109)</td>
<td>0.52 (5)</td>
<td>3.67 (227)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESOLUTION TO RECOMMIT SUPPORT FOR THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSOR’S STATEMENT ON DISCRIMINATION

FS02-1-1 P

Whereas, On August 18, 1992, the Faculty Senate of Clemson University in South Carolina did vote to support the Statement on Discrimination as penned by the American Association of University Professors; and

Whereas, This resolution subsequently was approved by the Provost and Board of Trustees of Clemson University; and

Whereas, While this resolution was not published due to actions taken by the Faculty Senate of Clemson University in September of 1993; and

Whereas, Clemson University publicly and joyfully embraces pluralism on the campus, in the state, in the nation, and in the world; and

Whereas, Clemson University upholds the virtues and values of nondiscrimination of all people in all settings at all times; and

Whereas, There is no reason not to recommit the Faculty Senate of Clemson University in South Carolina to the Statement on Discrimination as penned by the American Association of University Professors; and

Whereas, There is a compelling reason to publish such commitment;

Therefore be it:

Resolved, That it is the position of the Faculty Senate of Clemson University of South Carolina declares itself in support of the current Statement on Discrimination, as penned by the American Association of University Professors.

This resolution was unanimously passed by the Faculty Senate on January 8, 2002.
1. Call to Order: The Faculty Senate Meeting was called to order at 2:34 p.m. by President Alan Grubb.

2. Approval of Minutes: The General Faculty & Staff Minutes dated December 19, 2001 and the Faculty Senate Minutes dated January 8, 2002 were both approved as written.

3. "Free Speech": Professor Wayne Patterson, Department of Management, spoke on, "Why so Little for the Worker Bees?" (Attachment A).

   John Bednar, Professor of Languages (French), then delivered his thoughts on “Clemson in the World’s Service” (Attachment B).

   President Grubb recognized and congratulated Doris R Helms, upon being named the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, and also recognized other guests present at the meeting.

4. Special Orders of the Day: The Director of the Calhoun Honors College, Steve Wainscott, spoke to the Senate about the future and the impact of the budget on the Honors College, noting that it will be smaller but broader and that major decisions will need to be made to get a handle on the program growth. Dr. Wainscott would like to see the Honors College move toward all students becoming honors and scholars who aspire to educational greatness. He also noted that the Honors College need to be more educationally autonomous, more interdisciplinary. At present, most of the courses are available only because of the good graces of the department chairs and dean. The Honors College needs to have the wherewithal to offer special honors courses and have faculty hired to teach these courses. It was also noted that to strengthen the sense of community between students and faculty, that there needs to be a place on campus for this interaction. This is also important because interaction between students and faculty directly ties into President Barker’s goals for students to attain scholarships such as the Rhodes, Marshall, and Truman Scholarships. The question is whether we want to have a true honors college or not. At this time it is an honors college in name only. Does a degree granting honors college with its own faculty fit the Clemson culture? Dr. Wainscott informed the Senate that next year the Honors College will celebrate its 40th Anniversary and that maybe a major donor could be identified and a celebration be held.
Lawrence Nichols, Director of Human Resources, briefly described the different search processes used at Clemson University for faculty and staff. His office does not participate in faculty searches unless it works with a department by performing a background check. Classified staff positions are in several different forms. His office attempts to match what the person tells them as stated by the person advertising the position. This attempt is made to ensure that the pool is qualified for the position based on the advertisement. People are encouraged to be sure they cover all of the different qualifications represented in the advertisement. Mr. Nichols noted that his office does rely on the cover letter for specific information not necessarily mentioned in the application. The Senate was informed that Human Resources now does universal background checks prior to the point people are hired by Clemson University. This responsibility for pre-screening candidates for classified positions was delegated to Human Resources by the State Office of Human Resources. Departments are asked to give them the opportunity to perform these checks before a person is hired. It was also noted that the State of South Carolina requires that any person Clemson hires not be in default of student loans. Mr. Nichols then responded to comments and questions from the senators. In particular, several senators pointed out that the delay in processing of the paycheck causes enormous difficulties for foreign graduate students newly-arrived in the country. There was also some concern about Human Resources’ ability to properly screen the applications of applicants in technical fields, like computer programming.

Debbie Jackson, provided a SACS Update to the Faculty Senate reminding all that we are in the process of this reaffirmation. Visiting SACS teams will be on our campus during March 11-14, 2002. Dr. Jackson noted that we want the teams to understand that they are welcome on our campus and that they are free to access any of our information and that we want everyone to represent Clemson well. Dr. Jackson encouraged Senators to feel free to talk about things the teams have questions about, to provide solid information, and to answer their questions openly and honestly. Senators are encouraged to read relevant sections of the full Self-Study Report (available on the Clemson University Home Page).

6. Slate of Officers: The Slate of Officers was presented by the Advisory Committee to the Faculty Senate.

Vice President/President-Elect:
Chuck Linnell (Health, Education, & Human Development)

Secretary:
Camille Cooper (Clemson University Libraries)

The floor was opened for additional nominations for each office; however, none were received. Each candidate then provided a statement regarding his/her thoughts of and plans for the Faculty Senate.
Due to the withdrawal of Senator Linnell from the slate after the meeting, a revised slate was determined by the Advisory Committee and forwarded to all Senators:

Vice President/President-Elect:
Dale Linvill (Agriculture, Forestry & Life Sciences)
Brenda Vander Mey (Business & Behavioral Sciences)

Secretary:
Camille Cooper (Clemson University Libraries)
Connie Lee (Health, Education & Human Development)

Elections will be held in March, 2002 at which time additional nominations will be accepted.

7. Committee Reports
   a. Senate Committees
      1) Research Committee – Senator Dan Warner, Chair, stated that there was no report.

      2) Welfare Committee – Chair Connie Lee submitted and briefly explained the Report dated January 29, 2002 (Attachment C). President Grubb noted the level of enthusiasm of the partnership on the part of the directors of the Chambers of Commerce and expressed the hope that this endeavor will shape the way people are brought to Clemson during the search process.

      3) Finance Committee – No report.

      4) Policy Committee – Chair John Huffman noted that the committee met a few weeks ago. He informed the Senate that the handout regarding post-tenure review modifications will not be submitted until after he speaks with the Provost. The committee discussed the statement regarding professional responsibilities. The committee has no objections to part of it but does have reservations about the grounds for removal. Several items will be brought to the floor during New Business.

      5) Scholastic Policies – Senator Jim Zimmerman, Chair, submitted the Committee Report dated January 22, 2002 (Attachment D) and the Plus/Minus Grading at Clemson: Results of a Faculty Survey (Attachment E). The results were presented to the Council on Undergraduate Studies and after much debate vote to forward a recommendation that mimics the Senate recommendation to have a test period of two years. Two schemes will be forwarded to the Provost: C (the one that the faculty preferred) and D (the one that the ad hoc faculty committee preferred).
b. **University Commissions and Committees**
   
a. President Grubb informed the Senate that at the President's Cabinet a report was presented regarding insourcing and outsourcing. Clemson is trying to create possibilities of insourcing tying them to academics. The question of consideration of the human factor was raised during discussion.

b. Senator Vander Mey announced that nominations for Outstanding Women’s Awards are being received through February 15th for staff, faculty, graduate and undergraduate students, and contributor.

c. President Grubb thanked those Senators who went to the Board of Trustees Committee meetings in our attempt to establish a rapport with them. The Board is willing to talk with us, discuss issues, and establish contact.

d. President Grubb informed the Senate that past presidents of the Faculty Senate now meet regularly with President Barker. These meetings provide important input considering the collective, institutional memories of the past presidents and will have more impact as they continue.

e. The Grievance I Activity Overview (Attachment F) was submitted and briefly explained by President Grubb; as was the Grievance II Activity Overview (Attachment G) by Senator Sturkie.

8. **Old Business:** None

9. **President’s Remarks:** President Grubb
   
a. Remarked on the success of the Grievance Forum held on February 7, 2002. Presentations by speakers were unscripted. Videotapes are available from the Faculty Senate Office, the Provost's Office, and the Reserves Unit of the Cooper Library. Summaries of breakout session will soon be distributed.

b. Noted that it is time to complete the Senate Committee business for this session. Written annual reports should be submitted no later than the April, 2002 Senate meeting.

c. Informed the Senate that the Deans and Provost will meet together at the Executive/Advisory Committee meeting on February 26th in an effort to enhance communications between the two groups. A variety of issues will be discussed.

d. Reminded the Senate that as a body, we work as representatives, but that individual senators are always welcome to submit resolutions (resolutions do not have to come just from committees).
e. Informed the Senate that the Grievance Board reported that it is acceptable to grieve the performance-based salary increase process only if the procedures had not been properly followed.

f. Announced that the nominations for the Centennial Professorship Award are due to the Faculty Senate Office no later than March 4, 2002.

10. New Business:
   a. The Faculty Senate elected by secret ballot the following people to the Selection Committee of the Centennial Professorship: Fred Switzer, Chair; Bob Green (Named Professor); Bonnie Holaday (Administrator); and as faculty, Stephanie Barczewski and Doug Shier.

   b. Senator Huffman individually submitted and explained the following Faculty Manual Changes: Renewal of Appointment, Tenure or Promotion, Description of Assessment Committee, and Financial Disclosure to Holders of Endowed Chairs and Titled Professorships. There was no discussion on any of the proposed changes. Vote was taken on each and all three proposed changes were passed unanimously (Attachments H, I, J respectively).

   c. The Faculty Manual Change, Statement on Discrimination, was then submitted and the history explained by Senator Huffman. Senator Huffman, President Grubb, and Vice President Sturkie met with President Barker, Thornton Kirby, Byron Wiley, and Cathy Sams about this proposed change. The language submitted is a result of that meeting. During discussion a friendly amendment was offered and accepted. Vote to accept proposed change was taken and passed (Attachment K).

10. Announcements:
   a. The Annual Faculty Senate Spring Reception will be held on April 9, 2002 at the Madren Center.

   b. President Grubb reminded the senators to encourage colleagues to consider college elections to the Faculty Senate in March, 2002 – that good people are needed and continuity is important.

12. Adjournment: President Grubb adjourned the meeting at 4:39 p.m.
Absent: Bertrand, Huff, Miller, Hall, Linvill (Galyean for), Snyder, Rippy, Malloy, Brannan, B. Lee, Katsiyannis
Why so Little for the Worker Bees?

The mid-year pay raises announced in December leave me asking this question. The criteria for sharing in the wealth created by the increase in student tuition could not have been more broadly written. Yet, in many cases they were incompletely and very narrowly applied. Virtually everyone could build a case for a well-deserved share of the pie--yet none of us could have predicted such a small piece of pie. The portion of the pie received by faculty and staff may not give a true picture of the amount of money we're talking about. Consider the estimate below. In the fall, the increase was $150 for each in-state student and $750 for each out of state student. In the spring semester all students incurred the $750 increase. Graduate assistants had only a $60 increase per semester.

From a conservative estimate of more than 17.4 million dollars--only $2 million went to faculty and staff. If Clemson intends to become a top 20 ranked school, it could not be further behind elsewhere than in faculty salaries. If the faculty is to help achieve the goal of reaching the top 20, they are more likely to get on board if salary deficiencies are corrected sooner rather than later. In my college the entire $2 million allocation would not quite bring us to peer institution averages. Giving the $15.4 million to 'some other category' makes little sense. I urge the faculty senate to use every means at their disposal to ensure more equitable treatment of faculty and staff in distributing funds from this year's tuition increase and subsequent increases.

In order to become a top 20 university, the faculty must support the university's budget approach and I applaud the awareness of budget planning we enjoy today, thanks primarily to President Barker. While I appreciate the openness in disclosing the budget plan I don't fully understand how I could have affected the plan before its disclosure. I appeal to the Senate to play an active role in establishing the priorities for the next budget year. If faculty were to be considered more favorably in distributing the funds from a tuition increase, they are more likely to strive to achieve the top 20 ranking the university seeks.

Thank you.

Number of Undergraduates by Residency by Semester

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>In State</th>
<th>Out of State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 01*</td>
<td>9937</td>
<td>4038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 02*</td>
<td>9354</td>
<td>3785</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Estimated 2001-02 Increase Undergraduates 14373300

Number of Graduate Students by Residency by Semester

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>In State</th>
<th>Out of State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 01*</td>
<td>1576</td>
<td>1114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 02*</td>
<td>1507</td>
<td>1032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad Asst**</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Estimated 2001-02 Increase Graduate students 3028470

Estimated 2001-02 Increase 17401770

* Figures from Office of Institutional Research
** Number of Graduate Assistants by residency from Graduate School

J. Wayne Patterson, Professor
Management Department
College of Business and Behavioral Science
February 12, 2002.
President Grubb, Senators, Colleagues, and Fellow Members of the Clemson Community:

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak briefly to you about a subject that, in my opinion, warrants discussion.

Clemson in the World’s service. Clemson in the nation’s service. Clemson in the service of South Carolina. Clemson in the service of the community. Among the many services that we perform, I would like to think that one of the most vital (and surely one that is central to our mandate as an educational institution) is our open and frank examination of the issues we face in all of the above-mentioned venues. And there is one issue that I feel we have been ignoring. That is the purpose of my presence here today.

Since September 11th, according to our President, we are a nation at war. Since the middle of last year (and more severely since September 11th), our economy has been in a state of recession. For the first time in many years, a Republican President has proposed a deficit budget for the country, shortly after proposing tax cuts based on estimates of the biggest surpluses in history. Many businesses are telling their workers that they must take a pay cut if they want to keep their jobs. Other businesses are laying off workers. The State of South Carolina has announced funding cuts for state institutions and those cuts are impacting Clemson, in my own department as well as in all of yours. Educational programs are disappearing. People in the Clemson Family are
losing their jobs. We are not moving toward the top twenty. We are moving away from it. We simply do not have the resources at this time.

And that brings me to my subject. The subject I would like to raise with you is the subject of sacrifice. I have always thought that a nation at war, a nation that has sent its armed forces into battle, is a nation that calls upon its citizenry to make sacrifices while its soldiers risk the ultimate sacrifice of giving their lives. We have heard very little talk of sacrifice, not at the international level, not at the national level (except for President Bush's call to national service), not at the state level and not at the community level. And yet many sacrifices, as I have already said, are being imposed.

So I ask that you reflect upon this subject. And further I would ask that you give some thought to what sacrifice, if any, you personally would be willing to make under the circumstances. Would you be willing to contribute by teaching an extra class? Would you be willing, particularly if you are a tenured faculty member with job security, to take a cut in pay? If all of the Clemson employees making more than fifty thousand dollars a year contributed 5% of their base salary to the cause, much of the Clemson Family would be saved. And by extension, practically all of the current erosion of our pedagogical mission would disappear. But far more importantly, we would show the community, the state, the nation and the world that are indeed willing ... to sacrifice.

Thank you.
MEMORANDUM

Date: January 29, 2002
To: Faculty Senate Executive/Advisory Committee
From: Connie Lee, Chair of the Welfare Committee (WC)
Subject: Monthly Written Report

Old Business

1. Sick Leave for 9 Month Faculty Employees:

Mr. Brett Dalton phoned to inform that he has been working with Ross Wilkinson in helping Provost Helms with approving the WC to pursue the issue at the State level. Relevant documents were faxed to Mr. Dalton on 1/22.

2. Spousal/Partner Employment:

President Grubb and Chair Lee met with Mr. Nail, Director of Clemson Chamber of Commerce, on 1/18. Mr. Nail ran some issues by before coordinating a meeting with Clemson University representatives and the other Upstate Directors of Chamber of Commerce. The meeting is set for 2/6 at the Clemson Chamber in the Depot on Tiger Boulevard. Dori Helms, Lawrence Nichols, Kinley Sturkie, and Thornton Kirby are invited to the meeting.

3. Salary Inversion among Faculty Members:

The WC has put this issue on hold until further notice.

4. Getting Paid on a 12 month Basis:

As the Faculty Senate advised at its November 13, 2001 meeting, the following statement will be announced to all the Faculty members at Clemson University:

".....Over the past several months the Faculty Senate Welfare Committee has investigated the possibility of faculty members having choices about receiving salary payment over a 12-month or 9-month period. The possibility of faculty members electing to have their academic salary spread over a 12-month calendar year or retaining the current, 9-month, academic-year payroll system was investigated at length. Findings from this investigation suggest that faculty members paid over a 12-month period could face financial penalties in the form of under withheld income tax, reduced pay for teaching summer classes, and, for those receiving income through grants, reduced summer income and negative effects on retirement. As a result, the Faculty Senate decided that pursuing this issue further would not be in the best interest of the faculty."
Mr. Ron Herrin, Director of Payroll and Employee Benefits, encourages faculty members who wish to pursue alternative methods for ensuring financial security through the summer months to contact his office. Counselors in Mr. Herrin's office can work with individual faculty members to set up savings plans through payroll deductions. Payroll deduction plans are tailored to meet the needs of the individual.... 

5. Screening of the Applications:

Mr. Nichols will be at the February Faculty Senate Meeting to address the issue.

6. Medical Insurance Coverage for Preventive Measures:

Senator Katsiyannis joined the January WC meeting to get the issue off the ground. He shared information from Nebraska in an effort to explore what the WC should do in order to pursue this issue further.

Chair Lee will attend the Classified Staff Senate (CSS) Welfare Committee meeting on 2/12 at 9 am to explore if the CSS would be interested in pursuing this issue collectively. The WC feels that if more people at Clemson University showed interest in this issue, it would be easier to justify pursing the issue. Chair Patty Warner expressed her personal interest in this issue.

7. Reduced or No Fees for Fike Membership:

Dr. Jim Pope, Director of the Department of Campus Recreation, joined the January WC meeting and briefed the WC on his budgetary operation. Dr. Pope was not optimistic about pursing the issue, due to the current budgetary constraints.

President Grubb will present this issue to Gary Kirby, Student Government, to see if his constituents would be interested in pursuing this issue collectively. President Grubb and Chair Lee may approach President Barker with this issue after obtaining sufficient amount of information on the Fike Operation.

New Business

1. Reserving Parking Spaces for 24 hours for Faculty:

Senator Chapman referred the issue on Professor Martin Jacobi's behalf. To be discussed at the February WC meeting.

2. Insurance and Health Benefits for Domestic Partners:

Senator Chapman referred the issue on Professor Art Young's behalf. To be discussed at the February WC meeting.

The Next meeting is scheduled on February 1 at 3:30 pm in Room 538 Edwards Hall

Cwl/Written Report to the Ex/Ad Committee/1/27/2002
Minutes from the January 22, 2002 meeting of the Scholastic Policies Committee

Present: Frances Chamberlain, Julie Clark, Camille Cooper, Mickey Hall, Paula Heusinkveid, Ed Moise, Ryan Solomon and Jim Zimmerman

Two progress reports were heard.

The +/- proposal was presented to the December meeting of the Council on Undergraduate Studies. Student Senate has conducted an electronic poll of undergraduates. The students were approximately 70% against the change. The results of the student survey were published in last Friday's Tiger.

The Faculty Senate electronic survey, using the same format as the student survey, ran into some administrative delays over the holidays, but these delays were quickly resolved by Interim Provost Helms. The survey is scheduled to come out at any time (note added after meeting: the survey was sent out January 23). The closing date for the survey will be February 1. This should give sufficient time to present the results at the February 8 meeting of the Council on Undergraduate Studies.

The expanded test of the electronic version of the “red form”, which was scheduled to have been run last semester, will be done this spring semester. Friday, January 25, there will be a meeting of representatives from DCIT, Assessment, Dr. Reel’s office, Institutional Research, and Scholastic Policies to set up procedures and deadlines to overcome the difficulties that occurred last semester.

There are problems with our scheduled meeting in March. A suggestion was made to meet the hour before the March 12 Faculty Senate meeting. At least two members would not be able to be present. Jim Zimmerman is looking into this.
PLUS/MINUS GRADING AT CLEMSON: RESULTS OF A FACULTY SURVEY

Scholastic Policies Committee
Clemson University Faculty Senate
Clemson, SC, USA

February 2002
PLUS/MINUS GRADING AT CLEMSON: RESULTS OF A FACULTY SURVEY

Background

Discussions about changing the grading system at Clemson University from a whole grade to a plus/minus system have occurred off and on over the past decade or so. In the Spring of 2001, the Faculty Senate of Clemson University voted to formally pursue the issue.

One element of this pursuit was conducting a survey of faculty to see if faculty wanted to change grading systems, and if they did, what kind of system would they prefer. This survey was conducted in January 2002. It was overseen by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Assessment.

Access to and Content of Survey

Faculty at Clemson received an e-mail message asking them to voluntarily participate in the survey about plus/minus grading. The message directed them to a web site that housed the survey.

A copy of the survey appears as the last page of this report. As can be seen, this was a simple survey that asked only two questions. The first question was “Would you like to see Clemson University implement a university wide plus/minus grading system to replace the existing system?“ The second question was “If you voted YES in Question 1, in favor of a plus/minus grading system, which scheme would you like to see implemented? (See tables below for options.)”

Response Rate

The e-mail requesting voluntary participation in the survey was sent to 1,832 faculty members. There were 506 respondents. The response rate was 27.6%.

Faculty Senate Plus/Minus Grading Survey. 2002.
Interest in Changing to a Plus/Minus System

Of the 506 respondents, 300 (59.3%) indicated that they were interested in changing to a university wide plus/minus grading system. The remaining 206 (40.7%) respondents indicated that they would not like to see Clemson change to a plus/minus system.

Type Scheme Preferred

Of the 300 respondents indicating that they are interested in seeing Clemson change to a university wide plus/minus grading system, 298 indicated which of the four grading schemes included in the survey they would like to see implemented. Of the four schemes, 37.9% of the respondents preferred Scheme C, 25.2% preferred Scheme B, 20.5% preferred Scheme A, and 16.4% indicated a preference for Scheme D.

Faculty Senate Plus/Minus Grading Survey. 2002.
Other Notes

Five respondents who indicated that they would NOT like to see Clemson University change to a university wide plus/minus grading system indicated which scheme they would prefer if plus/minus were implemented. Two respondents indicated a preference for Scheme C and three indicated a preference for Scheme D.

The e-mail message sent to Clemson Faculty also gave them the names and e-mail address of persons to contact if they had questions or comments. A few individuals sent messages indicating a preference for grading schemes other than those presented in the survey. One person indicated a preference for straight number grades. Another wanted a scheme that would have pluses but no minuses, and another wanted a system that began with A and had whole grades and pluses and minuses for A, B, and C, but whole grades only for D and F.

Two individuals raised concerns about duplicate voting and access to the survey by those other than the intended audience. These concerns were considered early in the process. The survey was placed on a web site for which only Clemson faculty had access to the address. As with mail out surveys with which audiences have greater familiarity, the same issues about respondent honesty and integrity apply. Overall, it is most likely that all if not the vast majority of respondents were those who were invited to participate.

Another criticism had to do with the respondent list, which might contain names of individuals not actually on the faculty. This was not within the control of the committee.

Recommendation

Preference for changing to a plus/minus system appears stronger than leaving the system as it is. It is recommended that Scheme C be tried for two years on an experimental basis. After that time, a valid, reliable and extensive survey of students and faculty can be conducted to ascertain relative preferences.

Respectfully submitted, Brenda J. Vander Mey and James K. Zimmerman
Faculty Senate Grading Survey (Facsimile of original)

Would you like to see Clemson University implement a university wide plus/minus grading system to replace the existing grading system?

○ Yes ○ No

If you voted YES in Question 1, in favor of a plus/minus grading system, which scheme would you like to see implemented? (See table below for options.)

○ Scheme A
○ Scheme B
○ Scheme C
○ Scheme D

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme A</th>
<th>Scheme B</th>
<th>Scheme C</th>
<th>Scheme D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A+</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>4.3*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>B-</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C+</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>C+</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>C-</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D+</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>D+</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>D-</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*4.3 towards GPR, but 4.0 will appear as final average on transcript.

Faculty Senate Plus/Minus Grading Survey. 2002.
## CLEMSON UNIVERSITY
### GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE ACTIVITY

#### GRIEVANCE I PROCEDURE PETITIONS

April, 2001 through January, 2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Grievances</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Withdrawn Grievances</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Grievances found</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Grievable by Grievance Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Grievances found</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to be Grievable by Grievance Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grievances In Process</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Petitions</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supported by Hearing Panel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Petitions Not</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supported by Hearing Panel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Yet Determined Grievable</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or Non-Grievable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Hearing Panel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grievance Recommendations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supported by Provost</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Page One
GRIEVANCE ACTIVITY BY COLLEGE

Male

Female

0

2

NA

Number of Grievances Appealed to President

Number of Presidential Decisions Supporting Petitioner

Number of Grievances Appealed to Board of Trustees

Number of Board of Trustees Decisions Supporting Petitioner

LIBRARY

E&S

BPA

AFS

AAH

0

0

0

0

0

2
# CLEMSON UNIVERSITY GRIEVANCE BOARD
## GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE ACTIVITY
### GRIEVANCE II PROCEDURE PETITIONS

*April, 2001 through January, 2002*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Grievances</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Withdrawn Grievances</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Grievances found Non-Grievable by Grievance Board</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Grievances found to be Grievable by Grievance Board</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grievances In Process</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspended Grievances</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Petitions Supported by Hearing Panel</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Petitions Not Supported by Hearing Panel</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Yet Determined Grievable or Non-Grievable</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Hearing Panel</td>
<td>Grievance Recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grievance Activity by Non-Academic College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AAH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grievance Activity by College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMORANDUM

TO: Alan Grubb
FROM: Alan Schaffer

RE: Faculty Manual change for renewal of appointment, tenure or promotion

The final paragraph on page iv-3 of the Manual now reads:

"Except in cases of penultimate year tenure review, the candidate is offered the opportunity to withdraw at this stage. The complete file, including all recommendations and supporting evaluations, is then forwarded to the Provost. The dean also shall forward the complete file on those requests for reappointment for which there are one or more negative recommendations from the departmental committee, the chair or director, or the dean."

At its January meeting, the Policy Committee voted unanimously to change the paragraph so that it will read:

"Except in cases of penultimate year tenure review, the candidate is offered the opportunity to withdraw at this stage. In all other cases, the complete file is forwarded to the Provost."

Would you please put this on the agenda for the Senate’s February meeting.

cc: John Huffman
    Cathy Sturkie
MEMORANDUM

TO: Alan Grubb
FROM: Alan Schaffer

RE: Change in description of Assessment Committee

Prof. Debra Jackson, acting for the Self-Study Steering Committee suggested the following changes in the description of the university’s Assessment Committee, both of which have been approved by the Policy Committee.

The first sentence in the section on the committee’s composition on page vi-7 of the Faculty Manual is changed to read (the new language is in bold): “Members of the Assessment Committee with three-year terms include: two representative from each college and one from the library appointed by the respective deans; two representatives from different areas under the jurisdiction of and appointed by the vice president for administration and advancement; one representative appointed by the dean of undergraduate studies; two representatives from student affairs appointed by the vice president for student affairs; one representative appointed by each of the following: the athletic director, the dean of the graduate school, the vice president for public service and agriculture, and the vice president for research.”

The following sentence will be inserted near the end of that same paragraph: “The committee elects its own chair for a one-year term from among the faculty and administrative representatives.”

Would you please put this on the agenda for the Senate’s February meeting.

Cc: Debra Jackson
John Huffman
Cathy Sturkie
MEMORANDUM

TO: Doris Helms, Provost
FROM: Alan Schaffer

RE: Financial disclosure to holders of endowed chairs and titled professors

At its February meeting the Senate voted to append the following paragraph at the end of the *Faculty Manual*’s section on endowed chairs and titled professorships (part iii, section F):

"Before the end of the calendar year a record of all expenditures from the account supporting each endowed chair and titled professorship shall be made available to its holder."

With your approval this will be added to the Faculty Manual at the earliest opportunity.

cc: Alan Grubb
    Cathy Sturkie

14 February 2002
MEMORANDUM

TO: Dori Helms, Provost
FROM: Alan Schaffer

RE: Faculty Manual statement on discrimination

At its February meeting the Senate agreed to a change of language in the *Faculty Manual*’s section on *Affirmative Action, part iv, section B*, page iv-1.

The first sentence of the second paragraph of that section now reads: “It is the policy of Clemson University that no person is to be accepted or rejected for employment solely on the basis of sex, minority group membership, or handicap.”

The Senate voted to change the language to read: “It is the policy of Clemson University that no person is to be accepted or rejected for employment on the basis of age, gender, disability, race, religion, national origin, or sexual orientation.” The remainder of the paragraph is unchanged.

If you approve this, it needs then to be forwarded to the Board of Trustees for their approval before the *Faculty Manual* change can be made.

cc: Alan Grubb
    Cathy Sturkie
MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
MARCH 12, 2002

1. Call to Order: The Faculty Senate Meeting was called to order at 2:40 PM by President Alan Grubb.

2. Approval of Minutes: The Faculty Senate Minutes dated February 12, 2002 were both approved as written.

3. “Free Speech”: There was no one who wished to use the free speech period.

4. Special Order of the Day: Ryan Solomon from the Student Government introduced two issues carried over from last year that SGA is currently dealing with. He wanted to get some basic feedback from the Senate before the SGA took action.

   The first issue is the proposal of a grade redemption policy which would allow students to retake courses and replace the original grades with a new grade. Senators made several observations about this. It was noted that grade redemption in some form seems a good idea. However, the desirability of a policy is almost entirely dependent on the specifics of the proposal, so SGA is asked to present a such a proposal to the Scholastic Policies Committee for action next academic year.

   The other issue concerns the possibility of allowing professors to voluntarily publish their student teaching evaluations in a centralized location on the internet for student information purposes. An SGA resolution to this effect was passed in March of 2001 but the issue was tabled at the end of last academic year by the Faculty Senate Executive Advisory Committee. The SGA hopes to make a formal presentation of a new policy at the April meeting of the Faculty Senate. Several comments were made about this, including:

   - It’s not clear precisely in what form the results would be published. The SGA does not wish to have a single, overall numerical value but rather wishes to publish the distribution of answers to selected questions.
   - It’s not clear precisely what information students wish to have and thus whether the existing evaluation form is the proper instrument to get that information. It might be desirable for the SGA to develop its own questions.
   - There are important differences between different types of courses that effect the evaluations. For example, required courses often have lower scores than multiple sections of an optional course.
   - Since teaching evaluations are part of the instructor’s personnel file, any publication must be explicitly and entirely voluntary.
President Grubb asked that a specific proposal be made available before the April meeting so Senators would be sufficiently informed to discuss the specifics.

5. Election of Officers: The Senate has received the following nominations for next year's officers:

Vice President / President Elect: Dale Linvill
Brenda Vander Mey

Secretary:
Camille Cooper
Connie Lee

An opportunity was provided for further nominations from the floor – there were none. A motion to close the nominations was unanimously approved. Each candidate was then given the opportunity to make a brief presentation. Senators voted on paper ballots, which were then collected and counted. Both races were extremely close, but our new officers are as follows:

Vice President / President Elect: Dale Linvill
Secretary: Connie Lee

6. Committee Reports:

a. Senate Committees:

1) Research Committee – Chair Dan Warner reported that his committee was in the final stages of drafting a new research ethics policy in line with new NSF regulations. A final document will be produced in time for a vote at the April meeting.

2) Welfare Committee – Chair Connie Lee submitted and briefly explained the Report dated February 26, 2002 (Attachment A). She added that the committee had investigated the definition of “domestic partner” for the purposes of securing insurance coverage. It was discovered that the state already recognizes long term relationships as common law marriages, with common law spouses being able to secure all benefits. However, the state has no provision for same sex domestic partners.

3) Finance Committee – No report.

4) Policy Committee – Chair John Huffman reported that the committee has approved the new university consulting policy. Two other items will also come up later in the meeting and will be discussed then.

5) Scholastic Policies Committee – Chair Jim Zimmerman submitted and briefly explained the Report dated February 26, 2002 (Attachment B).

b. University Commissions and Committees: Senator Vander Mey announced that the Outstanding Women's Awards will be presented March 14th at 3:30 in the basement of the Strom Thurmond Center.
7. **Old Business:** There was no old business to discuss.

8. **President’s Remarks:** President Grubb noted that the SACS review was currently underway and Senators would have several opportunities to meet with the committee members. The final report will be presented publicly this Thursday at 9AM in the Strom Thurmond auditorium.

9. **New Business:**
   a. Senator Huffman brought forward a proposal from the Policy Committee to alter the composition of the academic council so as to make the dean of the graduate school a voting member (attachment C). The proposal was unanimously approved.

   b. Senator Huffman brought forward a proposal from the Policy Committee to make changes in the Grievance procedures (attachment D). After some discussion, a motion was made to table this issue. The motion was passed unanimously and the issue tabled.

   c. Senator Huffman brought forward a proposal from the Policy Committee to make changes in the PTR section of the faculty manual (attachment E). After some discussion, a motion was made to table this issue. The motion was passed unanimously and the issue tabled.

   d. Senator Huffman brought forward a proposal from the Policy Committee to adopt a new, university-wide consulting policy very similar to the existing one in the college of Engineering and Science (attachment F). There some discussion of the following points:

   - The policy treats 12 month employee and 9 month employee consulting differently. The provost pointed out that the way 12 month employee consulting is handled is a result of state law and that part of the reason for this is that 12 month employees, unlike 9 month employees, can accrue annual leave.
   - Paragraph 7 is not really about consulting. A friendly amendment was made and accepted to move this item to the last point so it will not be lost amidst relatively unrelated items.
   - It is unclear whether one needs to file a consulting form for consulting done on weekends. The consensus was that one should probably do this just to be safe, even if it wasn’t strictly required.

A motion was made to table this issue. The motion was passed unanimously and the issue tabled.
e. Senator Zimmerman brought up a proposal from the Scholastic Policies Committee to oppose the scheduling of football games Monday-Thursday during the academic year.

After two friendly amendments were made and accepted, the proposal now reads: “The Faculty Senate opposes the scheduling of any home football game on a weekday or weeknight when the university is in session and petitions the ACC not to negotiate contracts that require its member institutions to do so.”

The proposal passed unanimously (FS02-03-1 P) (attachment G).

Senator Zimmerman asked that the resolution be forwarded on to UNC’s Faculty Senate, from which it originated.

10. **Adjournment:** President Grubb adjourned the meeting at 4:04 p.m.

\[\text{Signature} \]

Kelly Smith, Faculty Senate Secretary

\[\text{Signature} \]

Cathy Toth Sturkie, Administrative Assistant
MEMORANDUM

Date: February 26, 2002
To: Faculty Senate Executive/Advisory Committee
From: Connie Lee, Chair of the Welfare Committee (WC)
Subject: Monthly Written Report

Old Business

1. Sick Leave for 9 Month Faculty Employees:

Mr. Brett Dalton sent the WC a copy of the memo that Provost Helms sent to President Barker (See attachment). Provost Helms believes that all the benefits that the State of SC offers for its employees are inferior to other States and recommends that the WC look into more than just sick leave for 9 month employees.

2. Spousal/Partner Employment:

President Grubb, Senator Backman, Chair Lee, and Mrs. Sturkie met with all the Directors of Chamber of Commerce on 2/6. There are some issues, such as meeting with the Director of the Michelin Career Center, that the WC needs to iron out before having the next meeting with the Directors.

3. Salary Inversion among Faculty Members:

The WC has put this issue on hold until further notice.

4. Getting Paid on a 12 month Basis:

Mrs. Sturkie announced via e-mail Mr. Herrin’s offer to set up a payroll deduction plan to the CU faculty on 2/12.

5. Medical Insurance Coverage for Preventive Measures:

Senator Dunston attended the Classified Staff Senate (CSS) Welfare Committee meeting on 2/12 to explore if the CSS would be interested in pursuing this issue collectively. The CSS is interested in supporting the WC’s efforts to improve state health care benefits and free membership to Fike. Chair Warner suggested that the WC contact the South Carolina State Employees’ Association (SCSEA) concerning the health care benefits. The SCSEA lobbies the legislators and it could help us pursue the issue.
Ms. Cathy Bell and Ms. Rosa Grayden, who are active with the SCSEA, will be contacted in the process of pursuing this issue. The CSS expressed one concern and one suggestion:

**Concern:** No one wants to see the quality of equipment and services at Fike diminished as a result of giving faculty and staff free membership.

**Suggestion:** Check into using the vending machine money from all across campus to subsidize Fike's budget. Currently, vending machine money is controlled by the Provost and given out at the end of each academic year in the form of grants to faculty.

7. **Reduced or No Fees for Fike Membership:**

Still need to hear from Gary Kirby, Student Government, on this issue. President Grubb and Chair Lee may approach President Barker with this issue after obtaining sufficient amount of information from Mr. Kirby.

---

**New Business**

1. **Reserving Parking Spaces for 24 hours for Faculty:**

Mr. Granger from Parking Service and Captain Hendricks from University Police will join the March meeting to address the issue.

2. **Insurance and Health Benefits for Domestic Partners:**

This issue will be on hold until the Board of Trusts passes the discrimination resolution.

---

*The Next meeting is scheduled on March 1 at 3:30 pm in Room 538 Edwards Hall*
MEMORANDUM

TO: Jim Barker
FROM: Doris Helms
SUBJECT: Faculty Senate Welfare Committee Request from Connie Lee
DATE: February 13, 2002

You asked me to look into an issue raised by Dr. Connie Lee and the Faculty Senate Welfare Committee. The Faculty Senate Welfare Committee has pointed out that although 9-month faculty accrue sick leave, they may only use this sick leave during their normal 9-month contract period. This creates a problem for faculty that become ill during a period of summer employment. Even though they may have accrued substantial sick leave, they are unable to utilize the leave during the summer.

The State Office of Human Resources has verified that state policy will not allow for 9-month faculty to utilize sick leave during the summer. I have reviewed the information provided by State O.H.R. and understand their ruling. However, we need to work cooperatively and proactively with other state agencies, and with the legislature to create a climate that is supportive of a high quality higher education system in South Carolina. The most critical component of this support being the ability to attract and retain the best faculty possible. As we compete with other top institutions for new faculty, we are rapidly learning how far Clemson University and the state of South Carolina lag behind many top quality institutions in other states that offer better salaries and better fringe benefit packages.

To focus on the specific issue raised by Dr. Lee, I recommend that our legislative liaisons be asked to explore this specific issue of faculty sick leave. Given that working with the legislature and other governmental agencies is a complex exercise and one that must be handled cautiously, I will defer to their judgement on exactly how we should proceed in handling this legislative or regulatory issue. After their review and input, we can formulate an informed and appropriate course of action in a manner that most benefits Clemson and its faculty.

C: Connie Lee
Scholastic Policies Committee

Minutes of the March 5, 2002 Meeting

Present: Frances Chamberlain, Julie Clark, Camille Cooper, Mickey Hall, Ryan Solomon, and Jim Zimmerman

Jim Zimmerman reported on the progress of the +/- initiative. It is currently in the hands of the Provost.

Jim Zimmerman also reported on preparation for the test of the electronic version of the red form used for teaching evaluations. More than 200 sections have been identified to take part. Most of these sections are paired such that a single instructor teaching multiple sections of a single course will have one section done electronically and a matching section done by paper. Not all of the sections could be matched this way. Courses from all five colleges are well represented. Some laptop courses are also included to see if the response rate is higher in these courses than in other courses using the electronic form. The instructors for these courses have now been notified (as have the Deans after our meeting). Evaluations are to start April 1.

In a response to an email forwarded by Eleanor Hare concerning an email from Dr. Reel's office concerning rules about who can take the packet of teaching evaluation forms to class, Jim Zimmerman confirmed with Dr. Reel's office that faculty can take the packets to class where the evaluations would then be done by the students. Dr. Reel's office indicated that a correction would be sent out.

The committee responded to a request from the Faculty Senate at the University of North Carolina. The request regarded resolutions on football on Thursday nights, the "exponential growth and commercialization of athletics programs in the A. C. C." and items related to implementation of the Knight Commission report. The committee submits the following wording as a resolution. "The Faculty Senate opposes the scheduling of any home football game on campus on a weekday or week night during the academic year and petitions the ACC not to negotiate media contracts that require its member institutions to do so."

The committee also heard areas of activity in the Student Senate regarding a Grade Forgiveness Policy, academic advising, and posting of teaching evaluations.

Our next meeting will be April 9, at the Madren Center, at 1:30--immediately before the full Senate meeting.

***************
MEMORANDUM

TO: Alan Grubb
FROM: Alan Schaffer

RE: Change in composition of the Academic Council

The Dean of the Graduate School has asked that her position on the Academic Council be changed from non-voting to voting member. The policy committee approved this at its last meeting, but the change needs also to be approved by the Faculty Senate.

Would you please put this on the agenda for the next Senate meeting.

cc: John Huffman
    Cathy Sturkie√
I haven't read these, but this is what Brenda sent.

Dr. Grub,

As per our conversation this day please find attached a word document that I constructed for Dr. Helms to take to the Chair of the Policy Committee over a year ago. This information was as instructed by Mr. Anderson. Please feel free to review the information and use it as you feel appropriate. Thank you.

I have included the information in the body of this email in the event that you cannot open a word document. Thanks

MEMORANDUM

TO: POLICY COMMITTEE CHAIR

FROM: INTERIM PROVOST DORIS R. HELMS

DATE: JANUARY 19, 2001

SUBJECT: SUGGESTED REVISION TO GRIEVANCE
PROCEDURE GUIDELINES

The present Faculty Manual discusses two grievance procedures, which are available to faculty members to facilitate the redress of alleged injustices. These procedures are found on pages 26-33 of the Faculty Manual as noted in the (web edition of the August 2000 Faculty Manual http://ww.clemson.edu/facman).

During the administrative review of recent grievances it was brought to my attention that certain wording found in the discussion of these two grievance procedures is not clear in its intent and needs to be reviewed and revised to eliminate any confusion in the process by which all administrative reviews and decisions are rendered.

Also there are areas that need to be changed in order to be consistent.

The purpose of this memorandum is to bring this matter to your attention and respectfully request that the Policy Committee review this matter for possible revision.

WORDS IN BOLD AND UNDERLINED WILL BE TAKEN OUT

WORDS IN BOLD AND ITALICS WILL BE INCLUDED

ITEM #1.
In the recent change to the Faculty Manual which created a new section to the grievance procedures as noted below the wording Professor should be changed to reflect Ombudsman.

B. Faculty Ombudsman (change approved 2/13/01)

The Faculty Senate through the Provost provides a Faculty Ombudsman who serves the interests of faculty, post-doctoral fellows, and graduate students by acting as mediator in any dispute in which they may be involved. The confidential services of this professor Ombudsman, knowledgeable about the grievance process, are available free of charge with the expectation of resolving disagreements before they reach the formal stages outlined in the following sections on grievance procedures.
ITEM #2
In order to determine the following as noted on page 27.

If at any time the Provost determines that a faculty member has filed grievances concurrently under both GP-I and GP-II, and that these grievances are based on the same or a related factual situation, the Provost may suspend processing of one petition until a final decision has been reached on the other petition.

ITEM #3
The following changes need to be made on page 28, 3. Procedure. A.

A faculty member who desires to file under GP-I must submit a written petition within thirty days after the date of the alleged grievance. (As an example of the time limits, if notification is given that a faculty member will be dismissed for cause, the thirty-day time period begins with the date that the faculty member was notified in writing. The time period does not begin with the effective date of dismissal.) The petition is to be submitted to the Chair of the Faculty Senate Advisory Committee with a copy being sent to the Office of the Provost.

ITEM #4
Changes are necessary to assure that all administrative decisions are rendered based on the same information in both a GP-I and a GP-2
d. Findings of fact and recommendations of the hearing panel must be based solely on the hearing record and shall be submitted to the Provost. *The Hearing Record shall consist of: all documents pertaining to the grievance which have been submitted to the Faculty Senate Office or to hearing panel member(s) prior to the hearing, during the hearing, or after the hearing by the petitioner, the respondent(s) or any other person(s).* The majority vote of the panel shall be the recommendation forwarded to the Provost. The recommendation must be submitted to the Provost within fifteen days after conclusion of the hearing. If the hearing procedure has been waived, recommendations of the Panel shall be submitted to the Provost no later than fifteen days after completion of its investigation of the grievance. Both parties to the grievance shall be given copies of the recommendation at the time they are forwarded to the Provost. The chair shall provide a copy of the transcribed record to both parties as soon as it becomes available.

e. The Provost shall review the record of the hearing and shall render a written decision to the Petitioner within thirty days of receipt of the transcribed typed hearing record. *The Hearing Record shall consist of the report of the hearing panel, the typed hearing record and all documents pertaining to the grievance which have been submitted to the Faculty Senate Office or to hearing panel member(s) prior to the hearing, during the hearing or after the hearing by the petitioner, the respondent(s) or any other person(s).* The documents pertaining to the grievance shall be submitted to the Office of the Provost in the following format: 1) documents submitted by the petitioner (labeled as such and assembled in the order they were received and placed under separate cover), 2) documents submitted by the respondent(s) (labeled as such and assembled in the order they were received and placed under separate cover), 3) documents submitted by any other person(s) (labeled separately as to each person and assembled in the order they were received and placed under separate cover). The decision of the Provost shall include findings of fact and conclusions of law, separately stated. Copies of the decision shall be sent to all parties to the petition the Respondent and to the Hearing Panel.

4. Appeals. The faculty member Petitioner may appeal the Provost's decision to the President. A written appeal must be submitted to the
Office of the President within ten days after receipt of the Provost's decision. If an appeal is made, the President shall review the hearing record and the decision of the Provost and shall render a written decision within thirty days of receipt of the request for the review. The decision shall include findings of fact and conclusions of law, separately stated. Copies of the decision of the President shall be sent to all parties the Petitioner, the Respondent(s), the Provost, and the hearing panel members.

The faculty member Petitioner may appeal the decision of the President to the Board of Trustees. A written appeal must be submitted to the Executive Secretary of the Board of Trustees within ten days after the receipt of the President's decision. Receipt by the Executive Secretary shall be deemed receipt by the Board. If an appeal is made, the Board of Trustees, or a committee of Board members appointed by the Chair, shall review the record of the hearing and the decisions of the President and the Provost, and shall render a final decision on behalf of the University. The decision shall be in writing and shall include findings of fact and conclusions of law, separately stated. Copies of the decision of the Board of Trustees shall be sent to all parties the Petitioner, the Respondent(s), the President, the Provost, and the hearing panel members.

3. Within fifteen days of the final hearing, the panel shall submit its findings and recommendations to the Provost along with appropriate documents and records the Hearing Record. The Hearing record shall consist of: all documents pertaining to the grievance which have been submitted to the Faculty Senate Office or to hearing panel member(s) prior the hearing, during the hearing, or after the hearing by the petitioner, the respondent(s) or any other person(s). The documents pertaining to the grievance shall be submitted to the Office of the Provost in the following format: 1) documents submitted by the petitioner (labeled as such and assembled in the order they were received and placed under separate cover), 2) documents submitted by the respondent(s) (labeled as such and assembled in the order they were received and placed under separate cover), 3) documents submitted by any other person(s) (labeled separately as to each person and assembled in the order they were received and placed under separate cover). In the event the Provost has been recused from a decision-making capacity, the findings and
recommendations and the Hearing Record shall be submitted to the President. Simultaneously, a copy of the Panel's findings and recommendations shall be forwarded to the petitioner, and the respondent.

g. Upon receipt of the hearing panel's recommendation, the Provost shall review the matter, requesting any persons involved to provide additional information as needed. The Provost shall render a decision no later than fifteen thirty days after the receipt of the Panel's recommendation and the Hearing Record. The decision and findings of the Provost, including the rationale for the decision, together with the report of the hearing panel, shall be transmitted in writing to the faculty member Petitioner, the hearing panel, and all named parties the Respondent(s).

4. Appeals. Any party at interest may submit a written appeal of the Provost's decision to the President. The appeal must be submitted within seven days after receipt of the Provost's decision. At the same time that a party appeals to the President, a copy of the appeal must be sent to the University Counsel. Upon receipt of an appeal, the President will notify in writing the faculty member Petitioner, the Provost, the respondent(s), and the hearing panel chair. The President shall review the grievance petition, the recommendations of the hearing panel, the decision of the Provost, and the Hearing Record. The President may seek additional information from any person involved in the case. If new relevant information comes to the President, he may remand the appeal to the Provost for reconsideration. The President shall render a final decision on behalf of the University within thirty days after receipt of the written appeal. Copies of the President's decision shall be sent to the Provost, the faculty member Petitioner, the respondent(s), and the hearing panel.

Brenda J. Smith
Office of the Provost
206 Sikes Hall
Clemson, SC 29634
864-656-3940
<bjs@clemson.edu>

This item was tabled by the Faculty Senate on March 12, 2002.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Alan Grubb
FROM: Alan Schaffer

RE: Modification of PTR section of the Faculty Manual

At its January meeting the Policy Committee unanimously accepted some changes in the procedures for post-tenure review (PTR). Most of what is in the Manual is reasonably clear, but number 7 under the Procedure section on page iv-7 is unclear and self-contradictory in part. What follows is the committee's attempt at making this section more "user friendly" and is based on the following assumption: it was the Faculty Senate's intention when PTR procedures were formulated that a rating of "unsatisfactory" could be given only if both the chair and the department peer review committee agreed on that rating. In effect that's what the Manual now says at the bottom of page iv-7 and since that has already been accepted it leaves a limited role for the deans and the Provost in establishing final ratings. The following changes recommended by the Policy Committee are designed to make that clearer:

Under PTR Guidelines on page iv-6 it now says, "The primary basis for PTR is the individual's contributions in the areas of research, and/or scholarship, teaching, and service." The committee recommends changing this to read, "The primary bases for PTR are the individual's contributions in the areas of teaching, research and/or scholarship, and service. The best judges of those contributions are the individual's departmental colleagues and the department chair who has annually evaluated the individual's work."

The committee also recommends changing section 7 on page iv-7 to read:

"The PTR committee and the department chair provide separate, independent reports to the faculty member who will have two weeks from time of receipt to submit responses. If in both reports the individual is rated "satisfactory," only the reports and responses are forwarded to the dean who certifies that the process outlined in the Faculty Manual has been followed and forwards the received file to the Provost who notifies the individual of the "satisfactory" rating.

"If either the PTR committee or the chair rate the individual "unsatisfactory," the entire PTR file is forwarded to the dean and through the dean to the Provost. If the dean writes a report giving his/her opinion in the case, copies go to the individual being evaluated, the PTR committee, the chair, and the Provost. The Provost provides a written report to the faculty member, the PTR committee, the chair, and the dean, establishing the rating as "satisfactory," but noting the differing opinions as a clear indication of a problem for the faculty member."
"If both the PTR committee and the chair find the faculty member's work "unsatisfactory," the entire file is forwarded to the Provost through the dean. The Provost establishes the final rating and files a report explaining the rating to the faculty member, the PTR committee, the chair, and the dean. A disclaimer to the Provost's finding may be filed."

The committee further recommends that the final paragraph on page iv-7 be replaced with the following statement:

"To receive a rating of "unsatisfactory" as the final rating, both the PTR committee and the department chair must so recommend and the Provost must agree. In such cases, the burden of proving "unsatisfactory" performance is on the university."

The Policy Committee asks that this be put on the agenda for the Senate's February meeting.

cc: John Huffman
Cathy Sturkie

This item was tabled by
the Faculty Senate on March 12, 2002.
Clemson University Faculty Consulting Policy

Clemson University extends to its faculty members the privilege of consulting because such activities can contribute to the professional development and stature of the faculty member, and thus may benefit the University as well as the faculty member. Such benefit may be, but is not limited to, enhancement of faculty professional expertise, establishing and maintaining professional contacts, associations and relationships, and developing opportunities for sponsored research. "Consulting activity" is defined as professional work performed outside university auspices that is substantively related to a faculty member's area of expertise and duties at the university. Included is consulting for a company owned by oneself or by a member of one's immediate family.

Professional consulting is encouraged provided such activities present no conflicts of interest and are kept within reasonable bounds. The primary safeguard is the requirement that the faculty member secure advance approval for consulting activities to ensure that the activity is beneficial to the University in that no conflicts of interest exist, no conflict with University duties and responsibilities is present, and the total amount of consulting by the faculty member is not excessive. Professional work that is part of the normal duties of members of the academy does not fall under the auspices of this policy.

1) For nine-month faculty, the maximum limit for consulting is one (1) day per week (39 days per academic year) during periods of full-time Clemson University employment. Consulting limits for part-time faculty employees are established on an individual basis using the one-day per week limitation as a guide. In accordance with State and University regulations, 12 month faculty and staff must take Annual Leave when engaged in consulting during their normal work hours.

2) As mandated by the Faculty Manual, all proposed consulting activities (while employed by the University) must receive prior review and approval through the appropriate channels (department chair, dean, and Vice President for Research) to ensure that they present no conflicts of interest and do not diminish the quantity and quality of professional services rendered to the University as part of the faculty member's normal duties and responsibilities. Non-compensated consulting (i.e., public service in one's area of professional expertise) must also receive prior approval whenever the potential for a conflict of interest exists. It is the faculty member's responsibility to assess whether the potential for a conflict of interest in non-compensated consulting exists; when in doubt a consulting form should be submitted.

3) Prior approval must be obtained for consulting use of University equipment or facilities, or the employment of University faculty, staff, and students. The inconsequential use of office-based computing equipment and telephone equipment (e.g. the exchange of e-mails or local telephone calls with a consulting client) is permitted without prior approval.

4) A consulting approval form must be submitted and approved for each proposed consulting arrangement each fiscal year (July 1 through June 30). The number of days of the proposed
consultancy must be provided on the consulting approval form. Estimates must later be amended to reflect the actual days of the consultancy.

5) Personal consulting contracts must not imply that the consultant is an agent of Clemson University. In this regard, Clemson University letterhead stationery or similar indicators of University affiliation must not be used when transacting personal consulting activities.

6) A faculty member must always use his/her own social security number (SSN) or employer identification number (EIN) when transacting personal consulting business.

7) Ownership (by a faculty member, her/his spouse, and any dependent children or any children occupying the same residence), as a principal, officer, director, partner or other like status, of an interest in a business relating to one’s profession must be disclosed to the department chair and dean with copies to the Provost and Vice President for Research. This disclosure must provide the full details of one’s relationship to the business, one’s obligations to the business, how the relationship might impact one’s teaching and research obligations to Clemson University, what potential conflicts of interest could exist, how conflicts of interest will be avoided, etc.

8) If a consulting agreement involves a faculty member assigning rights in intellectual property to the client, and if the subject area or field of such intellectual property is closely related to or the same as a field of research being actively pursued by the faculty member as part of his/her University responsibilities, or logically anticipated as part of such responsibilities; the faculty member must inform the University (Dean, Provost, and Vice President for Research) in detail of such potential assignment and notify or authorize the University to notify the client of possible vested interests in such property held by Clemson.

9) Requests for approval must be processed by the administration within 15 working days of submission.

This item was tabled by
the Faculty Senate on March 12, 2002.
Resolved, That the Faculty Senate opposes the scheduling of any home football game on a weekday or week night when the university is in session and petitions the ACC not to negotiate contracts that require its member institutions to do so.

This resolution was unanimously passed by the Faculty Senate on March 12, 2002.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Alan Grubb
FROM: Alan Schaffer

RE: Change in description of Assessment Committee

Prof. Debra Jackson, acting for the Self-Study Steering Committee suggested the following changes in the description of the university's Assessment Committee, both of which have been approved by the Policy Committee.

The first sentence in the section on the committee's composition on page vi-7 of the Faculty Manual is changed to read (the new language is in bold): "Members of the Assessment Committee with three-year terms include: two representative from each college and one from the library appointed by the respective deans; two representatives from different areas under the jurisdiction of and appointed by the vice president for administration and advancement; one representative appointed by the dean of undergraduate studies; two representatives from student affairs appointed by the vice president for student affairs; one representative appointed by each of the following: the athletic director, the dean of the graduate school, the vice president for public service and agriculture, and the vice president for research."

The following sentence will be inserted near the end of that same paragraph: "The committee elects its own chair for a one-year term from among the faculty and administrative representatives."

Would you please put this on the agenda for the Senate's February meeting.

Cc: Debra Jackson
     John Huffman
     Cathy Sturkie

23 January 2002
MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
APRIL 9, 2002

1. Call to Order: The Faculty Senate Meeting was called to order at 2:33 p.m. by President Alan Grubb. Lawrence Nichols, Director of Human Resources, and Gordon Halfacre, Faculty and Graduate Student Ombudsman, were both recognized by President Grubb.

2. Approval of Minutes: The Faculty Senate Minutes dated March 12, 2002 were approved as written.

3. “Free Speech”: During the Free Speech period, John Huffman, Professor of Chemistry, mentioned problems created by the university bureaucracy in carrying out funded research. In particular appointing postdoctoral fellows (a special faculty rank) is difficult due to the fact that the university treats this as a regular hire, which requires background checks, certification that a foreign university is the equivalent of an American university and in the College of E&S both a letter of invitation from the Dean and a letter of appointment. Both of these have to be signed by the candidate. There are additional, and continuing problems with the university's accounting system which is from several weeks to a few months behind. This makes it impossible to keep track of expenditures on research grants. There is a distinct perception by faculty that the university bureaucrats have lost sight of the fact that they are here to help the faculty.

4. Special Order of the Day: Ryan Solomon, Chair, Academic Affairs Student Senate, provided presentations on a proposed redemption policy and a proposed policy for publicizing evaluations of instructors (Attachment A). Discussion followed. President Grubb thanked the students for their detailed presentation and noted that this discussion will continue.

5. Old Business:
   a. Vote was taken and passed unanimously to rearrange the agenda so that a resolution could be presented at this time. President Grubb submitted the resolution, Resolution Expressing Appreciation to the Madren Center and to Aramark, Inc., for approval by the Faculty Senate. Motion to approve was seconded. Vote was taken and resolution passed unanimously (FS02-4-1 P) (Attachment B).

6. Committee Reports:
   a. Senate Committees:
   1) Research Committee - Chair Dan Warner reported that a draft for comments of the Research Ethics Policy will be submitted to the Faculty Senate later and provided a general explanation of the Policy. Senator Warner reminded the body that Research Week is in progress and noted that the Research Committee of the Board of Trustees will meet on Wednesday at which a Senate representative will be present.
2) Welfare Committee – Chair Connie Lee submitted and briefly explained the Annual Report of the 2001-2002 Welfare Committee dated April 9, 2002 (Attachment C). Senator Lee noted that the two remaining action items regarding the inauguration of a spousal/partner hiring partnership between the University and the Upstate Chambers of Commerce are to approve a logo and to meet with the deans. Senator Lee thanked her committee members for their diligent efforts throughout the year.

3) Finance Committee – Steve Miller, Chair, inquired about the expected distribution date of the salary report showing total compensation for faculty. Provost Helms explained that about six faculty members still need to be checked thoroughly before the report is completed and noted that a faculty member had requested this information through the Freedom of Information Act. Provost Helms expressed her concerns about releasing this information due to the great possibility of misinterpretation. A copy of the report will be given to the Faculty Senate President and one will be placed in the Library. The Provost informed the Senate that the faculty member was asked by the administration to make the same request of other public universities in the state. It is not known if he has done so. Discussion followed.

4) Policy Committee – Chair John Huffman submitted the Final Report of the 2001-02 Policy Committee (Attachment D). Highlights noted by Senator Huffman included time limits for submission of grievance documents; nondiscrimination statement to include sexual orientation; senior lecturer position; and extension of probationary period for parenting. Items noted by Senator Huffman to be addressed next year include: revisions to the post-tenure review procedures; University consulting policy; draft statement of professional responsibilities; evaluation of individual holding endowed chairs; revisions to Grievance I and II procedures; and proposed search procedure guidelines.

5) Scholastic Policies Committee – Chair Jim Zimmerman submitted and briefly explained the Summary Report for 2001-2002 Academic Year (Attachment E). Senator Zimmerman thanked his Committee and also the student leaders who participated in this Committee’s meetings and discussions.

b. University Commissions and Committees: None

c. Report from the ad hoc Committee to Implement a Faculty Performance Appraisal System – Professors Fred Switzer and Mary Ann Taylor provided a brief history of the work of this Committee. A final version of the report will be submitted to the Faculty Senate next semester. Noted especially was that the report will contain three sections: Section 1-basic principles of good performance appraisals (which will not be generalities); Section 2-specific recommendations for various things that need to be done at Clemson University for improvement; and Section 3-miscellaneous specifications for a performance appraisal system at Clemson University (smaller issues). The Provost
thanked Professors Taylor and Switzer noting that it is something that will benefit the University – something the Faculty Senate started that is being carried forward to the department chairs.

d. Senator Camille Cooper provided an historical overview of the faculty display and informed the Senate of the new Clemson Authors Display sponsored by FirstSun Management Corporation (Joe Turner and Kelly Durham). The display will hold articles written by faculty who have been at Clemson University five years.

7. Outgoing Remarks and Introduction of Senate President: Outgoing remarks were made by President Alan Grubb (Attachment F) who then introduced D. Kinly Sturkie, III, as the Faculty Senate President for 2002-03. New officers were installed at approximately 4:26 p.m.

8. New Business:
   a. President Sturkie welcomed the new Senators and noted that individual introductions will be done at the May Faculty Senate meeting.
   b. Vacancies on the 2002-03 Senate Roster were noted by President Sturkie, who also asked that they be filled as quickly as possible.
   c. An orientation luncheon for new Senators and Alternates will be held at 1:00 p.m. on Tuesday, May 14, at the Madren Center immediately prior to the Senate meeting. This orientation is an effort to provide information and get acquainted.
   d. President Sturkie asked continuing Senators to reply to the email message regarding their committee preferences. Forms were distributed to new Senators and Alternates to complete and return.
   e. President Sturkie asked for a vote to continue the ad hoc Committee to Implement a Faculty Performance Appraisal System At Clemson University. Vote to continue Committee was taken and passed unanimously.

9. Announcements: President Sturkie urged the Senators to designate two representatives from each college to the Advisory Committee; note which one will perform the duties of Lead Senator; and to forward this information to the Faculty Senate Office as soon as possible.

Kelly Smith, Faculty Senate Secretary
10. **Adjournment:** President Sturkie adjourned the meeting at 4:32 p.m.

   [Signature]
   
   Connie Lee, Secretary

   [Signature]
   
   Cathy Toth Sturkie, Administrative Assistant

Absent: L. Grimes, J. Burns, F. Chamberlain, B. Vander Mey, D. Placone, J. Brannan
Distinguished Faculty of Clemson University:

Hello. I have attached the PowerPoint documents for the Student Senate's presentation on April 9, 2002 at the Faculty Senate Meeting on April 9, 2002. We want these two policies to go into effect in some shape or form; therefore, we plan to negotiate with Faculty Senate on this date and come up with final proposal. We understand that before the policy goes into effect, it must first meet the approval of the Academic Council, which includes the Provost and all of the deans. If the council approves the policy, it will be sent to President Barker for his approval. Both of these policies have been debated in the Faculty Senate for the past few years. Student Senate has already passed a resolution for both of these policies, and now we want to get the approval of the Faculty Senate. Please look over both presentations and reply with any questions, concerns, complaints, or criticisms that you may have. You will notice that we have deleted the grades of B and C from the redemption policy. We made this decision based on more research and previous criticisms of including both of these grades. We are extremely open to any and all feedback as we plan to work for the students of Clemson University. We would definitely like to make both of these policies agenda items; therefore, we definitely want to vote on final proposals for Academic Council to review. Thank you very much and we all look forward to the meeting on Tuesday, April 9th at 2:30 pm in the Madren Center.

For Clemson,

Ryan S. Solomon

________________________
Ryan S. Solomon
Chair, Academic Affairs
Clemson University Student Senate
Home: 858-4496
Cell: (843) 224-3683
rsolomo@clemson.edu
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Implementing a Redemption Policy

Summary of Data & Proposal
By Mohamed Abdel-Kader and Jeff Davis
Academic Affairs Committee of the CU Student Senate
Ryan S. Solomon, Chair
Mark Mead, Vice-Chair
Erin Hines, Stephen J. Aaron, Franklin Davis
Chris Hogue, Chris Welch

159 University Union Plaza
Clemson, SC 29634
The foremost priority of the Clemson University administration, faculty, and students is to promote student learning.

Clemson University should strive to formulate policies conducive to student learning.

Students should be rewarded for sacrificing money, energy, resources, and time in order to correct mistakes of an academic nature.

Clemson University's benchmark schools such as NC State, Virginia Tech, Iowa State, Michigan State, and Purdue have implemented forgiveness policies without compromising academic integrity.

ACC schools such as UNC, Univ. of Maryland, FSU, and Wake Forest have implemented forgiveness policies as well.
Academic performance is subject to suffer in the course of human events that every student faces, at times due to uncontrollable or unforeseen circumstances.

Several of the top 20 institutions in US News & World Report's ranking have similar retake or forgiveness policies without compromising their academic reputation.

US News & World Report bases its ranking of colleges and universities on several criteria, several of which could be enhanced by an Academic Redemption Policy.

Out of the top 20 public colleges, nine support similar redemption policies. The University of California-Berkeley has a redemption policy.
Policy Section #1

All currently enrolled students may retake three courses of grades D or F for re-computation into the Grade Point Average. I grades must be completed before course redemption can be attempted.

The intent of the policy is to allow students to make up any deficits in learning. In striving for excellence we should allow any student the opportunity to redeem their academic deficits, and have them so noted.
The Redemption Policy

Policy Section #2

All courses taken shall remain noted on the transcript, with each respective grade recorded permanently.

Rationale: This is to ensure that students are accountable for their actions. If a grade were to be simply expunged from the record, there would be no accountability for one’s actions. The transcript is a historical record of all academic courses taken. Regardless of grades attained, all courses should be noted with grades.
The Redemption Policy

Policy Section #3

All courses taken at Clemson University shall be eligible for redemption.

Rationale: Classes taken at other institutions may not have the same material covered and may not be subject to the same regulations in place at Clemson University. Since transfer courses are not accounted into the GPR, they are not applicable. Under the current system a student may repeat any course they wish according to availability. Some departments have restrictions that would restrict students to one re-take. This would not be affected.
The Redemption Policy

Policy Section #4

Grades received in breach of the Academic Integrity Statement will be ineligible for retake.

Rationale: Any breach of the Academic Integrity Statement is usually the result of a form of cheating or stealing. There is no uncontrollable circumstance that would lead a student to cheat or steal.
The Redemption Policy

Policy Section #5

Dual course credit towards a degree will not be permitted.

Rationale: This is to prevent a student from using a previously taken course as a fulfillment for another requirement, and therefore “hitting two birds with one stone.”
The Redemption Policy

Policy Section #6

Before a course may be re-taken, the student must submit a “Course Redemption Request” form to the registrar before the first day of classes. Priority in seats will be given to students that have not previously taken the class. If seats thereafter become available, vacancies may be occupied by students wishing to re-take the class for redemption.
The Redemption Policy

Policy Section #7

Redemption credit hours will be accounted in conjunction with Withdrawal hours. The number of redemption credit hours used will be deducted from the cumulative number of Withdrawal hours a student has remaining. In the event a student has exhausted their Withdrawal hours, consequently their redemption credits will have been exhausted. The number of credit hours for transfer students will be adjusted accordingly by the registrar's office.
The Redemption Policy

Policy Section #8

A course may be repeated only once for redemption credit.

Rationale: This is to prevent abuse of the system. A student will have one opportunity for redemption credit in a chosen course. However, the student may still retake a course under the existing system.
The Redemption Policy

Policy Section #9

Redeemed grades will be graphically noted on the transcript with a "*" or a "R."

Rationale: This will differentiate between classes taken for redemption and under the normal system.
The Redemption Policy

Policy Section #10

In calculating class rank, students with a non-redeemed Grade Point Average will have the higher rank over students with a redeemed GPA.

Rationale: This rewards the students that have achieved excellence without having to redeem a course.
The Redemption Policy

Policy Section #11

An administrative fee shall be levied upon the student taking a course for redemption. This fee will be used to cover the cost of administrative expenses by the registrar.

Rationale: This is to alleviate any financial expenses arising out of "bookkeeping" for such a policy. Also, this will provide a financial commitment to students to also help prevent abuse. The fee is also not steep to prevent students from not paying it.
This policy is retroactive for CURRENT students of Clemson University.

Rationale: Students who are currently attending Clemson University and have re-taken classes may opt to use redemption credits to adjust their records. These students should be rewarded for their hard work. Their GPR should signify their level of achievement as their transcript notes all their courses and grades.
Publicizing Instructor Evaluations

Summary of Data & Proposal
Compiled by the Academic Affairs Committee of the CU Student Senate
Ryan S. Solomon, Chair
Mark Mead, Vice-Chair
Erin Hines, Stephen J. Aaron, Franklin Davis
Chris Hogue, Chris Welch

159 University Union Plaza
Clemson, SC 29634
Statement of Purpose

To research the possibility of publicizing instructor evaluations through a study of 73 other "benchmark" institutions, selected by *U.S. News & World Report* and *Time Magazine* rankings.

To develop a plan for publication best suited to the interests of the faculty and students of Clemson University.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of South Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas A &amp; M University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard Law School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Pennsylvania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dartmouth College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California-Berkeley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California-Los Angeles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Michigan at Ann Arbor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wake Forest University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California-San Diego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Southern California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wisconsin at Madison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington and Lee University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furman University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Tech University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of the Holy Cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill - 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Responses to Question 1-A

Are professor evaluations currently published by your institution?

- Yes: 45%
- No: 45%
- Other/Abstain: 10%
Responses to Question 1-B

If they are published, how so?

- Intent--Online: 18%
- Other/Abstain: 9%
- Both: 9%
- Traditional/Print: 27%
- Online: 37%
Responses to Question 2

If you publish or intend to, what part of the evaluation do you publish?

- Objective: 31%
- Written/Free-Response: 23%
- Both/Combo: 15%
- Intent--Written/Free-Response: 0%
- Intent--Both/Combo: 0%
- Intent--Objective: 31%
Responses to Question 3

If you do not publish, is there a student group that does?

- Student Government: 52%
- Greek Organization: 0%
- Unspecified Organization/Group: 16%
- No-no pub.: 32%
Responses to Question 4

Are Evaluations Part of Personnel Files?

- Yes: 37%
- No: 25%
- O/A/U: 25%
- Combo: 13%

- O/A/U
- Combo.
- Yes
- No
Responses to Question 5

Are Syllabi Part of Personnel Files?

- Yes: 8%
- No: 25%
- O/A/U: 46%
- Combo: 21%
Summary of Data

- 45% of schools release instructor evaluations.
- Of these schools, 36% indicated results are released online and another 18% said they intend to release results online soon.
- 85% of schools release or intend to release the objective sections of the evaluation.
- 32% of schools indicated Student Government had some role in publishing the evaluation results.
- Of the institutions that do publish, 33% also retain professor evaluations as part of personnel files, 22% do not, and 45% leave the decision at the discretion of each instructor's respective department in one form or another.
Proposal

As a service to both faculty and students, the Student Senate Academic Affairs Committee is proposing that the responses from certain questions on the evaluation be published on a web-site with the faculty’s permission. Only evaluations of instructors who release their information to the public will be published.

An outline of our proposal is as follows:
Nine questions of great importance have been selected from the list of 16 "bubble-in" questions. These questions are those answered on a scale of 1 to 5, ranging from "Not at All" to "Very Much."
Proposal: Part Two

The bubble-in responses will be displayed in a manner similar to the following, in which X represents the number of students that gave that response and Y represents the percentage, of the students that responded, that gave that particular response:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#of 1's</th>
<th>#of 2's</th>
<th>#of 3's</th>
<th>#of 4's</th>
<th>#of 5's</th>
<th>#of %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Question #1: The instructor... X Y X Y X Y X Y X Y

Question #2: The instructor... X Y X Y X Y X Y X Y
Proposal: Part Three

THE NINE QUESTIONS

- The course was well organized.
- There was a positive interaction between the class and the instructor.
- The instructor's teaching methods helped me understand the course material.
- The instructor's verbal communication skills helped me understand the course material.
- The instructor clearly explained what was expected in assignments and tests.
- Overall, the instructor is an effective teacher.
- The instructor's grading procedures gave a fair evaluation of my understanding of the material.
- How much work did you put into this course relative to your other courses?
- How difficult was this course for you relative to your other courses?
Proposal: Part Four

The free-response question: "Would you recommend this instructor to a friend? Y/N Why?" would also be published.

Due mostly to logistics, only the number of "yes" and "no" responses will be displayed.
Proposal: Part Five

Instructor evaluations would be published by course. This means that for a particular instructor, if different courses (not sections, but courses) are taught, the instructor would have two different summaries of responses. For instance, the instructor teaches two courses. Instructor evaluations would be published by course.
Proposal: Part Six

An overall rating for an instructor will not be published.
Proposal: Part Seven

Evaluation summaries will be published online.
DCIT offers client support and could provide help to get an initial web-page up and running.
Proposal: Part Eight

Student Government, especially Student Senate, would lead this effort, requiring virtually no effort by faculty.

The Academic Affairs Committee will send out a mass e-mail to all faculty explaining the publication process and asking if he/she grants permission for their evaluations to be published.

If so, the faculty member will simply hit reply and enter the course for which they desire evaluations to be released.

No other effort should be required.
Proposal: Part Nine

There is a sheet included in each instructor evaluation packet for identification purposes.

This sheet currently contains the faculty member's name and course number.

Another line will be added stating "Publish: Y" or "Publish: N."
Upon initial implementation, the database would contain evaluations from the Fall 2001 semester. As time passes, subsequent evaluations will be posted.

Previous semesters the course was taught is semesters of evaluations from the four added each semester until a maximum of four.

Proposal: Part Ten
A Few Final Words...
RESOLUTION EXPRESSING APPRECIATION
TO THE MADREN CENTER AND TO ARAMARK, INC.

Whereas, The Faculty Senate has had a longstanding relationship with the Madren Center and Aramark, Inc.; and

Whereas, The Madren Center and Aramark, Inc., have provided a variety of services to the Faculty Senate in an excellent manner and either at no charge or at reduced prices; and

Whereas, Responses to the Faculty Senate's many requests regarding facilities, equipment, food, etc., have always been handled in a timely, friendly and helpful manner; and

Whereas, The Faculty Senate depends upon the Madren Center and Aramark, Inc. especially when hosting such events as its annual Spring Reception, Faculty Senate Retreats and Forums, the Class of '39 Celebration, Library Appreciation Receptions, and gatherings with the Board of Trustees as well as its monthly meetings; and

Whereas, The Madren Center and Aramark, Inc. employ personable, highly professional, and loyal people with whom it has always been a pleasure to work;

Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Clemson University Faculty Senate expresses its appreciation of these services and of its long association with the Madren Center and Aramark, Inc., and looks forward to working with them in the future.

This resolution was passed unanimously by the Faculty Senate on April 9, 2002.
Annual Report of the 2001-2002 Welfare Committee
Connie W. Lee
April 9, 2002

The Welfare Committee Members: Ken Backman, Pamela Dunston, Larry Grimes, Daryl Guffey, Harold Hupp, and Connie Lee (Chair)

The Welfare Committee (WC) was charged with a number of issues during the 2001-2002 term of office. The WC met once a month between May 2001 and April 2002. The issues upon which action was taken are as follows:

1. **Sick Leave for 9 Month Faculty Employees:**
   Due to the fact that this issue was imposed by the State of South Carolina, President Barker and Provost Helms approved the WC to bring this issue to the State level. A letter was sent to Legislator Mr. Buddy Webb in April 2002.

   All the benefits that the State of South Carolina offers for its employees are inferior to other States. This is, in particular, is vital to the success of Clemson University and higher education in the recruitment and retention of faculty.

2. **Spouse/Partner Employment:**
   Michelin Career Center at Clemson University, along with the Clemson Chamber of Commerce, will assist Clemson University Faculty and Staff spouse/partner in finding job placement in the Upstate.

   Faculty Senate President is to have a meeting with the Deans and the Provost to disseminate the service.

   This service will be inaugurated by the beginning of the fall semester, 2002.
   A brochure of the service will be available in the near future.

3. **Salary Inversion among the Clemson University Faculty:**
   This issue has been on hold since August 2001.

4. **Getting Paid on a 12 Month Basis:**
   In spite of intensive work by the WC on this issue, the Faculty Senate voted on November 13, 2001 not to pursue this option.

   Mrs. Sturkie announced via e-mail, Mr. Herrin’s offer from the Office of Human Resources to set up a payroll deduction plan to the CU faculty on February 12, 2002.

5. **Insurance Coverage for Preventive Measures:**
   This issue, along with the issue of sick leave for the CU faculty, will be addressed on the letter to Legislator Webb.
6. Fees for Fike Recreation Facility Use:
This issue will be approached in an attempt to establish a structured and well
supervised wellness/fitness program for the CU faculty, staff, and students.

A meeting with President Barker will be scheduled in April. A representative
from the Sullivan Center, Redfern, Public Health Department, Graduate Student
Council and the Campus Recreation will be at the meeting with the President.

7. Reserving Parking Spaces for 24 hours for CU faculty:
The parking Services and the CU Police stated that there was nothing they could
do to increase the number of parking spaces reserved for 24 hours for faculty.
However, they will make sure to reinforce parking regulations. There are over 70
spaces reserved throughout the campus.

8. Mandatory Deposit and Screening of the Applications at Clemson
University:
Mr. Nichols, from the Office of Human Resources, stated that cost and security
are the main concerns. Paycheck stubs will be available on line in the near future.
In addition, direct deposit for the reimbursement checks is in the works.

The college/department search committee handles hiring faculty. However, staff
hiring is handled differently at CU. Some applications were not looked at because
the applicant often failed to specifically state on the cover letter that he/she was
qualified for the job applying for.
FINAL REPORT OF THE 2001-2002 POLICY COMMITTEE  
JOHN HUFFMAN–CHAIR

The Policy Committee considered a number of matters during the 2001–2002 term of office. The more important items upon which action was taken were:

- Post-tenure review procedures were modified to exclude from the review period any year(s) that a faculty member is on approved leave. Approved by the Provost 12/5/01.
- The probationary period for new nine month faculty joining after October 1 of a calendar year will now start with the following August. For twelve month faculty joining after January 1, the probationary period will begin July 1. Approved by the Provost 12/5/01.
- A statement on honesty in grievance proceedings. Approved by the Provost 9/1/01.
- A time limit for the submission of documents in a grievance was established. Approved by the Provost 9/1/01
- Post-tenure review for faculty in the TERI program. Faculty in the TERI program will not undergo post-tenure review. This was passed by the 2000-2001 Senate, rejected by the Provost. 9/3/01.
- A Faculty Manual addition stating that holders of endowed chairs shall receive an annual accounting of all expenditures from the account supporting the chair. Approved by the Provost.
- A Faculty Manual statement that the university will not discriminate by reason of sexual orientation was adopted by the Senate. Approved by the Provost and awaiting approval by the Board of Trustees.
- A new position, that of senior lecturer, was established by the 2000-2001 Senate. This will provide recognition and additional job security for lecturers who have provided several years of meritorious service. Approved by the Provost 2/3/02. Awaits approval by the Board of Trustees.
- A resolution to make the Graduate Dean a voting member of the Academic Council was passed by the Senate. Awaits approval by the Provost.
- A Faculty Manual provision to extend the probationary period for parenting was passed by the Senate. The Deans, through the Provost, requested changes which were rejected by the Policy Committee. The fate of this resolution is unknown.
- Revisions were made in the procedures for review of academic administrators, which were passed at the December or January Senate meeting. Approved by the Provost 2/5/02.
- Much time was spent in proposed revisions in post-tenure review procedures. This will have to be taken up by the 2002-2003 senate.
• The university consulting policy was approved by the committee, but some points need clarification. This will have to be taken up by the 2002-2003 senate.
• A draft statement on professional responsibilities was presented to the committee at their March 2002 meeting. This will have to be taken up by the 2002-2003 senate.
• The evaluation of individuals holding endowed chairs needs to be revisited. This will have to be taken up by the 2002-2003 senate.
• At the March, 2002 meeting the Policy Committee approved a number of revisions in both Grievance Procedures (GP1 and GP2). After consultation with a past President of the Senate and others with recent experience in the grievance process this Manual revision has been held over for the 2002-2003 Policy Committee.
Summary Report
Faculty Senate Scholastic Policies Committee
2001-2002 Academic Year

There were two major initiatives carried over from previous years that will need to be continued in future years.

The major amount of time was spent on the possible implementation of a +/- grading scheme. In the fall, last year’s resolution on +/- grading was referred to the Council on Undergraduate Studies (CUS) which promptly created a committee. During the year, this committee met numerous times obtaining more data and discussing possible variations. During this time Student Government conducted a panel discussion on the topic that was well advertised. The students also conducted a student survey. The Scholastic Policies committee, with the eventual help of the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Assessment, ran a parallel survey of the faculty. The results were diametrically opposed: the students were opposed (30% for, 70% against) and the faculty for (59.3% for, 40.7% against). CUS passed the recommendation by a 13 to 9 margin. CUS also recommended (20:1) that a trial period be used. The matter is now in the hands of the Provost. She has suggested meeting with NC State personnel to see how a test run could be made efficiently. Next year’s Scholastic Policies Committee will need to continue to press this issue.

The second major initiative was a more wide-spread trial of the electronic version of the student assessment forms on teaching (the “red form”). The electronic version asks exactly the same questions as the paper forms. An initial trial on a limited basis was done, at the request of the Graduate Student Association, last year for graduate classes with small numbers. The Provost requested that a larger survey be done through the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Assessment. An initial meeting was held in June with representatives from Institutional Effectiveness, DCIT, Institutional Research, and the Scholastic Policies Committee. Assignments of responsibilities were made. Pairs of sections were made whenever possible to have the same instructor involved in both an electronic version and a paper version. When it came time to implement in the fall semester, an administrative oversight made it impossible to conduct, therefore it was postponed until the spring semester. In January another meeting was held with the same participants plus Dr. Reel and members of his staff. Again specific assignments were made. This time over 200 sections were identified very early. Unfortunately the instructors were not informed until the very last moment. Many faculty have opted out for various reasons. Many faculty still do not feel comfortable with using MYCLE or computers in general. The results should be available this summer. A report on the results will need to be made to the Senate and to the Provost. The infrastructure is firmly in place, but it is already obvious that training of faculty would still be necessary. Next year’s Scholastic Policies Committee will need to consult with the Provost about any recommendations.
Other items that were accomplished during the year:

A clarification was obtained from Joy Smith, Student Affairs, concerning student excuses coming from her office. The excuse only indicates the University recognizes the activity; the decision to excuse a student or not is at the discretion of the instructor. A related issue that was discussed in committee, but not acted upon because of lack of specifics, concerned students who miss class because another instructor has required a field trip in his/her course.

A resolution was passed that indicated students with a GPR <2.0 and who want to change majors should be referred to the newly created Academic Support Center for advising.

A resolution was passed requesting that Clemson University not support the negotiation of media contracts for football games that would result in interference with scheduled class time.

The memo from Dr. Reel’s office on the process for administering the forms for Student Evaluation of Classroom Evaluations has been officially been revised to allow faculty to pick up the packets.

Submitted by Jim Zimmerman, Chair, Scholastic Policies Committee
PRESIDENT'S REPORT

I come now to my President’s Report, which in most respects I suppose I ought to regard like a convict facing his release, that is with relief, but really do not. It has been a privilege to be Faculty Senate President and to represent and work for the faculty and, specifically, for you the senators who really represent and watch over faculty interest and also work to improve this University. The President’s job is, to take a phrase that President Jim Barker has popularized, a “collaborative” endeavor and could not have been done adequately, or at all, without the work of many people—of Cathy Sturkie, who’s helped to keep me abreast of things and handled day-to-day concerns; of Alan Schaffer, Faculty Manual Consultant; of the Executive/Advisory Committee, which had functioned like a cabinet and whose advice has been essential; and of hardworking committee chairs, who have both initiated and carried through many things. I’ll willingly take the credit for their endeavors but I do want to acknowledge that they are theirs and to say what an honor it has been to work with such a group.

An annual report necessarily entails an accounting of things and record of the highlights or achievements of the year. Actually I must confess I hate lists—the ten best of this or that, as if other things aren’t equally important or worth talking about. One of my daughter’s favorite books a few years ago was a book you might recall, The Book of Lists; she read it constantly and was always querying me about what were the ten best of this or that. I hated it. So I have to admit as I’ve thought about my report recently and how I ought to sum up a year, I’ve come around to the view that what’s more important is long range issues and programs, that we ought to think more in terms of laying the foundations for things that may only come to completion or fruition later and even that others may get the credit for than lists of accomplishments in themselves. I think that’s what we’ve done this year. We’ve laid the foundations for things that we will necessarily continue to work on and can only make the University better and help it realize its ambitions and potential.

So with that in mind, let me indicate what I see as the highlights of this year’s Senate. I may miss some, for there’s no way that I can review all that senators or committee chairs or done; there is much that remains subterranean, essential but largely—and wisely—unknown about the Senate’s work, like its part in the grievance process or ability to relay and articulate faculty concerns and interests.

Revision of the Faculty Manual

The Policy Committee continues to work on improving the Faculty Manual—greater clarity, resolving new problems and issues as we become aware of them, updating the document, and improving its availability on the Web. We’ve also decided that changes will henceforth be added at one prescribed date so as to avoid confusion. We started this year with some problems concerning adherence to the Faculty Manual and have, I hope, established that the Faculty Manual is the document we all operate by, that it is not
something we don’t follow because it’s not convenient or because we presumably have a better way of doing things. Like any human document, it has its flaws (though I would not call it “a flawed document”) and needs review and updating from time to time, but it is, besides embodying the notion of faculty governance, the point of reference for how we operate.

Spousal/Partner Hires Program

Thanks to the work of Connie Lee and the Welfare Committee and as the result of numerous meetings with the Clemson Chamber of Commerce and those of surroundings cities and the career counseling people in the Michelin Center and the Alumni Association, the Senate has spearheaded a cooperative program that should help us in recruiting superior faculty because it tackles a problem we have all dealt with in our recruiting efforts, whether of faculty, administrators, or staff, which is that of spousal/partner employment. This program will assist the whole recruitment endeavor but it also, importantly, represents a “partnership”—a partnership not only between the Senate and colleges and departments, between the Senate and the Michelin Center and Alumni Association, but between the University and surrounding cities and towns. It is a program that will be of mutual benefit to the Universities and growing cities like Greenville, Spartanburg, Anderson, Seneca, and Clemson.

Grievance Forum

This year the Senate organized a Grievance Forum which brought together individuals involved in Performance Evaluation and grievances—chairs, deans, grievance panel members, grievance counselors, the Ombudsman—for a discussion of how our procedures might be improved. The text of the Grievance Forum will help shape the forthcoming recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Evaluation chaired by Mary Anne Taylor and Fred Switzer and is an example of the Senate’s contributing to and tackling long-range issues of real substance.

Non-Discrimination Policy

The Senate passed a modification (expansion, really) of the Non-Discrimination Policy, adding sexual orientation, which has been signed by the Provost and will be presented to the Board of Trustees.

Plus/Minus Grading

Due to the efforts of Jim Zimmerman and the Scholastic Policies Committee and the work of many, the Senate has helped along the long-discussed change in grading and this will be tried on an experimental basis.

Parking
This issue, surprisingly, did not arise during the year. The policy recommendation from Administrative Council was presented to Kinly and myself only after the fact and the Senate had no part in its formulation. The Senate has subsequently responded to this proposal and will keep you abreast of developments. I should also note that parking garages are a part of the Master Plan for construction in the near future.

A Spirit of Collaboration

We have worked hard this year to make the Senate a focal point of collaboration by working with other groups, by being inclusive in our proposals and discussions. I think I can say I have worked consciously and diligently at this, because I think this way and believe it is the only way to operate, that by working with others—the President and Provost, deans and other administrators, the student leadership, the Classified Senate, and the Board—we will find solutions to the things we all care about. The Senate doesn’t just speak for and represent faculty viewpoints and interests. That’s our constituency and our essential function, of course, but we’ve also moved beyond that. I’ve wanted to assist in that movement and outlook and I encourage Kinly and the new Senate to continue in that spirit.

I have confidence in the Senate, because I believe in faculty governance and its competence, and also because, in leaving, I know I leave the Senate in good hands and under strong leadership.
MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
MAY 14, 2002

1. Call to Order: The Faculty Senate Meeting was called to order at 2:33 p.m. by President Kinly Sturkie.

2. Approval of Minutes: The Faculty Senate Minutes dated April 9, 2002 were approved as written.

3. Election of Faculty Senate/Faculty Representatives to University Committees: Normal voting rules were suspended in order to allow elections by plurality. Elections of Faculty Senators/Faculty representatives to University Committees were held by secret ballot.

4. “Free Speech”: None

5. Special Order of the Day: Bryon A. Wiley, Director of the Office of Access & Equity, provided an overview of a new outreach effort to be initiated at Clemson University in July. This effort is modeled on one that was originated in the Philadelphia, Pennsylvania school district (Attachment A). Our effort will be called the “Clemson Emerging Scholars Partnership.” The pilot group will consist of fifty students, rising high school sophomores, who will be brought to Clemson for one week. During that week they will have opportunities for collaborative learning, a physical evaluation, and basic skills to assist them with their future plans – orientation, motivation, preparation.

6. Committee Reports:
a. Senate Committees:
   1) Scholastic Policies Committee – Chair Nancy Walker noted that Committee held a brief meeting this morning to look at where Committee needs to go. Committee will continue to address grade redemption issue, publishing of results of online faculty evaluations by students, and Committee wants to ensure that there is follow-up on the plus/minus grading system.

   2) Research Committee – Senator Dan Warner, for Chair Nadim Aziz, stated that Committee has not yet held its reorganizational meeting.

   3) Welfare Committee – Pamela Dunston, Chair, stated that a meeting of new Committee members has not been held yet but that several members of the 2001-02 Senate session met with President Barker and other to discuss a preventive care program at Clemson University. It will be coordinated with a variety of campus groups and will be inaugurated with the reopening of Fike.
4) Finance Committee - Chair Daryl Guffey noted that this Committee has not yet met.

5) Policy Committee - Chair John Huffman stated that the Committee will meet on the 16th of June and will look at the use of the Faculty Activity System from the Committee on International Initiatives.

Secretary Connie Lee provided an update on the spousal/partner hiring initiative.

b. University Commissions and Committees: None

7. President's Report: President Sturkie commented on the following:
   a. A Faculty Senate Orientation Luncheon was held prior to today's meeting to familiarize new Senators and Senate Alternates with the basic structure of the Senate and how business is conducted (Attachment B).
   b. Importance of development of a formal statement to President regarding his leadership throughout the parking crisis - Senators were asked their thoughts. It was decided that an open letter to President Barker and all faculty on behalf of the Faculty Senate expressing congratulations for his decisive action would be the best vehicle of communication.
   c. Graduation - President Sturkie stated that Graduation was very nice under the difficult circumstances. The students were granted what they said they wanted. Cal Becker and staff did a great job.
   d. Reminder to Senators to keep Tuesday afternoons available for Senate meetings
   e. The Faculty Senate will meet on June 11, 2002 but NOT in July.
   f. Concerns were raised to the Provost regarding the use of the Faculty Activity System and International activities.
   g. President Sturkie asked Senators to think of topics for the Fall Senate Retreat to be held in September.
   h. President Sturkie informed the Senate of a plan to have Senators visit Student Government meetings on a rotating basis in an effort of collaboration and better communications. Senator Lee will coordinate scheduling these visits. Senators are to notify Senator Lee if they have problems with the schedule.
   i. The Provost has agreed in principle that if a faculty member is part of the online teaching evaluation experiment, that the information from that procedure will not be used in promotion, tenure, and reappointment process – that it is not fair to issue that data. The Provost wants a formal recommendation through the Faculty Senate Policy Committee to her for approval. The Policy Committee will draft a recommendation.
j. Professor Mary Ann Taylor provided a brief history of the work of the ad hoc Committee to Implement a Faculty Performance Appraisal System noting that there was identification of broad-based problems. The next phase of this work will be to propose changes and recommendation for change.

8. Old Business: None

9. New Business:
   a. Faculty Senate Committee assignments based on Senators’ ranking of preference were shared (Attachment C).

10. Announcements:
   a. Senator Camille Cooper explained the FirstSun Management, Inc. Faculty Display at the Martin Inn. The display now holds the work that was published during the first five years of a few Faculty who started in 1997.
   b. President Sturkie reminded all that the Agendas and Minutes for each Faculty Senate meeting can be found on the Senate website.
   c. Secretary Lee informed Senators that attendance at meetings will be observed.
   d. President Sturkie recognized: Gordon Halfacre, Dean Tom Keinath, Phil Lander, Beth Jarrard, and Alan Grubb.

11. Adjournment: President Sturkie adjourned the meeting at 3:50 p.m.

Connie Lee, Faculty Senate Secretary

Cathy Toth Sturkie, Administrative Assistant

With activities for parents and students, this growing program is helping students graduate from high school and go on to college.
Group activities stress the importance of cooperation and personal adaptation.
Overview of the Partnership Program

One hundred sophomore students are selected annually to participate in a three-phase college preparation program concluding with high school graduation. Rising seniors participate in a three-week residential program at Indiana University of Pennsylvania which closely approximates the academic demands of an average college course load. and enrollment in college. The program is organized around three summer sessions and offers several other educational activities for students and parents during each academic year. The emphasis is on orientation, motivation, and preparation, and all costs are paid by the Office of Social Equity.

Nomination Criteria. The program attempts to maximize student success by focusing on those cognitive and noncognitive variables that positively influence the likelihood that students from poor school districts will graduate from high school and go on to college. Students are nominated by high school counselors on the basis of a number of criteria, including:

- the student is scheduled to graduate with his or her class;
- the student has a high school average of C+ or higher and is enrolled in an academic rather than a vocational program;
- the student has completed Algebra I with at least a grade of C;
- the student is reading at or near grade level;

The Philadelphia School District clearly meets the criteria in the proposed legislation. The district was recently described by a regional newspaper in the following manner: "The fifth-largest urban school district in the nation, it sees half of its ninth graders fail to graduate from high school in four years.... Fewer than 6 percent of high schoolers are proficient in reading.... Three-quarters of its students are black or Hispanic, and most of them are poor."
the student will need financial assistance to attend college; and

the student has demonstrated personal responsibility through involvement in school, community, work, or home activities.

Several of these criteria have been shown to predict graduation from high school and enrollment in and success in college. The mathematics criterion is nonnegotiable. According to Horn and Carroll, “Among at-risk students who aspired to a college degree and were academically prepared, about two-thirds (64 percent) of those enrolled in a four-year college completed at least one advanced math course (such as calculus), compared with about one-third who enrolled in other postsecondary education (36 percent) or who did not enroll at all (31 percent).”

Demonstrating personal responsibility through participation in extracurricular activities is also important. Horn and Carroll stated, “The rate at which students participated in two or more extracurricular activities distinguished students who enrolled in a four-year college (48 percent) and those who had never enrolled in postsecondary education (34 percent).”

A deliberate decision was made to recruit above-average and average students (with B to C averages) rather than superior (A) students. We reasoned that superior students would be encouraged to apply to college by counselors and would see college as a possibility. We hoped to offer college opportunities to those students who thought college was outside of their grasp. Also, we intentionally targeted students from low-income families. Most students from poor and welfare backgrounds believe college is out of reach financially and have little idea of the many financial aid resources that are available.

Selection Criteria and the Selection Process. The application for the program focuses on several noncognitive predictors of college success for low-income and minority students. These predictors were developed by Sedlacek and Brooks and include having a positive self-concept, making a realistic self-appraisal, having the ability to deal with racism, participating in community service, having a preference for long-range goals rather than concentrating only on short-term or immediate needs, having a strong support person to turn to in times of crisis, and exhibiting evidence of successful leadership experience. While the application questions do not tap into each of these characteristics, the questions gather information about the nominee’s strengths in these categories.

Each of the 250 applications is read and ranked by two independent raters. The selection process is difficult and each year scores of students who meet the basic selection criteria must be rejected because of budget limitations.

Phase One: The Rising Junior Program. The first summer session in the program is offered following the students' sophomore year in high school at West Chester University of Pennsylvania and is a combination of outward-bound and upward-bound experiences, adapting many of the themes found in adventure-based programming. Phase One lays the foundation for the development of the academic and behavioral skills and styles that will enhance students' preparation for college. Many physically challenging activities are introduced to demonstrate the importance of human interdependence and personal adaptation. Students begin to realize that reaching out to others in times of need is of critical importance and that the ability to adapt to changing environments is a life skill essential to success in college. The program uses the metaphor of the dinosaur, "those that do not adapt, do not survive!" Other summer program activities include an environmental science laboratory experience: a camping trip for which the students do most of the preparation, cook, set up tents, and practice new outdoor living skills; and an on-campus volunteer service activity. Students are required to keep a journal and to reflect on each experience and its personal significance for them. Formal assessment instruments in mathematics and reading are administered, establishing baselines against which students can monitor their progress over the next two years.

In September, students and their parents or guardians receive a report evaluating their performance in the first year of the program, including the results of the Nelson-Denny Reading Test, the results of the Early Mathematics Placement Test (EMPT), which assesses a student's readiness for college algebra: an evaluation (grade) for the environmental science laboratory experience; and faculty feedback on the student's journal. The report also addresses such things as attention to detail, goal setting, the ability to concentrate and focus, problem-solving skills, and effort, commitment, and partici-
The Philadelphia Partnership

The program is designed to prepare high-risk students for college and improve their academic performance. Students are immersed in a college setting, including attending classes, writing research papers, and taking exams, as well as general coping and problem-solving strategies. The simulation demonstrates the stark reality of college academic life.

Each student is "enrolled" in six minicourses—math, laboratory science, social science, fine arts, English composition, and a study skills/higher education orientation seminar. This schedule approximates a normal 16 credit-hour college load. The format, pace, and content of courses mirror as closely as possible that of regular college courses. The schedule includes attending classes, writing research papers, and taking exams, as well as considerable free time, which participants are expected to manage effectively. Students are retested using the same reading comprehension and math tests administered during Phase One. Peer advisers live in the residence hall and provide guidance on how to tackle the new curriculum, course schedule, and abundance of free time. These topics are also stressed in the study skills seminar, which emphasizes strategies for success in the college environment.

Students and their families receive a report on their performance in September. Professors award grades for each minicourse along with written feedback regarding students' performance. Peer advisers write comments on how students handled the considerable freedom and the associated responsibilities of the simulated college experience. The report includes results on the standardized reading and mathematics tests and recommendations for the senior year. Students are also given a global score on their performance in the program ranging from superior to below average. This score is based on the grade-point average earned in the minicourses.

In addition to the summer sessions and fall meetings at which evaluations are given, the program offers several other ongoing activities. Summer program faculty visit participating students in their schools twice a year. This provides an opportunity for faculty to meet with students on their own turf and to continue the mentoring activities initiated during the summer sessions. Faculty consult with counselors and discuss grades, SAT dates, and financial aid and admission deadlines with students. A meeting is held for the parents of each new group of students at which the special responsibilities of parents of partnership students are discussed.

Phase Two: The Rising Senior Program. Following the junior year, students participate in the rising senior summer session of the program. This is a three-week residential session held on the campus of Indiana University of Pennsylvania, closely simulating the first three weeks of college. Many high-risk students find themselves hopelessly behind after a few short weeks in college. They have no idea of the academic demands of college and attempt to use the same approaches in college that worked with a fair degree of success in high school. The simulation demonstrates the stark reality of college academic life.

Each student is "enrolled" in six minicourses—math, laboratory science, social science, fine arts, English composition, and a study skills/higher education orientation seminar. This schedule approximates a normal 16 credit-hour college load. The format, pace, and content of courses mirror as closely as possible that of regular college courses. The schedule includes attending classes, writing research papers, and taking exams, as well as considerable free time, which participants are expected to manage effectively. Students are retested using the same reading comprehension and math tests administered during Phase One. Peer advisers live in the residence hall and provide guidance on how to tackle the new curriculum, course schedule, and abundance of free time. These topics are also stressed in the study skills seminar, which emphasizes strategies for success in the college environment.

Students and their families receive a report on their performance in September. Professors award grades for each minicourse along with written feedback regarding students' performance. Peer advisers write comments on how students handled the considerable freedom and the associated responsibilities of the simulated college experience. The report includes results on the standardized reading and mathematics tests and recommendations for the senior year. Students are also given a global score on their performance in the program ranging from superior to below average. This score is based on the grade-point average earned in the minicourses.

In addition to the summer sessions and fall meetings at which evaluations are given, the program offers several other ongoing activities. Summer program faculty visit participating students in their schools twice a year. This provides an opportunity for faculty to meet with students on their own turf and to continue the mentoring activities initiated during the summer sessions. Faculty consult with counselors and discuss grades, SAT dates, and financial aid and admission deadlines with students. A meeting is held for the parents of each new group of students at which the special responsibilities of parents of partnership students are discussed.

Phase Three: College Matriculation. Students who successfully complete the first two summer phases of the program and choose to enroll at one of the 14 universities in the Pennsylvania State System of Higher Education matriculate during the summer following high school graduation. This strategy is intentional on our part. Many students are accepted in special summer developmental or bridge programs. Others matriculate as regular college freshmen and earn up to six or seven college credits in summer school. Still others take a combination of developmental and college courses. Summer school offers students a good opportunity to get to know the campus, its resources and personnel, and to develop general coping and problem-solving strategies before beginning the frenzied fall term as new freshmen. The program pays for the entire cost of the summer session. The program also awards students who maintain a C or better grade-point average a grant of $250 a semester for eight semesters of study. All costs are paid through funds administered by the Office of Social Equity.

Program Outcomes

To determine the effectiveness of the program, a research and evaluation study was initiated in 1989. To date, 452 students have completed the summer sessions—65 percent of the students who were selected for and started Phase One. Of these 452 students, 402 (89 percent) graduated from high school on time and 401 enrolled in some form of postsecondary education. Of those who entered college, 307 (77 percent) enrolled at one of the 14 universities in the Pennsylvania State System of Higher Education. Of those 307 students, 192 (63 percent) have either graduated or are still enrolled. Of those eligible to graduate in six years, 55 percent have done so. Of the remaining students, 33 (11 percent) left college prior to graduation in good academic standing and 82 (27 percent) were dismissed for academic reasons or left with below-average grades.

Correlation studies were conducted to investigate the relationships between program variables and students' performance during their first year of college. We looked for relationships between first-year college grade-point averages and scores on the Nelson-Denny Reading Test, the EMPT, and performance in the Phase Two college
The Philadelphia Partnership Program has experienced considerable success. Students benefit from the guidance of faculty as well as the support of a college-bound peer group.

A statistical correlation was observed between the global scores and the first-year college grade-point averages. The better students performed in the college simulation, the better they performed in college. Also, a modest though statistically significant correlation was found between the EMPT scores and the first-year college grade-point averages. No statistically significant correlation was found between the Nelson-Denny Reading Test scores and first-year college performance.

The retention and graduation rates of students participating in the partnership program are extremely encouraging and provide evidence of success. The lack of, or presence of only modest, statistically significant correlations between formal measurements of cognitive ability (math and reading) and college performance did not surprise us. We did not expect to find a relationship between reading level (measured by the Nelson-Denny Reading Test) and first-year college performance.

A comparison of national graduation data for similar student cohort groups is another indication of the success of this program. Recent data published in Postsecondary Education Opportunity indicated that students with backgrounds similar to partnership students experience lower graduation rates. For example, approximately 31.2 percent of the African-American population, 56.6 percent of the Asian-American population, 38.3 percent of the Mexican-American population, 35.5 percent of students with SAT scores of 700 to 840, and 42.6 percent with parents' income between $20,000 and $24,999 graduate within six years of matriculation.

The program is making a difference. Parents and school counselors continually tell us of the change they observe in these students as they participate in the summer program activities. They say that the students demonstrate a stronger commitment to their high school studies, enroll in more demanding courses, and assume greater personal responsibility for their lives.

One explanation for the positive results may be the comprehensiveness of the program interventions. Through participation in the program, students become part of a college-bound group. Horn and Carroll stated, "the number of students' friends with plans to attend a four-year college was strongly associated with enrollment outcomes; students who enrolled in a four-year college were much more likely to report that all or most of their (Continued on page 32)
Philadelphia Partnership (Continued from page 27)

friends planned to attend."12 Strong friendships develop during the summer sessions, and some students even make plans to enroll at the same college.

The partnership program is not only making a difference, it is doing so at a very reasonable cost. The Pennsylvania State System of Higher Education spends approximately $6,800 to sponsor a student for the two summer sessions, summer school matriculation, and the $250 grant for each of eight semesters of college study. In comparison, the federally funded Upward Bound program, which has similar goals, costs approximately $6,800 per student for three years of high school, compared with the $6,800 the Pennsylvania State System of Higher Education is investing in partnership students from the tenth grade through four years of college.
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FACULTY SENATE ORIENTATION

1:00 p.m., Tuesday, May 14, 2002
Board Room of the Madren Center

AGENDA

1. Introduction of those Present at Orientation

2. Introduction of Faculty Senate Officers – 2002-2003
Kinly Sturkie, President (provides input to major groups such as the
Academic Council and the President' Cabinet)
Dale Linvill, Vice President/President-Elect
Connie Lee, Secretary
Brenda Vander Mey, Parliamentarian

Faculty Senate-Related Positions
Alan Schaffer, Faculty Manual Editorial Consultant – annually appointed
by the Faculty Senate President. This person edits the Faculty Manual,
incorporates all changes and ensures the accuracy of the Manual.

Pat Smart, Faculty Representative to the Board of Trustees – recognized as
the official representative of the Faculty to the Board of Trustees of
Clemson University. The faculty member is selected by a committee and
serves a three-year term.

Gordon Halfacre, Faculty Ombudsman – serves the interests of faculty by
acting as mediator in any dispute in which they may be involved. These
services are confidential and free of charge with the expectation of
resolving disagreements before they reach the formal stages of a
grievance. The Ombudsman reports to a Subcommittee of the Faculty
Senate Executive/Advisory Committee consisting of the immediate past,
current, president-elect of the Faculty Senate; the faculty representative
to the Board of Trustees; a faculty member appointed by the Senate Advisory
Committee annually; and a faculty member appointed by the
Ombudsman annually. Grievance Counselors are: Tom Keinath (for
administrators), Dale Linvill, Ken Murr, Bill Steirer, and Ben Stephen.

Assistants
Anne McMahan, Faculty Senate Web Manager
Cathy Sturkie, Administrative Assistant, Faculty Senate Office
3. **Department and Responsibilities of Faculty Senators and Senate Alternates (see handout)**

   a. **Committee Chairs** - mentoring partnership between the current and immediate-past chairs of Senate standing committees to maintain continuity and provide assistance and encouragement.

   b. **Professionalism** - channels of effective communication between Senators and University administration working together on University issues.

4. **Faculty Senate Committee Structure (Subterranean Work per Immediate Past President Alan Grubb)**

   a. **Executive Committee** - Consists of the officers of the Faculty Senate and the chairs of the standing committees. The President is the chair.

   b. **Advisory Committee** - Composed of the Senate officers, a senator from the library, two members from each college (one of whom is the college lead senator). Non-voting members are the immediate past president of the Faculty Senate and the Faculty Representative to the Board of Trustees. The President is the chair.

   This committee advises the President and oftentimes must make exigent decision on behalf of the full Senate (for example, the recent Resolution on the Proposed Parking Plan). This committee also serves as the nominating committee for the Senate, and hears grievances brought under the Faculty Grievance Procedure I. Grievance I Petitions may include dismissal; termination of a faculty member before the end of a specified term of appointment; unlawful discrimination in compensation, promotion work assignments and race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age, handicap, or veteran status; and violations of academic freedom.

   The Executive/Advisory Committee meets together monthly.

   c. **Standing Committees** - Chairs will describe purpose and examples of issues undertaken by individual committees.

   Finance - Senator Daryl Guffey
   Policy - Senator John Huffman
   Research - Senator Dan Warner for Senator Nadim Aziz
   Scholastic Policies - Senator Nancy Walker
   Welfare - Senator Pamela Dunston
d. Other Senate-Related Committees

Budget Accountability Committee – to present analysis of the annual salary report in addition to other University budget accountability issues. Membership includes representatives from the Classified Staff Senate and representatives from the University administration.

Grievance Board – Members consist of tenured full or associate professors and must be members, alternates, or former members of the Faculty Senate. Members represent different colleges and the library and serve two years. The chair is appointed by the Advisory Committee. The Board, through three-person hearing panels, hears grievances brought to it in accordance with the Faculty Grievance Procedure II (chaired by Beth Kunkel). Grievance II Petitions allege improper or unfair, either to the complainant or by an administrator, implementation of procedures; assignment of professional duties, application of recognized criteria for review processes; appraisal of performance; denial to access to university resources; determination of salary increments; and other matters. Board members are: Burt Lee, Marsha McCurley, Fran McGuire, Ed Moise, Lucy Rollin, Eric Skaar, Webb Smathers, Kinly Sturkie, Deborah Thomason, Brenda Vander Mey.

e. Select or ad hoc Committees – The Faculty Senate often establishes and appoints membership to select or ad hoc committees to work on particular issues that spontaneously arise. Membership is not limited to Faculty Senate members but may include faculty and others from throughout the University.

f. University Committees/Commissions – Senators and Alternates are elected to University committees/commissions at the May Faculty Senate meeting from a ballot that consists of those Senators/Alternates who responded to the Committee Preference Questionnaire of their interests.

5. Miscellaneous Comments and Information
a. Since you will serve for one or three years, notify person within your college who schedules classes of your Faculty Senate responsibilities on Tuesdays so that you will not be scheduled during the time of monthly Senate meetings.
b. Faculty Manual is located on the Faculty Senate Website for individuals to download (www.lib.clemson.edu/fs/).

c. A Faculty Senate Handbook containing Senate information will be forwarded to each Senator/Alternate during the summer (see example).

d. “Free Speech” – a short period at the beginning of each Senate meeting is an opportunity for anyone to speak on a particular issue publicly. Guidelines are contained within the Faculty Senate Handbook.

e. Open Forum – a written opportunity for faculty to express thoughts on a particular issue which is shared via electronic message and hard copy with all faculty.

f. Past Presidents of the Faculty Senate meet regularly with President Barker to provide input.

6. Questions?

Handouts
2002-2003 Faculty Senate Roster
Faculty Senate/Alternate Responsibilities
“Free Speech” Guidelines
Open Forum Guidelines
Schedule of Meetings

Faculty Senate Website: www.lib.clemson.edu/fs/
FINANCE COMMITTEE  
Daryl Guffey, Chair  
James Burns  
Gary Lickfield  
Steve Miller  
Dennis Placone  
Webb Smathers

POLICY COMMITTEE  
Eleanor Hare and John Huffman, Co-Chairs  
Jean Bertrand  
Beth Daniell  
Chuck Linnell  
John Meriwether  
Doug Rippy

RESEARCH COMMITTEE  
Nadim Aziz, Chair  
Rudy Abramovitch  
Wayne Chapman  
Antonis Katsiyannis  
Elham Makram  
Mary Ann Taylor  
Dan Warner  
Geoff Zehnder

SCHOLASTIC POLICIES COMMITTEE  
Nancy Walker, Chair  
Frances Chamberlain  
Camille Cooper  
Peter Keissler  
Ed Moise  
Brenda Vander Mey

WELFARE COMMITTEE  
Pamela Dunston, Chair  
Larry Grimes  
Paula Heusinkveld  
Harold Hupp  
Nancy Jackson  
Connie Lee
MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
JUNE 11, 2002

1. Call to Order: The Faculty Senate Meeting was called to order at 2:33 p.m. by President Kinly Sturkie and guests were acknowledged.

2. Approval of Minutes: The Faculty Senate Minutes dated May 14, 2002 were approved as corrected.

3. “Free Speech”: None

4. Special Orders of the Day:
Wickes Westcott of the Office of Institutional Research explained the previous and present international aspect of the Faculty Activity System (FAS). Modifications were made in response to faculty concerns in an effort to make the system more specific. Questions and answers were exchanged and further discussion followed.

David Fleming, Director of the Office of Institutional Research, began by stating that the Total Compensation Report, Calendar Year 2001 (a result of a Freedom of Information Request) has been released. This Report will be shared with the Faculty Senate Executive/Advisory Committee but will not be placed on the web. Mr. Fleming then responded to questions from Senators.

5. Committee Reports:
a. Senate Committees:
   1) Scholastic Policies Committee – Reporting for Chair Nancy Walker, Senator Camille Cooper stated that this Committee last met on May 14th and plans to work on grade redemption, publication of results of online faculty evaluations by students, and the follow-up to the plus/minus grading system.

   2) Research Committee – Chair Nadim Aziz noted that the Research Committee will address updating the Faculty Manual to include the present research structure; revisions to the Research Ethics Policy; analysis of research at other universities; status of post docs; contradictions of publications; and driver’s licenses for foreign students. This committee will meet on the third Tuesday of each month.

   3) Welfare Committee – Secretary Connie Lee reported for Pamela Dunston, Chair, that Committee continues working on the spousal hiring issue which should be implemented at the beginning of the fall semester. An ad hoc Health Communities Committee has been established with representatives from campus with Alan Grubb as Chair. This endeavor should be implemented at the time Fike reopens. The Welfare Committee Report dated May, 2002 was submitted (Attachment A). This Committee will next meet in August.
4) **Finance Committee** – Chair Daryl Guffey submitted and briefly explained the Committee Report dated May 27, 2002 (Attachment B). Regular Committee meetings will begin in August.

5) **Policy Committee** – Chair John Huffman submitted and briefly described the Committee Report dated May 20, 2002 (Attachment C). Next meeting will be on June 17th.

**b. University Commissions and Committees:**

1) **Budget Accountability Committee** – Senator Brenda Vander Mey, Chair, requested that comments on the Total Compensation Report be forwarded to her and stated that this Committee will begin meeting in August.

2) **Vendor Committee** – Vice President Dale Linvill reported that this Committee had to send out another Request for Proposal (RFP) in a pursuit to get a good deal academically and sportswise.

3) **ad hoc Committee to Plan the Implementation of a Faculty Performance Appraisal System at Clemson University** – Senator Mary Ann Taylor submitted for acceptance the Final Report from this Committee (Attachment D), explained the history, and summarized the recommendations contained within the Report. Accepting the Report for the Faculty Senate, President Sturkie noted the diligent efforts of Co-Chairs Taylor and Fred Switzer and thanked them for their hard work. This Report will now go to the Policy Committee to address possible Faculty Manual changes.

6. **President’s Report:** President Sturkie commented on the following:

a. President’s Cabinet – in the recent past Clemson has received eighty percent of our funding from the state. This year, funding will be below thirty percent. The perception of faculty is changing. We are no longer known as the leisure class but now are known as an important component in the engine. Salaries can be justified.

b. Board of Trustees – will meet this Thursday at 11:00 a.m. to consider a tuition increase.

c. Centennial Professorship Plaque – there is no permanent recognition on campus for the recipients of this award. We have proposed to Jeff Martin of the Conference Center and Inn that a plaque honoring the recipients be affixed outside the BellSouth Auditorium.

d. Budget Accountability Committee – has been established earlier this year than usual due to the release of the Total Compensation Report. Faculty Senate representatives are: Brenda Vander Mey, Chair; Dale Linvill; and Doug Rippy.

e. Consulting Policy – at this time each college has its own policy. Auditors say we need only one policy for the University. It may be difficult to obtain policy agreement for nine and twelve-month faculty. President Sturkie asked that each Senate
delegation come up with some solution in terms of nine and twelve-month faculty to recommend to Policy Committee.

f. Parking – a letter was sent to Ben Anderson, Legal Counsel, regarding legalities for graduated parking fees. Mr. Anderson quickly responded that he knew of none or of any challenges to such. The task force appointed by President Barker met yesterday. Camille Cooper, Daryl Guffey, and Doug Rippy also attended the meeting. The Task Force began to grapple with the issue. The core assumptions on campus are being looked at and a report should be completed by December, 2002.

g. Student Government Association meetings – Senators are to notify Secretary Lee of any scheduling conflicts upon notification of meeting to attend.

h. Those faculty members who were elected by the Faculty Senate to serve on University committees have been invited to attend the August Senate meeting.

i. Ad hoc Committee on Professional Responsibility – will soon be established. See Attachment E for further information.

j. SACS Recommendations – have been forwarded to the Faculty Manual Editorial Consultant, the Policy Committee, and the Scholastic Policies Committee. Two issues of importance are the ones dealing with advising ratios and 400/600 level courses.

k. Retreat Topics – Senators are to forward possible topics to President Sturkie as soon as possible.

l. Scanner – Thanks to Former Faculty Senate President Alan Schaffer who has donated a scanner to the Faculty Senate Office.

m. Research Ethics violation – an allegation is being investigated this summer and is chaired by Senator Ed Moise. Vice President Chris Przirembel has made an unprecedented decision to compensate nine-month faculty serving on the Committee of Investigation. We sincerely appreciate this decision by Dr. Przirembel.

n. Concerns regarding Performance-Based Salary Increases – The Provost stated we had performance raises and criteria that were supposed to have been followed for three years. It has been suggested by her that last year had to do more with performance and this year more to do with equity. There is concern with the shift of criteria, that they will not be applied as last time. We had information that criteria would be the same; that if you missed out, you could get an increase the next year; and also that there would be a survey about how faculty felt about the raises. The survey has still not occurred. This instrument was to have been developed and run by the Faculty Senate and El Nault. We hope this will be done before the next raise.

o. Workshop for Department Chairs – will be held during the week of July 15-19, 2002.

7. Old Business: None

8. New Business:
   a. Senator Huffman submitted and moved for acceptance the Procedure for Background Checks for Faculty Positions to be forwarded for implementation to the Provost and to Lawrence Nicholls, Director of Human Resources. Vote to accept procedure was taken and passed unanimously.
b. In view of the controversy of the FAS System, Senator Huffman made a motion that the Faculty Senate rescind its permission to make available items from the FAS System to the general web page until such time as methodology has been approved by the Faculty Senate. Motion was seconded. Vote was taken to bring this item to the floor for discussion and required two-thirds vote was received. Discussion was held. A friendly amendment was offered and accepted. Vote to accept amended motion was taken and passed (Attachment F).

9. Announcements:
   a. The next Faculty Senate meeting will be at 2:30 p.m., August 20, 2002, at the Madren Center.
   b. Convocation will be held at 9:00 a.m. on August 20, 2002. Further details will be shared in August.
   c. Congratulations to William Pennington, Professor of Chemistry, as the recipient of the 2002 Governor's Award for Scientific Awareness.
   d. President Sturkie provided a Graduation Update and stated that the Board of Trustees will make a determination on Thursday.

10. Adjournment: President Sturkie adjourned the meeting at 4:37 p.m.

Connie Lee, Faculty Senate Secretary

Cathy Tom Sturkie, Administrative Assistant

Welfare Committee Report for May 2002
Pamela Dunston, Chair

Senator Connie Lee, former Welfare Committee chair, has graciously agreed to oversee the completion of the Spousal/Partner Hire project that she began working with last fall. Senator Lee will work with Former President Alan Grubb and President Kinly Sturkie to locate funding for the printing of materials that will be put in portfolios for prospective new hires. Once materials are printed and collated, Senator Lee will distribute them to Deans, the Career Center, and Tenneil Moody in the Alumni Center. Search committee chairs will be get portfolios from the Dean and distribute them to candidates during interviews. Senator Lee will have 500 portfolios prepared for distribution by the beginning of fall semester.

Following a meeting with President Barker in early May, the Welfare Committee has begun work on a Well Communities project. An Ad Hoc committee representing a variety of agencies and programs across the University will be put together to work with Former President Alan Grubb who will chair the committee. Once the committee is formed, members will meet with President Barker to receive their official charge. The committee will work to design a University-wide program to aid and improve preventative health, physical and emotional health, diet, exercise, and general well being. President Barker plans to use the program as a recruitment device and market the program to other universities. The initiation of the program is timed to begin with the reopening of Fike Recreational Center.
An organizational meeting of the finance committee was held on Thursday (May 23) in 323 Sirrine Hall. The purpose was to discuss possible agenda items. The following items were suggested.

1. Acquire a copy of the “new” salary report based on W-2’s. Members assumed that questions will arise from this report and we should review it for potential outliers from the university’s compensation policy. A spreadsheet copy is preferred.
2. Parking
   a. Should this committee become involved in the original parking decision?
   b. Why are parking fees subsidizing a free bus system which includes service to Anderson? Is it cost-effective to provide such a service? Why are those using the service not paying the cost?
3. Budgeting
   a. How are budgeting centers determined?
Notes on May 20, 2002, Meeting of the Faculty Senate Policy Committee  
LL3, Cooper Library

In attendance: John Huffman, Eleanor Hare, Beth Daniell, Chuck Linnell, Doug Rippy,  
Alan Schaffer, Kinly Sturkie

Remarks by the Chair

John Huffman opened the meeting by announcing that we would adjourn at 5 pm, even if  
we hadn't covered everything.

John announced as well that he will probably receive an NIH Senior Scientist Award,  
which will mean 80% research and 20% teaching for him. For us, it means that beginning  
in August Eleanor Hare will be chair of the Policy Committee.

Old Business

a. Post-tenure Review. We deferred this until a future meeting, since some of the new  
business is more urgent.

b. Proposed changes in Grievance Procedures. This was also deferred.

c. Statement on faculty responsibility. After some discussion, this issue too was tabled.  
Kinly Sturkie will appoint an ad hoc Committee on Collegiality, or Faculty  
Responsibilities. Alan Schaffer brought an expanded version of the statement about  
faculty responsibilities presently in the Faculty Manual, p. iii-2.

According to Kinly the goal is a mechanism for assessing in an objective way the  
behavior of faculty, who do from time to time, behave in unprofessional way. The  
Manual should offer guidance to administrators. Alan Schaffer says that the procedures  
are in the Faculty Manual now and that of the four cases he knows about, most could  
have been prevented if department chairs and deans had used these procedures early on.

Kinly suggests that we ask the Executive/Advisory Committee to look at the expanded  
statement and to see if they can come up with something substantive.

New Business

a. International data and FAS. Some faculty members have said that they didn't click on  
the command on FAS to grant permission for their international activities to be used on  
the International Database on the CU website. The International people are saying that  
permission was given; otherwise they would not have had the information. We wondered  
if people had not realized they were giving permission. Doug Rippy wondered whether  
there could be a bug in program, since the commands had seemed clear. We are getting  
contradictory assertions. Kinly will speak to the faculty member who has complained to  
see if his problem has been solved.
b. Guidelines for the conduct of personnel searches. We should deal only with faculty searches, not those of classified staff. The committee plans to meet with Byron Wylie and the Provost to discuss Mr. Wylie's proposal and its ramifications for faculty hires. The proposal as written seems to put some bureaucratic roadblocks in the way of expeditious hiring. Even the three-day turn-around on getting approval for the ad could be a serious problem for some departments. We agreed that Kinly Sturkie will ask to have this proposal held until August. We will try to meet on Thursday, July 18, or Thursday, July 25, with both the Provost and Mr. Wylie.

c. Background checks. Eleanor Hare stated that this could be a real problem in hiring, since two checks in her College took three weeks each. Eleanor had brought a draft for Procedures for Faculty Background Checks to use to amend the proposed statement on background checks from Human Resources. It is the opinion of the committee that offers should be made "contingent on background check" and that checks should be done only on those people who actually accept positions. If we hold up an offer waiting for the background check, we are sure to lose desirable job candidates. We also think that letters of recommendation should substitute for verification of credentials until such time as the person is made and accepts the offer. Of course the new faculty member will have to have transcripts sent before he or she actually begins work. Alan Schaffer is going to "wordsmith" the statement and send it to Cathy Sturkie to distribute to the Executive/Advisory Committee for the May 27 meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:50.

Next Meeting: The June meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, June 18.
Recommendations for Professional Development Training

The following recommendations are proposed to help address existing issues in the faculty performance appraisal system at Clemson University. These issues are discussed in length in the document Report on the Faculty Performance Appraisal System at Clemson University: Challenges and Proposed Changes (July 5, 2001; Faculty Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Performance Appraisal, Mary Anne Taylor, Chair).

But the basic principles of good performance appraisal are universal:

1) Decide (a priori) what dimensions and subdimensions of job performance are important to the job and what are the upper and lower allowable limits of job performance are on each subdimension.

2) Decide what sources of information will be used to measure performance on the dimensions and subdimensions of the job.

3) Decide how those sources of information will be used to make a job performance judgment on each subdimension of job performance.

4) Decide how those judgments of subdimension performance will be combined (including their relative weights) to make an overall judgment of job performance.

5) Decide how to use that overall judgment of job performance in making personnel decisions.

These recommendations are based on those principles.

Recommendation 1

All Clemson University department chairs should have explicit training in the basic issues involved in performance appraisal (i.e., in the measurement of individual job performance). This includes:

a) Clarifying, communicating, and reaching consensus on what the relevant dimensions of job performance are. (e.g., Is public service a critical component of good job performance in our department?)

b) Clarifying, communicating, and reaching consensus on the issue of what are the relevant subdimensions of job performance are. (e.g., Is research defined in our department strictly as publications or publications and grant dollars?) Warning: it is a common mistake at this stage to confuse a subdimension of job performance with the measure or indicator of that subdimension. "Publications" can be operationalized in many different ways (pubs in peer-reviewed journals, pubs in top peer-reviewed journals vs. lesser peer-reviewed journals, first author pubs vs. sole-authored pubs vs. secondary authored pubs etc. ad infinitum). See recommendation 2(a) below.

c) Clarifying, communicating, and reaching consensus on the flexibility and limits of job performance within those dimensions. (e.g., can someone do only research and no teaching or does everyone in the department have to do some teaching (and if so, how much)?)

Recommendation 2

All Clemson University department chairs should have explicit training in the basic methods involved in performance appraisal. This includes training in:

a) Clarifying, communicating, and reaching consensus on reliable and valid measures or indicators and proper sources of information for the assessment of each particular subdimension of job performance.

b) Obtaining and documenting those measures and indicators.
c) Combining and integrating those measures and indicators into overall performance ratings (including weighting each of the subdimension measures to reflect their importance to the department's mission). Note that merely having a list of measures is insufficient. There must be consensus on how those measures are used (e.g., if there are 10 indicators of good research, do you have to have one, at least five, all ten?)

Recommendation 3

All Clemson University department chairs should have explicit training in making personnel decisions, providing performance feedback, and allocating rewards based on performance appraisal and organizational goals. This includes the following:

a) knowledge of how to make appropriate relative comparisons between faculty.

b) knowledge of how to provide clear and timely performance goals, particularly for untenured faculty, in conjunction with the T&P committee and the individual faculty member.

c) knowledge of how to provide clear, timely, and directive individual developmental feedback, particularly for untenured faculty.

Recommendation 4

Those Clemson University personnel who are also involved in faculty performance appraisal and personnel decision making should have the information listed above available to them for training and review. These personnel include deans, school directors, institute heads, etc. as well as all faculty members who serve on tenure and promotion and post-tenure review committees. It is especially important that the chairs of these committees are aware of the basic issues and good practices in performance appraisal.

Ideally, everyone involved in faculty performance appraisal should have some type of explicit training in basic principles and good practices. However, the sheer number of those individuals at a university generally prohibits this approach. Therefore, we recommend that a Web site or other source of easily accessible information be made available so that all of those involved in the performance appraisal process can have a common pool of information.

Recommendation 5

Don't let the system get bureaucratic. Any good performance appraisal must leave room for situations unanticipated by the designers. It is typically the function of the department chair to determine when the performance appraisal system is missing important information, if there have been changes in the situation, if there are extenuating circumstances, etc. Any judgment system that has a systematic or mechanical component runs the risk of being fossilized - being used (by the chair, or by the faculty, or by other administrators) as a bureaucratic way to avoid dealing with difficult, hard-to-classify situations.

However, this cannot be construed as a license to avoid or get around the system. Any well-designed performance appraisal system should work for the vast majority of personnel situations. Changes should result after a careful evaluation of deficiencies in the existing evaluation system. These changes should be discussed with tenure and promotion committees and communicated to all faculty members.

Some specific performance appraisal issues at Clemson

1. Confusion over the goals of the tenure review process vs. the promotion review process:

Tenure and promotion are not the same. The essential difference is that tenure is a gate-keeping process while promotion (like post-tenure review) should be a developmental process as well as a personnel decision. More bluntly, in negative tenure decisions the person will be leaving Clemson University; in promotion decisions the person will be staying (at least for a while). In promotion it is essential to give the person the maximum amount of accurate feedback about their job performance. Anything less is irrational from the point of view of the good of the organization and the person. In promotion decisions the likelihood is that the person...
will be around for a while - we need to use the opportunity to improve their job performance (or more accurately, give them the information that they need to improve their job performance)\(^7\).

For tenure decisions, faculty must receive clear and directive yearly feedback before the "penultimate year". Talented, productive faculty can fail tenure simply because they did not focus their efforts appropriately.

Some additional implications:
(a) The person being reviewed should get a copy of the committee's letter. This person should have the opportunity to review the letter and provide the committee with feedback. Committees do (occasionally) make mistakes of fact. (Note: merely being allowed to view the letter makes no sense - if they get to see it they should get a copy - human memory is fallible. Should they get an electronic copy (e.g., the letter file on disk)? This is not a critical issue - however, typically electronic versions are made available to people who will modify/edit the letter - that is not the case here).
(b) The person being reviewed should have the opportunity to correct mistakes of fact in the committee's letter before that letter is forwarded to the next level. Anything else is poor measurement practice.
(c) Should the person see letters solicited from outside reviewers or from other sources (e.g., staff, non-committee faculty members, etc.)? Probably not. The developmental feedback from these sources is typically solicited with the understanding that this information is confidential. However, a clear and accurate summary of the job performance information gleaned from these sources (and how that information was weighted in the decision) should be in the committee's letter. However, please note the comments below about information from external reviewers.

2. Job performance and rewards

In a democratic society we all agree that people should be rewarded according to their merits, i.e., according to their job performance. From the organization's point of view it is also very desirable to retain top performers in the organization ("stars"). This helps to advance the organization's goals on a number of dimensions. However, there is a danger in taking this principle too far. Employees at all reasonable levels of job performance ("workhorses") contribute something to the organization. Further, if the organization's selection (hiring) system is even halfway competent, the distribution of job performance is skewed to the high end (i.e., most employees do a very good job for the organization). In an organization with even a quasi-rational selection system, there will not be a normal (Gaussian) distribution of job performance.

While there should be concerns about the scaling of job performance and about the "Lake Wobegone" effect ("all of the children are above average"), it should be remembered that relative (normative) measures of job performance do not reflect absolute (criterion) levels of contribution to the organization. These two different yardsticks of performance are often confused. In making personnel decisions and in allocating rewards, it should be crystal clear which yardstick is being used.

However, even then another problem is present: In most departments the rank order of job performance does not change all that much over time\(^8\). Most "stars" stay stars, and most "workhorses" stay workhorses. If the reward allocation system always rewards stars to the exclusion of the workhorses (again remembering that the workhorses, using an objective rather than relative measure, contribute substantially to the organization), the workhorses will never be rewarded for those contributions. The reverse is true as well.

Implications:
(a) Unfortunately, in the the zero-sum game that characterizes academic raise monies there is no good solution for this inherent dilemma. Most successful organizations use a combination of approaches - that is, some raises are allocated based on exceptional performance (relative to peers) and some raises are allocated based on objective performance (contribution to the organization). That does mean that in times of scant resources the size of widely-distributed raises may be very small.\(^9\)

Clearly, this type of resource distribution is likely to increase conflict among faculty members. This means that supporting the decisions with compelling systematic evidence is critical. Evaluations of merit pay should be a natural extension of valid, well-developed performance appraisal systems, since the criteria for performance evaluations and pay evaluations are very similar.
(b) Clemson University administration will have to walk the proverbial tightrope and find the middle ground between the two different approaches (and goals) of rewards. Controversy will probably be inescapable.
(c) In any case, rewards should be distributed with a specific goal and target group in mind. These goals should be communicated to faculty members to enable them to focus their efforts in the most efficient and productive ways.

3. The role of external reviewers in academic personnel decisions:

There is a lot of variability in how external reviewers are selected, how information is solicited from them, and how that information is used in academic personnel decisions. Most of the disagreements about outside reviewers (at least at Clemson) seem to revolve around issues like how many letters should go out, should the committee choose who is solicited or should the professor being evaluated get to choose one (or two, or more). Those issues, while important, are not the central issues. What is being ignored is the issue of "what is the function of the external reviewer and what is the quality of the information obtained from that reviewer".

The first question revolves around the issue of "why do you need an outside reviewer at all"? We already have a full committee of people, a department chair, and to some degree a dean, a provost, and a president already evaluating the professor's performance. Why add more? Worse, the external reviewer violates a basic measurement rule of "use the observer closest to the phenomenon being observed". External reviewers are the "farthest" from (and therefore least able to evaluate) job dimensions such as teaching and service.

However, the external reviewer is the best source of one particular kind of information: subdiscipline-specific information. We call upon external reviewers in that professor's particular subdiscipline because even other faculty in the same department may not have a precise idea of the quality of the research/scholarship being done, and the quality of the journals in which that research is published. We have to ask external reviewers for opinions in this area because they are the best informed source for this information. By the same token, we should not be asking them for opinions and judgments about aspects of job performance of which they have little or no knowledge (e.g., teaching, service, even research in other subdisciplines).

Implications:
(a) External reviewers should be carefully chosen for their expertise in the professor's research subdiscipline. Faculty in the professor's area of expertise should have input into this decision. Academic disciplines are broad and have unique areas; faculty members within the relevant academic subdiscipline should be consulted along with the professor to identify appropriate reviewers.

(b) External reviewers should not be asked to comment on whether the professor should get tenure. Tenure decisions (presumably) are based on many factors (e.g., teaching and service) of which the reviewer would have limited or no knowledge. In a sense, the tenure committee is abrogating its own responsibility as better-informed observers by asking an external reviewer to render a decision. External reviewers should not be asked if the professor would receive tenure at the reviewer's home institution. Not only is the reviewer being asked to make a decision without adequate information, he or she is likely being asked to make a decision using different criteria than that used by the professor's institution.

(c) External reviewers who are asked to comment on the professor's productivity should be given sufficient information about workloads (especially teaching load, extension work, and service requirements) and performance expectations at Clemson University and in the specific department. Not to do so is asking the reviewer to make a judgment without adequate referents. This is especially important when the external reviewer is at an institution that has different criteria for tenure than Clemson. Even with workload information, a productivity judgment by someone at a different institution may have questionable measurement properties.

(d) The type of information that external reviewers are expected to provide is usually already available from a more reliable source: the journal peer-review process. Multiple, usually anonymous (see note 2 below) reviewers have examined the professor's work, typically with detailed feedback. Rather than external letters, reviews of manuscripts, editor's comments, etc. may provide better information about work quality in the specific subdiscipline.

Some concluding comments

It is clear that the initial steps in improving faculty performance appraisal will involve some serious and sometimes contentious discussions about what the faculty in a department ought to be doing and how much of each thing they should/can do. However, this is (one of the few) types of healthy conflict. No performance
No performance appraisal system can work if the observers don't agree on what they're looking for. No performance appraisal system can achieve its goals (good personnel decisions and improvement of job performance) if the observers don't agree on what they're looking for.

Disagreement between department chairs and T&P committees on performance evaluations place faculty members in no-win situations. Performance feedback provided by T&P committees and chairs should be consistent, specific, and provide clear performance goals for faculty. No faculty member can perform their best if feedback is conflicting or ambiguous.

Notes

1. "Consensus" here means a common understanding of what was decided. The dean, the chair, and the faculty should all be on the exactly the same page about the role and goals of the department. To do this means that the goals (including the role of the department in the college and in the University) must be made explicit. Obviously not everyone will agree about what those goals should be. However, everyone should know what those goals are. Note that we are not recommending how the goals should be set. But whether they are set unilaterally, democratically, top-down, bottom-up, or some combination of all of these, at the end of the process everyone should know what the goals are and how the department is expected to move toward those goals.

2. Here, "reliable" is used in its technical sense. In Industrial/Organizational Psychology "reliable" means consistent. That includes consistency over time and across multiple observers ("interrater reliability"). If a T&P committee chair, a department chair, and a dean are all looking at the same piece of information, they should come to the same conclusion about what it says about that professor's job performance on a particular subdimension of the job.

3. Here, "valid" is used in its technical sense. In Industrial/Organizational Psychology "valid" means that the chosen measure actually gauges the phenomenon it is intended to measure, no more and no less. If this measure does not pick up on important aspects of a particular job performance subdimension, it is less valid ("criterion deficiency" is the technical term). If it picks up irrelevant information that is not germane to performance on that particular subdimension, it is less valid ("criterion contamination"). Note that this also implies that the use of the measure is appropriate (i.e., measures that are valid for some uses can be invalid for others).

4. We mean organizational goals in the "local" sense. We are not explicitly referring to the goals laid out in the University's mission statement (Top 20, $100m in research funding, etc.) We mean the specific goals of the department as jointly recognized by the faculty, chair, and dean. Obviously those specific goals should contribute to the overall goals of the organization, but different departments can contribute to those organizational goals in different ways.

5. This training should not be made mandatory. Most, if not all, of the individuals involved in faculty performance appraisal, as conscientious and intelligent people, will voluntarily choose to avail themselves of this information in order to improve the performance appraisal process.

6. There is an ethical issue here - are we obligated to try to correct/improve this person's job performance even though they will be (presumably) going to another institution (either as an obligation to the person or to the next institution)?

7. Post-tenure review ("ptr") decisions may have more in common with promotion decisions than with tenure decisions. In most ptr decisions the professor will likely be staying at Clemson for a substantial period of time and it is (again) in the best interests of the organization and the person to use the review process for development, i.e., improving job performance. Dismissal (at least as originally envisioned in the ptr process) is the "action of last resort" in post-tenure review. Ptr decisions should not be modeled strictly on tenure decision processes as they are (supposed to be) functionally different. If ptr decisions are essentially every-six-years tenure reviews, then that calls into question the meaning of tenure itself.
Also, in the post-tenure review situation, the assumption is that the faculty member is capable of doing the work (assuming the tenure decision was valid). So the post-tenure review is clearly meant to be a performance-maintaining check. In fact, post-tenure review should be treated as a valuable performance-improvement opportunity.

8. This assumes that such a ranking is based on actual job performance. It is unfortunately possible for people to be labeled/stereotyped/pigeon-holed as stars or workhorses independent of their actual contributions.

9. A note about the motivational effects of small raises. Humans tend to react to relative rather than absolute changes (this phenomenon is known as the "framing effect"). If the state-mandated budget situation is such that everyone is aware that Clemson University has little money for raises, even small raises can still have a positive motivational benefit. People like to know that their work is being recognized and their judgment of the meaning of a raise is based on its relative level (in this case relative to the amount of available money). This phenomenon is well-recognized in private-sector organizations: people will often compete fiercely for rewards (e.g., sweatshirts, paperweights, plaques, etc.) that have minimal monetary value. The reason is that these rewards are explicit positive messages from the organization about the value of a person’s work (though they lose that value if they are perceived as a device for the organization to avoid paying out more substantial rewards). By the way, the converse is also true - large raises (in absolute terms) may not be perceived as a reward if they are small relative to the amount of available money.

10. Even here there is a potential danger. Within a subdiscipline an external reviewer may know a particular professor precisely because that professor has disagreed or criticized the theory or research of the reviewer. Academia is, by nature, a contentious arena. While we would like to think that, within the academy, an external reviewer could be objective about judgments of the quality of a critic’s work, that Olympian objectivity may not be achievable. One would hope that the external reviewer would disqualify him or herself in such a situation, but that is not guaranteed.
Ad Hoc Committee on Professional Responsibility: An Amended Initial Proposal

The Charge of the Ad Hoc Committee is three fold:

1. To strengthen the current language in the Faculty Manual relating to professional responsibility and conduct, including but not limited to expanding and revising the philosophy statement and the specific dimensions of misconduct;

2. To impress upon the Administration at multiple levels (Chairs, Deans, the Provost) the need to use appropriately the authority already available through their respective offices to address issues of unprofessional and disruptive behavior before it becomes entrenched and implacable;

3. To augment and guarantee the Administrative procedures currently available to responsibly address and resolve these problems.

Membership

1. One member from each College to be selected by his or her respective College Advisory Council or Senate delegation.
2. Alan Shaffer (Faculty Manual Editorial Consultant).
3. Gordon Halfacre or Ombuds Sub-Committee member.
4. Faculty Senate President (or designee).
5. A Dean (Faculty Senate President will consult with Senior Dean to determine three names of deans from which Senate President will choose one).
6. A Department Chair (Faculty Senate President will elicit three names from the Academic Organization of Department Chairs from which Senate President will choose one).
7. John Gentry (or other legal consultant) - Ex Officio.
8. The Ad Hoc Committee Chair will be chosen by the membership.

Timeline

1. Committee is constituted and Chair is selected (June – August, 2002).
2. Committee initiates and completes “needs-assessment” (August - October, 2002).
3. Preliminary report to Executive-Advisory and Full Senate (October, 2002).
5. Preliminary report to Executive-Advisory and Full Senate (February, 2003).
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Procedure for Background Checks for Faculty Positions

Faculty applicants will sign the form giving permission to do a background check at the time they interview on campus.

During the recruitment phase of a search, letters of recommendation may substitute for verification of credentials.

To aggressively recruit a candidate, an offer may be extended without the background check having been completed. In such cases the offer of employment extended by the University shall contain the following statement: "This offer of employment is contingent upon the result of your background investigation." If a background check has not been done, it will be initiated after acceptance of an offer of employment.

Background checks will not be required for employees who return to service at the University within a year following voluntary termination.

Passed unanimously by the Faculty Senate on June 11, 2002.
There was no Faculty Senate Meeting in July 2002
1. **Call to Order:** The Faculty Senate Meeting was called to order at 2:30 p.m. by President Kinly Sturkie and guests were acknowledged.

2. **Approval of Minutes:** The Faculty Senate Minutes dated June 11, 2002 and the General Faculty Minutes of May 9, 2002 were approved as written.

3. **“Free Speech”:** None

4. **Special Orders of the Day:** Terry Don Phillips, newly-named Athletic Director and Bill D’Andrea and Katie Hill, Senior Associate Athletic Directors were introduced to the Faculty Senate by President Sturkie. Mr. Phillips then spoke about the role of athletics as a part of education. One of the reasons he chose to come to Clemson University was that he liked its model program and the academic integrity of the University. Questions and answers were then exchanged. Mr. D’Andrea and Ms. Hill then noted his desire to continue working cooperatively with the academic side of the University and her eagerness to come and work at Clemson, respectively.

5. **Committee Reports:**
   a. **Senate Committees:**
      1) **Scholastic Policies Committee** – Chair Nancy Walker submitted and briefly explained the Committee Report dated August 6, 2002 (Attachment A).
      2) **Research Committee** – Chair Nadim Aziz noted that this Committee has not met since June. Issues that will be discussed this year include updating existing documents and issues involving intellectual property publication.
      3) **Welfare Committee** – Secretary Connie Lee, reporting for Chair Pamela Dunston informed the Senate that this Committee is working on three issues: spousal/hiring, South Carolina employee benefits, and healthy communities.
      4) **Finance Committee** – Chair Daryl Guffey stated that this Committee has not yet met since the last Faculty Senate meeting. The next meeting of this Committee will be on August 27th to determine issues to pursue this year.
      5) **Policy Committee** – Chair John Huffman stated that this Committee met a week ago and discussed the issues contained within the Committee Report dated August 13, 2002 (Attachment B). Senator Huffman has received an NIH Senior Scientist Award for this coming year and, therefore, transferred total committee chair responsibilities to Senator Eleanor Hare.
b. President Sturkie introduced faculty who represent the Faculty Senate on University committees and commissions (Attachment C).

c. University Commissions and Committees: None

6. President's Report:
   a. thanked those Senators who participated in the Convocation Ceremony earlier this morning.
   b. noted recent Faculty Senate oversights which included omissions on the University web page and on new faculty orientation festivities.
   c. noted that Lawrence Nichols, Director of Human Resources, is interested in developing a Staff Ombudsman position.
   d. shared faculty reactions to criteria and process of the Performance-Based Salary Increase Draft Survey. He will revise and forward revisions to the Provost. The Provost will have the final say as to what ends up on the survey that will go out to faculty.
   e. provided an update on the nondiscrimination statement.
   f. noted that calls for nominations for the Class of '39 Award for Excellence will soon be distributed to faculty.
   g. thanked Joe Boykin and Dori Helms for their positive participation regarding office space for the Faculty Manual Editorial Consultant in the Library.
   h. provided an update on the parking issue noting that a task force with Faculty Senate representation has been established. Any parking comments are to be forwarded to President Sturkie.
   i. noted that the students want Graduation to be held on campus in December, 2002.
   j. stated that the Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Responsibility will soon begin work on its charge.
   k. described the daily activities and discussions held during the Department Chair Retreat that was held in July.

7. Old Business: None

8. New Business:
   a. Senator Lee informed Senators of their scheduled date to attend the Student Senate meetings.
   b. Senator Aziz asked Provost Dori Helms to clarify the road map. The Provost responded that the good news was that at the Board Retreat in July, the Board was clearly told that the road map required total funding and that the Board understood that information. The road map includes: 1.5 million dollars for faculty salaries; $500,000 for graduate student stipends; $500,000 for new hires; $250,000 for information technology; and $500,000 for the Library. The Provost noted that the criteria for the performance-based salary increases were the same for each college but that the process was handled differently within the colleges. Another performance-based salary increase will occur in October and at the end of the cycle there will be questions to ask, including looking at bonuses.
9. **Announcements:**
   a. The Faculty Senate Retreat will be held on September 10, 2002. Agendas will be mailed to Senators and others later this week.
   
   b. Connie Lee provided an update on the inauguration of the spousal/hiring initiative; distributed descriptive brochures of the initiative; and show the Senator an example of the portfolio that will be given to those who call for this service. Senator Lee received applause for her diligent efforts on this much-needed service to retain and recruit faculty.
   
   c. Senator Camille Cooper informed the Senate that for the next six months, the FirstSun Management, Inc. Faculty Display at the Martin Inn will contain information from the Division of Research identifying those faculty whose work is contained within.
   
   d. Cathy Sturkie announced that plans are being made to have monthly faculty gatherings beginning on September 3 at the Madren Center Terrace from 4:30 p.m. until 7:00 p.m. for faculty and staff. The Provost explained her thoughts of the possibility of the designation “distinguished faculty scholars” and having them speak at such occasions on alternate months.
   
   e. Senator Paula Heusinkveld informed the Senate that the Department of Languages will sponsor an International Film Series each Wednesday night.

10. **Adjournment:** President Sturkie adjourned the meeting at 4:34 p.m.

    [Signature]
    Connie Lee, Faculty Senate Secretary

    [Signature]
    Cathy Toth Sturkie, Administrative Assistant

Scholastic Policies Committee Report, Faculty Senate Executive/Advisory Committee meeting, August 6, 2002

Jerry Reel’s office is moving forward with the +/- grading trial. Departments need to make sure that all undergraduate teaching faculty are aware of this.

Upcoming issues:

The committee plans to meet with representatives from the Student Senate to continue discussion of publication of teaching evaluations.

A report on the on-line evaluation of teaching from spring semester has not been received. It is anticipated that this will be an issue for Scholastic Policies.

A memo from Ralph Welton, School of Accountancy & Legal studies poses some troubling questions concerning time of return to faculty and integrity of Student Course Evaluations. A separate issue concerns when evaluations are made available to department chairs (May or January).
Scholastic Policies Committee changes to Responses to SACS recommendations

Recommendation 3: Section 4.2.5 Academic Advising of Undergraduate Students--The Committee recommends that the University take the necessary steps to ensure that the number of advisees assigned to faculty or professional staff is reasonable.

Proposed policy statement with Scholastic Policies Committee suggested changes underlined in bold.

For professional advisors, whose responsibility does not include teaching and research activities, a 250:1 ratio is the maximum number recommended by most authorities on advising. For faculty, whose responsibilities include teaching, research, scholarship, and service, the maximum ratio is 40:1, but preferably less than 30:1 undergraduate students. Advising for students with a departmental major should be by faculty in the department; advising for undeclared students should be in an advising center. The academic department should document the rationale for the ratio, based on faculty workloads and departmental resources and demand for both graduate and undergraduate advising.

Rationale

Discussions of ratios of faculty to student advisees reveal no easy answers. Surveys report averages for particular institution/academic units, based on unique institutional rationale. The primary consideration in determining ratios is the type of advising being addressed (particularly, the level of student and the curriculum demands on students) and the types of persons responsible for the advising process (faculty, professional advisors, or others). Some students require less time and resources while others (examples: undeclared/undecided, athletes, honors/scholars, under prepared/at-risk, first generation, international, etc.) exceed allocated resources. The preferred model at the NACADA Conference 2001 is the shared model in which advising is provided by both professional advisors and faculty advisors. Faculty advisors are recommended for upper division students and graduate students.

Scholastic Policies questions related to Rationale:

Although a model from a NACADA conference in 2001 is cited, it is still not very clear where the numbers came from. The entire rationale is not very clear. We wonder if local personnel, both faculty and professional advisors were consulted in formulating this statement.

Debra Jackson's response:

Local personnel were consulted in formulating this statement. Arlene Privette who is Interim Associate Dean for Undergraduate Studies and who has been chairing an Advising Task Force for the University. My understanding is that both faculty and professional staff serve on the Advising Task Force and that the task force has used the NACADA standards in making the recommendations for the numbers.
Recommendations 6, 7, 8 and 9:

Section 4.8.2.3: Graduate—At issue is a process to review current documentation of recent scholarship and/or research activity in relation to graduate eligibility on a recurring basis.

6. The Committee recommends the institution demonstrate continued high level of faculty competence in teaching and scholarship for faculty assigned to graduate courses.

7. The Committee recommends that the institution demonstrate the continued research capability of faculty teaching in doctoral programs.

8. The Committee recommends that the institution clearly define and publicize criteria for continued eligibility to teach graduate courses.

9. The Committee recommends that each faculty member teaching courses at the masters and specialist degree, including 400/600 approved courses, must hold the terminal degree in the teaching discipline.

Proposed policy statement with Policy Committee and Scholastic Policies Committee suggested changes underlined in bold.

A terminal degree and a strong, ongoing record of peer reviewed scholarship is required to qualify a faculty member as eligible to teaching graduate (master's and doctoral) level courses. In exceptional instances, specific to a given discipline, an individual lacking a terminal degree may be uniquely qualified by reason of experience or expertise to teach a specific graduate level course. Such cases must be justified in writing by the department chair and approved by the college dean and the Provost. To serve as chair of a thesis or dissertation committee, the faculty should hold the terminal degree and demonstrate a strong ongoing record of peer-reviewed scholarship, publication, professional activity and/or creative projects. A letter from the department chair or dean must be provided for individuals who meet these qualifications by exception.

Initial eligibility is certified by the department chair and dean at the time of appointment and reported to the Provost by means of the OIR Faculty Credentials form. Continuing eligibility is to be certified annually by the department chair using a check-off system in the Faculty Activity System (FAS).

The department chair is to reference his/her certification assessment and ultimate decision based on professional judgment according to the following qualification criterion statement: A faculty member must have a record of scholarly research or creative activity and a record of substantial achievement in publication, presentation, or other means of making work available for peer review, which is characteristics of the discipline.

Rationale

It is evident from the self-study and from the site visit by SACS that we do not have a consistent means of ensuring that faculty who are qualified to teach graduate level courses and serve as chairs for thesis and dissertation committees are in fact, teaching these courses and serving as chairs. The audit by the SACS visiting team clearly found problems. Non-doctoral prepared faculty were teaching a large percentage of our 400/600 level courses. We do not have stated policy regarding the qualifications for teaching graduate courses, nor does the university have procedures in effect that encourage department chairs to take faculty credentials into consideration in assigning courses. The above policy statement is suggested to fill this gap.
Faculty Senate Policy Committee
Tuesday, August 13, 2002
LL 3 Cooper Library, 3:30 pm

In attendance: Jean Bertrand, Beth Daniell, Eleanor Hare, John Huffman, Doug Rippy, Pat Smart.

The meeting began with news that John Huffman did in fact receive the NIH senior scientist award for this coming year. For him, that means 80% research and 20% teaching. Thus, John turned over the Policy Committee leadership to Eleanor Hare during this meeting.

Old Business

Post-tenure review. We discussed feedback that the deans want PTR to follow the same "flow" as promotion and tenure — that is, from committee, to chair, to dean, to provost. As it is written now, the flow for PTR is committee to dean, chair to dean, dean to provost.

After some discussion, we agreed that at this time we see no compelling reason to change "the flow" of post tenure review, but would be willing to consider changing the flow of the tenure procedure to match that of the post tenure review policy. If having two different paths for PTR and promotion/tenure proves problematic for the deans, we will, we agree, consider a change for routing promotion and tenure.

In the course of this conversation, it was reported that the chairs are interested in changing PTR so that a review is triggered only by the annual review. The Policy Committee would be interested in pursuing this possibility.

Review of endowed chairs and titled professors. We looked at the wording in the Faculty Manual. We think that a specific statement about "special reviews" is needed to clarify; the current language is a bit muddy. We will continue this discussion and decide on a recommendation at our next meeting.

Leave time for new parents. There was a request for information on the status of this initiative. The Senate voted affirmatively on this last year, and we believe that the document is in the Provost’s office awaiting her signature. Eleanor will find out for sure.

New Business

Advising. We discussed putting something in the Manual about advising being part of the annual report and a statement saying that faculty would be evaluated on the quality and quantity of their advising. While we all agree that faculty should be evaluated on their assigned duties, we were not sure that if chairs assign advising and the dean does not "count" that work, a statement in the Manual would help.

Our next meeting will be 3:30, LL3, Cooper, Tuesday, September 17.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:50.
**Faculty Elected to Represent Faculty Senate on University Committees/Commissions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Committee/Commission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alan Burns</td>
<td>Administrative Disciplinary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marty Bynum</td>
<td>Student Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn Goolsby</td>
<td>Recreation Advisory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah McCleskey</td>
<td>Administrative Disciplinary and University Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessyna McDonald</td>
<td>Recreation Advisory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fran McGuire</td>
<td>Athletic Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Ann McKenzie</td>
<td>Alcohol &amp; Drug Awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray Schneider</td>
<td>University Advisory Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
SEPTEMBER 10, 2002

1. Call to Order: The Faculty Senate Meeting was called to order at 2:36 p.m. by President Kinly Sturkie.

2. Approval of Minutes: The Faculty Senate Minutes dated August 20, 2002 were approved as distributed.

3. “Free Speech”: None

4. Special Orders of the Day: Gregory Harris, Chief of the Clemson University Police Department, informed the Senate of his background in both education and law enforcement, also emphasizing his philosophy of law enforcement on a university campus. He believes that his job, in part, is to help students learn right from wrong. Questions and answers were then exchanged between Chief Harris and Faculty Senators.

5. Committee Reports:
   a. Senate Committees:
      1) Scholastic Policies Committee – Chair Nancy Walker informed the Senate that a Spring, 2002 Comparison between Paper-Based versus Web-Based Teaching Evaluations showed no differences between the two methods. The Scholastic Policies Committee found this result surprising (Attachment A). Another analysis will be done that will not be based on percentages and those results will be shared. This Committee met with student representatives to talk about grade redemption. Senator Walker noted that there are many details that need to be worked out and explored. A faculty survey is under development to inquire of faculty how they feel about grade redemption. The Committee’s next meeting will be held in the Library Conference Room on Tuesday, September 17, 2002 at 1:30 p.m.

      2) Research Committee – No report.

      3) Welfare Committee – Chair Pamela Dunston stated that this Committee met recently and provided an update of the issues that continue to be addressed. The Welfare Committee will investigate the possibility of a faculty club and the possibility of salary inequities by gender. Senators asked the Welfare Committee to look at the benefits packages of the Top 20 institutions and to also consider pursuing the issue of childcare on campus. Vice President Linvill suggested the establishment of an ad hoc committee to pursue the benefits package issue.
4) **Finance Committee** – Chair Daryl Guffey submitted and briefly explained the Committee Report dated August 27, 2002 (Attachment B).

5) **Policy Committee** – Chair Eleanor Hare stated that this Committee will next meet on September 17th at 3:30 p.m. in the Library’s Conference Room.

b. **University Commissions and Committees:**
   
   (1) Senator Smathers described the Student Senate meeting that he recently attended as very pleasant and noted that the Student Senate has a different perspective than the Faculty Senate.
   
   (2) CU Life Savers, a program that focuses on risks and behaviors of teens and college-age youth with alcohol and fatal accidents, will sponsor a conference on September 26 and 27, 2002. This conference will serve as a national model.
   
   (3) Vice President Linvill reported that the Joint City/University Committee met in Athens, Georgia. Senator Linvill stated that Clemson and the University of Georgia have some of the same problems and that a good discussion was held about student problems.

6. **President’s Report:** President Sturkie reported on the following items:
   
   a. The Athletic Department Directors and Car Sports Association are developing a strategic plan to look at the Athletic Department in its entirety.
   
   b. The Board of Trustees have a new website that is very informational.
   
   c. After two revisions, the final Faculty Senate version of the Performance-Based Salary Increase Survey has been forwarded to the Provost. The survey will be distributed between now and when the next increases are given.
   
   d. The process to select the Faculty Representative to the Board of Trustees will begin soon.
   
   e. Former Faculty Senate President, Pat Smart, has been named as the official linkage and liaison between the Faculty Senate and the Provost’s Office in an effort to streamline and facilitate operations between the two entities.
   
   f. A *Faculty Manual* violation allegation regarding late contracts going out to instructors has been forwarded to the Provost.
   
   g. Concern has been raised that no formal notification has been forwarded to faculty regarding no raises this year. President Sturkie has spoken with the Provost about this and a mechanism to do so has been identified.
   
   h. Another important issue has been raised: the backdating of important personnel forms. If a faculty member wanted to file a disclaimer or a grievance, this could affect that process. President Sturkie has spoken with the Provost about this issue.
   
   i. Three deans are being evaluated this year. The instrument and the process by which they will be evaluated will be examined. Senators were asked to forward any thoughts to President Sturkie.
j. There are continuing concerns about FAS and the International Initiatives Committee. President Sturkie will meet with Wickes Westcott and Michael Morris to discuss a revised version to be presented to the Faculty Senate.

7. **Old Business:** None

8. **New Business:**
   a. Senator Hare submitted for approval, Modification of PTR Section of the *Faculty Manual* (Attachment C) from the Policy Committee. Following much discussion motion was made to table. Vote to table was taken and passed.

9. **Announcements:**
   a. President Sturkie congratulated Pat Zungoli, Professor of Entomology, upon being named the recipient of the Prince Award for Innovation in Teaching at the Fall Convocation.

10. **Adjournment:** President Sturkie adjourned the meeting at 3:47 p.m.

Connie Lee, Faculty Senate Secretary

Cathy Toth Sturkie, Administrative Assistant

Absent: J. Bertrand, L. Grimes, J. Burns, P. Heusinkveld (K. Smith for), D. Placone
Paper-Based Versus Web-Based Teaching Evaluations:

A comparison, Spring 2002

Purpose

To determine whether or not there are significant differences between the paper-based and web-based evaluations in terms of how students respond to questions about their learning experience. Specifically, this research answers the question of whether teachers rated through the web-based evaluations are evaluated differently (more harshly, more leniently, or in a manner similar) than those faculty who are evaluated using paper-based methods. Further, we are concerned with response rate differences and reliability issues between the two methods.

Approach

Data were collected from classes, in which there were two sections taught by the same faculty member. One section was evaluated using paper-based methods, while evaluations in the other class consisted of web-based versions. The evaluation results from the two sections of each class were combined with other classes to gain insight into the pattern of results. When analyzed as a whole, the classes could then be compared by evaluation method used. Reliability analysis was conducted, response rates were compared, and aspects of the scales analyzed in an attempt to determine whether or not significant differences exist.

Statistical methods

Reliability analysis: Scale reliability was high for both the paper and web-based evaluation (Appendix A). The Alpha coefficient (.92 and .92, respectively) is based around those who completed each question of the survey. Of note, although a smaller number of people completed the web-based evaluation compared to the paper based, the number of people who completed each question of the scale is slightly higher for the Web-based evaluation. This
suggests that although some issues may arise with regards to response rate, the quality of the data derived from the web-based method is at least comparable to the paper-based method. Scale reliability is not diminished by using the web-based version.

Response rate: The average response rate for the web-based evaluations was 96% of that for paper-based version. When comparing each of the classes with regards to response numbers from paper and web-based evaluations, a Paired-samples T-test reveals that response numbers to the web-based version are statistically significantly lower than the paper-based version (Appendix B). However, this effect size should be placed in the proper context. The practical value of knowing that for every 28 paper based evaluation one might receive, one can expect on average 24 web-based response may be quite small. This is especially true when one considers the consistently high scale reliability for the web-based version and the possibility that web-based users may be more likely to complete each item of the evaluation.

Comparisons: The evaluation forms were averaged and a mean computed for the overall scale. This represented an overall score for the evaluation. Means were also computed for a) questions devoted to the characteristics of the teachers (Items 1 through 11), and b) questions related to the difficulty of the class (Items 12, 13, & 14). The two groups (Web and Paper) were then compared with regards to differences between these means.

Independent samples T-tests were conducted to analyze differences between the means (Appendix C). There were no significant differences between the two methods with regard to average response to the overall scale, items related to the quality of the teacher, or items related to the difficulty of the class. The effect size, in each comparison is quite small, differences between the two methods seem minimal and likely due to chance.
Therefore, one can conclude that based upon this data there are no real statistically significant differences between the web-based and paper-based evaluations with regards to how students evaluate their teachers or the difficulty of their class. Further, there are no statistically significant differences between the two groups with regards to how they respond to the scale as a whole. Although there may be differences in response rates, these differences are small and may not be meaningful. Scale reliability is high and response patterns very similar for both methods.
Appendix A

Reliability of Electronic Web-based version of the scale

Reliability Coefficients
N of Cases = 1312.0  N of Items = 15
Alpha = .9231

Reliability of Paper-based evaluations

Reliability Coefficients
N of Cases = 1293.0  N of Items = 15
Alpha = .9252
### Appendix B

**Paired Sample T-Test comparing classes by number of responses**

**Paired Samples Statistics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pair</th>
<th>ELERES</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>24.0781</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>17.9252</td>
<td>2.2406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAPRES</td>
<td>28.0156</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>19.2251</td>
<td>2.4031</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Paired Samples Test**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pair</th>
<th>ELERES - PAPRES</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-3.9375</td>
<td>14.7604</td>
<td>1.8450</td>
<td>-7.6245</td>
<td>-2.134</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>.037</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Descriptive Statistics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VAR00002</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>383.00</td>
<td>96.1255</td>
<td>60.2186</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Valid N: 64
Appendix C

T-Test of differences between Paper and Web-based evaluations in terms of Overall Ratings, aspects directly related to the teacher, and aspects related to the difficulty of the class.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Statistics</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EVAL</td>
<td>Electronic</td>
<td>1312</td>
<td>3.9331</td>
<td>.7678</td>
<td>2.120E-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Web-based</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.9045</td>
<td>.7644</td>
<td>2.126E-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paper Based</td>
<td>1293</td>
<td>3.9045</td>
<td>.7644</td>
<td>2.126E-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEACH</td>
<td>Electronic</td>
<td>1565</td>
<td>3.9401</td>
<td>.9767</td>
<td>2.469E-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Web-based</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.9287</td>
<td>.9526</td>
<td>2.222E-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paper Based</td>
<td>1838</td>
<td>3.9287</td>
<td>.9526</td>
<td>2.222E-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIFF</td>
<td>Electronic</td>
<td>1582</td>
<td>4.0318</td>
<td>.8289</td>
<td>2.084E-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Web-based</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.9905</td>
<td>.8477</td>
<td>1.961E-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paper Based</td>
<td>1868</td>
<td>3.9905</td>
<td>.8477</td>
<td>1.961E-02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Independent Samples Test

Levene's Test for Equality of Variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Equal variances assumed</th>
<th>Equal variances not assumed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EVAL</td>
<td>.029 .865 .953</td>
<td>.953 .2602 .73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEACH</td>
<td>1.150 .284 .343</td>
<td>.343 .3287 .50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIFF</td>
<td>.043 .836 1.440</td>
<td>1.442 .3377 .95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Std. Error Difference 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Upper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EVAL</td>
<td>3.002E-02</td>
<td>-3.0247E-02</td>
<td>8.749E-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEACH</td>
<td>3.315E-02</td>
<td>-5.3610E-02</td>
<td>7.638E-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIFF</td>
<td>4.127E-02</td>
<td>-1.4942E-02</td>
<td>9.749E-02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Finace Committee Report
Faculty Senate Executive/Advisory Committee Meeting (August 27, 2002)

The finance committee meet on Tuesday (August 27) at 11AM in 323 Sirrine Hall. Present were James Burns, Daryl Guffey, Steve Miller, Dennis Placone, and Webb Smathers.

I. Old Business

a. A copy of the Total Compensation Report was distributed to members. Members of the finance committee will make the report available to interested faculty/staff and consider any concerns or questions raised.

II. New Business

a. Senator Lickfield received questions about fringe benefit rates charged to tenure track 9 month faculty, post docs, research professors versus fringe benefit rates for tenure track faculty in the summer and staff. He will check if the information he received is correct and if the rates are specific to his college. If the information is correct and not specific to his college a meeting will be established with a representative from Sponsored Research to inquire about this rate differential.

b. The finance committee received concerns that resources were being reallocated from departments to institutes and centers. Senator Smathers will draft a memo to the Provost concerning this issue. We will determine a course of action based on the response.

III. The next meeting is scheduled for Tuesday (September 17) at 11AM.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Alan Grubb
FROM: Alan Schaffer

RE: Modification of PTR section of the Faculty Manual

At its January meeting the Policy Committee unanimously accepted some changes in the procedures for post-tenure review (PTR). Most of what is in the Manual is reasonably clear, but number 7 under the Procedure section on page iv-7 is unclear and self-contradictory in part. What follows is the committee’s attempt at making this section more “user friendly” and is based on the following assumption: it was the Faculty Senate’s intention when PTR procedures were formulated that a rating of “unsatisfactory” could be given only if both the chair and the department peer review committee agreed on that rating. In effect that’s what the Manual now says at the bottom of page iv-7 and since that has already been accepted it leaves a limited role for the deans and the Provost in establishing final ratings. The following changes recommended by the Policy Committee are designed to make that clearer:

Under PTR Guidelines on page iv-6 it now says, “The primary basis for PTR is the individual’s contributions in the areas of research, and/or scholarship, teaching, and service.” The committee recommends changing this to read, “The primary bases for PTR are the individual’s contributions in the areas of teaching, research and/or scholarship, and service. The best judges of those contributions are the individual’s departmental colleagues and the department chair who has annually evaluated the individual’s work.”

The committee also recommends changing section 7 on page iv-7 to read:

“The PTR committee and the department chair provide separate, independent reports to the faculty member who will have two weeks from time of receipt to submit responses. If in both reports the individual is rated “satisfactory,” only the reports and responses are forwarded to the dean who certifies that the process outlined in the Faculty Manual has been followed and forwards the received file to the Provost who notifies the individual of the “satisfactory” rating.

“If either the PTR committee or the chair rate the individual “unsatisfactory,” the entire PTR file is forwarded to the dean and through the dean to the Provost. If the dean writes a report giving his/her opinion in the case, copies go to the individual
being evaluated, the PTR committee, the chair, and the Provost. The Provost provides a written report to the faculty member, the PTR committee, the chair, and the dean, establishing the rating as "satisfactory," but noting the differing opinions as a clear indication of a problem for the faculty member.

"If both the PTR committee and the chair find the faculty member's work "unsatisfactory," the entire file is forwarded to the Provost through the dean. The Provost establishes the final rating and files a report explaining the rating to the faculty member, the PTR committee, the chair, and the dean. A disclaimer to the Provost's finding may be filed."

The committee further recommends that the final paragraph on page iv-7 be replaced with the following statement:

"To receive a rating of "unsatisfactory" as the final rating, both the PTR committee and the department chair must so recommend and the Provost must agree. In such cases, the burden of proving "unsatisfactory" performance is on the university."

The Policy Committee asks that this be put on the agenda for the Senate's February meeting.

cc: John Huffman
    Cathy Sturkie

This agenda item was tabled.
MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
OCTOBER 8, 2002

1. **Call to Order:** The Faculty Senate Meeting was called to order at 2:34 p.m. by President Kinly Sturkie.

2. **Resolution of Appreciation:** Eddie Nail, Director of the Clemson Chamber of Commerce, was presented a Resolution of Appreciation and a framed picture of Tillman Hall thanking him for his cooperative and diligent efforts to bring the highly successful partnership of spousal/partner hiring to fruition (Attachment A) (FS02-10-1 P).

3. **Approval of Minutes:** The Academic Convocation Minutes of August 20, 2002 and the Faculty Senate Minutes dated September 10, 2002 were both approved as distributed.

4. **"Free Speech":** None

5. **Committee Reports:**
a. **Senate Committees:**
   1) **Welfare Committee** – Senator Larry Grimes stated that this Committee met briefly recently and discussed the organization of another evaluation of salary based on gender.

   2) **Scholastic Policies Committee** – Chair Nancy Walker noted that all efforts of this Committee since the last meeting have been regarding the academic redemption proposal that will be discussed under New Business.

   3) **Research Committee** – Nadim Aziz, Chair submitted and briefly explained Committee Report dated September 17, 2002 (Attachment B).

   4) **Finance Committee** – Chair Daryl Guffey submitted the Committee Report dated September 24, 2002 (Attachment C). He also stated that a memo to the Provost is being drafted regarding diversion of funds from departments to centers. A new business item under discussion by this Committee is that of the manner by which raises are being distributed to faculty and staff. This issue will be transferred to the Budget Accountability Committee to pursue. The issue of summer school funding and how determination is made to cancel classes is also being addressed.

   5) **Policy Committee** – Chair Eleanor Hare submitted the Committee Report dated September 17, 2002 (Attachment D). Post-Tenure Review procedures are still be addressed so will not be brought to the floor of the Senate today. The draft PTR chart was briefly explained by Senator Hare. The next Committee meeting will be Tuesday, October 15, 2002 at 2:30 p.m. in the Library’s Second Floor Conference Room.
b. University Commissions and Committees: None

c. Secretary Connie Lee is a member of the Alcohol Task Force but the meeting time conflicts with her schedule. She asked that if another senator would like to serve in her place to please notify her.

6. President’s Report: President Sturkie reported on the following items:
   a. Reminded everyone that the current official Faculty Manual is the August, 2002 version and that old ones should be discarded.
   b. Evaluation of Deans – Deans met with the Executive Advisory Committee to iron out particular issues. The evaluation of deans process will begin on October 15th. It was decided that it is appropriate to develop a different, separate instrument for staff. The Classified Staff Senate will prepare the instrument. There was a concern that some faculty had not treated the process in a professional manner. Comments were often personal and had very little to do with the functioning of the dean’s office and how the dean handled their office. Deans asked about the possibility of faculty signing off (but not a signature), as a mechanism to be sure ballot box didn’t get stuffed and for accountability purposes. The Executive/Advisory Committee made it clear that it would not agree with such an aspect of the process. The Committee also made it clear that the process is to be helpful to the Provost so that she can make informed decisions about the performance of the deans. Everyone will be encouraged to responsibly participate in the process. It was determined that external reviewers can be anyone outside of the academic unit, both on and off campus. It was noted that the Faculty Manual does not mandate that department chairs be interviewed during the process. It was decided that the Provost may make her own judgment on how to obtain information from department chairs. It was also determined that a review committee will provide a summary of the comments received from faculty to the Provost. Tabulations of comments will not be provided. The Provost stated that she will be happy to accept letters from faculty regarding deans under evaluation, but that they must be signed and not anonymous.
   c. Performance-Based Salary Increases – The Faculty Senate has been working with the Provost on the process. Unfortunately, there was only a five-day notice to faculty, but changes were being made up until very recently and there is a time limit to get the process done by November 1 so raises will appear in data for national polls. The survey on the faculty salary increase process will be done following this second round of distribution.
   d. Salary Increases for Classified Staff and Extension Personnel – Salary increases for staff were not funded through the road map but the Provost has come up with the idea of an accumulation of monies equaling $450,000 which will be used for staff increases.
   e. Non-discrimination Statement – The Faculty Senate approved a statement that was forwarded to the Board of Trustees last spring. Lawrence Gressette, Thornton Kirby, Alan Grubb, and Kinly Sturkie are to meet this fall about this issue.
f. Board of Trustees Committee Meetings - These meetings will be held on October 24 and 25, 2002. Senate liaisons to Board Committees were encouraged to attend as these meetings are very interesting and informative.

g. The Board of Trustees will recognize staff at a luncheon on October 24th. This event is similar to the Faculty Awards Dinner hosted by the Board.

h. Clarification of PTR (regarding promotion and post-tenure review) - the Executive/Advisory Committee and the *Faculty Manual* Editorial Consultant discussed the issue and believe that the *Faculty Manual* is explicit and that clarification is not needed.

i. Syllabus - there have been expressions of concern that there are so many mandated content that they are too long. A suggestion was made that all mandated requirements not related to the course content be located somewhere else (the Student Handbook with a reference).

j. Faculty Participation in General Education - this will be a big issue. Nancy Walker will be the Faculty Senate representative to the committee when it is established.

k. The Dean of the Graduate School has contacted the Faculty Senate once again about a noise ordinance. Her concern is that noise at night is disruptive to classes. President Sturkie contacted Mary Poore, who said something very official would have to be developed and approved by the Board of Trustees or go through Joy Smith, Dean of Students, and Student Life.

l. Salary Notification - The *Faculty Manual* requires that faculty be notified each year. The President and the Provost mentioned the fact of no raises in a road map discussion. Some people believe those kinds of communications are not adequate. The Provost responded that everyone will get a letter after performance-based salaries are determined.

m. October 24th Ballgame - Classes are not being cancelled, however, faculty may offer alternate plans during class time.

n. February Forum - President Sturkie asked the Senators to be thinking about a research forum to be held in February.

o. Annual Library Book Sale - the Library Book Sale raised over $9,000. President Sturkie offered thanks to Steve Johnson, Librarian, who organized this event.

7. Old Business: Senator Hare withdrew the *Faculty Manual* Change - Modification of Post-Tenure Review until a later date.

8. New Business:

a. Senator Walker explained the history of the grade redemption issue and briefly went over the contents of the proposal. Drew Land, Student Government Academic Affairs, shared information regarding grade redemption at other institutions, withdrawal hours, and a Student Senate resolution. Lead Senators from each college informed the Senate of their colleagues' responses to the proposal. Senator Walker then made a motion for the Faculty Senate to accept the Grade Redemption Proposal. Much discussion followed during which friendly amendments were offered and accepted (one was not). Call to Question was called and seconded. Vote on Call to Question was taken.
and passed. Vote on amended Grade Redemption Proposal was taken and amended proposal passed (Attachment E).

b. Senator Rudy Abramovitch expressed to the Faculty Senate his concerns regarding students cheating noting that it is the students' responsibility to assimilate information and produce viable conclusions. The Provost noted that a compact disc will soon be distributed to faculty and staff on this subject.

9. Announcements:
   a. President Sturkie noted the Phi Beta Kappa attachment and asked faculty on search committees to be aware of our numbers to attain a chapter at Clemson University so that candidates may be identified (all things being equal).
   b. Class of '39 Award for Excellence nominations are due to the Faculty Senate Office on October 22, 2002.
   c. The next Faculty Senate meeting will be Tuesday, November 12, 2002.

10. Adjournment: President Sturkie adjourned the meeting at 4:48 p.m.

Connie Lee, Faculty Senate Secretary

Cathy Toth Sturkie, Administrative Assistant

Absent: H. Hupp, D. Placone, G. Zehnder
RESOLUTION OF APPRECIATION

Whereas, The Clemson University Faculty Senate identified and introduced the issue of spousal/partner hiring opportunities in an effort to enhance the recruitment and retention of faculty at Clemson; and

Whereas, this program was designed to deal particularly with providing prospective candidates who have spouses or partners with information regarding local employment opportunities; and

Whereas, upon initial contact with the Clemson Chamber of Commerce, Eddie Nail, Director, became the liaison among all the Upstate Area Chambers of Commerce to pursue this issue; and

Whereas, Eddie Nail gathered information and obtained materials from the Upstate Area Chambers of Commerce; and

Whereas, Eddie Nail and the Clemson Chamber staff worked diligently to complete the responsibilities to inaugurate the spousal/partner hiring opportunity in Fall, 2002; and

Whereas, Eddie Nail and the Clemson Chamber of Commerce worked cooperatively and collaboratively with the Clemson Alumni Association and the Michelin Career Center to bring this idea to fruition;

Be It Resolved, That the Faculty Senate appreciates Eddie Nail’s willingness and enthusiasm to attract people to Clemson and work towards our efforts to make Clemson University a top institution; and

Be It Further Resolved, That the Faculty Senate also appreciates the spirit of cooperation and partnership among Clemson University, the community, and the many Upstate Chambers of Commerce; and

Be It Further Resolved, That the Faculty Senate, on behalf of those who will seek this spousal/partner hiring service, appreciates all Eddie Nail has done to help prospective faculty and their families as they consider relocating to the Clemson campus and community.

This resolution was unanimously passed by the Faculty Senate on October 8, 2002.
Meeting Minutes
Faculty Senate Research Committee

Tuesday, September 17, 2002
3:30 P.M.
131 Lowry Hall

Present: Abramovitch, Aziz, Taylor, Warner and Katsiyannis

1. Research Ethics Policy. The Committee discussed the need for updating the Policy to reflect the new title of the Chief Research Officer and to make changes that will bring the Policy into compliance with NSF’s policy. The Committee also recommends that a link to the Policy be established from the senate website.

*Action. Senator Warner will present the committee with a draft of the draft of the revised Policy based on previous editions in his possession.*

2. Consulting Policy. The Committee recommends that the Policy be compared with consulting policies at peer institutions and with the University Personnel Manual as it relates to item 7 of the proposed policy. Further, the committee was not clear on the status of the Policy in the Senate.

*Action. Senator Aziz will communicate the discussion and inquiry to the Policy Committee.*

3. Intellectual Property and Copyright. The issue of ownership of online courses was discussed and the committee determined that a copy of relevant policies should be obtained and that discussion on the matter should begin in the Senate.

*Action. Senator Aziz will obtain copies of pertinent University policies and distribute to the members.*

4. Proposal before the Administrative Council. The Committee discussed the proposal before the Administrative Council regarding annual leave for temporary grant employees. Since these positions involve postdocs and other personnel hired on grant funds, the Committee recommended that the Faculty Senate President seek a delay on a vote by the Council until the faculty had a chance to provide input on the proposal.

*Action. Aziz will contact President Sturkie to request the delay on the vote.*

5. Discussion on scholarship vs. “dollarship” was started and will continue at the next meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 P.M.

Submitted by
Nadim M. Aziz
September 19, 2002
Finance Committee Report
Faculty Senate Executive/Advisory Committee Meeting (September 24, 2002)

The finance committee meet on Tuesday (September 17) at 11AM in 323 Sirrine Hall. Present were James Burns, Daryl Guffey, Gary Lickfield, Steve Miller, and Dennis Placone.

I. Old Business

a. Differential Rate on Fringe Benefits. Senator Lickfield reported he had spoken with Doug Rippy and that the different percentages used for calculating fringe benefits for external grant proposals are there to ensure that there is enough money in the budget to pay the university portion of the fringe benefits for those employees who will be paid from the external grant. The different percentages reflect both the salary differential among the various employees and that each employee can have a different fringe benefit cost.

b. Concerns about reallocation of resources from departments to institutes and centers. Senator Smathers was not present. The committee will await an initial draft of a memo to the Provost from Senator Smathers.

II. New Business

a. Concerns expressed over the differential compensation for use of personal vehicle when a University-owned vehicle is available. Several committee members stated this problem existed because research funds were commingled with other funds. Reimbursement is then made from this “common pool.” Senator Guffey will contact someone in the motor pool to verify this position and ask for a specific cite.

b. Summer school funding. Concerns were received over the manner in which summer school was funded. Especially the concern with classes being canceled or offered at a reduced compensation. Several committee members noted that this was usually planned at the College level. Therefore graduate courses that would never be fully funded are anticipated and covered during the planning process. Individual member of the Finance Committee were to confirm the accuracy of this statement through their respective deans.

c. An e-mail raising concerns about administrative raises and the condition of the P&A building was received. Senator Guffey will e-mail the faculty member and request further information. Senator Guffey will also notify the faculty member that concerns about the P&A building probably belong with the Welfare Committee, not the Finance committee.

III. The next meeting is scheduled for Tuesday (October 15) at 11AM.
Report of the Policy Committee, September 17, 2002

Present: Beth Daniell, Eleanor Hare, Chuck Linnell, Doug Rippy
Guests: Alan Schaffer, Pat Smart, Kelly Smith, Kinly Sturkie

The Committee was asked to examine the elapsed time allowed between the date of an alleged grievance and when a petition must be filed in the GP-I process. The current GP-I process allows 30 days and the GP-II process allows at least 90 days. The Committee agreed that there may be cases in which the Advisory Board feels there are extenuating circumstances which warrant an extension of this deadline. Rather than recommend increasing the time limit, the committee proposes to append the statement "The Advisory Committee, in its own judgment, may extend this time limit." immediately after "... with the effective date of dismissal." to paragraph 3-a on page v-3 of the Faculty Manual.

The statement (GP-I, paragraph 3-b) "If the advisory committee determines the petition is not grievable under this procedure, the Chair shall notify the faculty member within seven days of that decision and the matter is closed" was discussed, but no action was taken. Some of the committee think that there should be an appeal from the decision of the committee.

The possibility that alleged violations of human subjects regulations in Federal research grants might come to light during a Grievance Hearing was discussed. The Committee agreed that these allegations should be reported to the Institutional Review Board by the person/administrator responsible for the project. Thus, the Faculty Manual and grievance procedures should not be involved.

The Committee discussed the disposition of a "minor complaint." The Committee decided that the language was adequately clear and decided not to attempt to change it.

Old Business.

The Committee revised the Post Tenure Review procedures once more and have cut down the paper work, as the Provost requested. Once more, Alan Schaffer will write the proposed changes.

New Business.

Copies of the CHE policies on Post-tenure review for tenured faculty and Best Practices for Post-Tenure Review were distributed. Three proposals from Dean Keinath were introduced, but discussion was postponed until the Committee members had an opportunity to consider them in light of the CHE documents.

Next meeting: Tuesday, Oct. 15, 3:30 p.m. in the Library Conference Room.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collected Reports &amp; Responses</th>
<th>Sat/Sat</th>
<th>Sat/Unsat</th>
<th>Unsat/Unsat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>forwarded to Dean</td>
<td>forwarded to Dean</td>
<td>forwarded to Dean</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provost may request from the Dean</td>
<td>Provost may request file from Dean</td>
<td>Provost may request file from Dean</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>returned to faculty member by department</td>
<td>Dean may request file</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provost may request file from Dean</td>
<td>forwarded to Dean and Provost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter to faculty member establishing outcome</th>
<th>Sat/Sat</th>
<th>Sat/Unsat</th>
<th>Unsat/Unsat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within 2 weeks Dean informs the faculty member of &quot;satisfactory&quot; rating, with copy to the PTR committee and the chair.</td>
<td>Within 2 weeks Dean informs the faculty member of &quot;satisfactory&quot; rating, with copy to the PTR committee and the chair.</td>
<td>Within 2 weeks of receiving the files and reports, the Dean informs the faculty member of the rating, with copy to chair, PTR committee, and Provost.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty member has two weeks from time of receipt of Dean's letter to write a response, which becomes part of the file.</td>
<td>After the time for a response has elapsed, the entire file is forwarded to the Provost.</td>
<td>After the time for a response has elapsed, the entire file is forwarded to the Provost.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within 3 weeks of receiving the files. Provost writes letter to the faculty member, with copy to the dean, the chair, and the PTR committee establishing the outcome</td>
<td>Within 3 weeks of receiving the files. Provost writes letter to the faculty member, with copy to the dean, the chair, and the PTR committee establishing the outcome</td>
<td>Within 3 weeks of receiving the files. Provost writes letter to the faculty member, with copy to the dean, the chair, and the PTR committee establishing the outcome</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Academic Redemption Policy: passed by Faculty Senate, 10/8/02

Grade redemption would allow a student to re-take a course in which s/he earned a D or F and, if a better grade is achieved, have that higher grade replace the lower grade in computation of the GPR. Both grades would still appear on the transcript.

The Academic Redemption Policy (ARP) would have the following characteristics:

1. Only Ds and Fs will be able to be redeemed.
2. Students must declare that they are redeeming a course at the beginning of the term in which they will be taking it. (See 5b, for clarification.)
3. Nine (9) hours per student will be available for redemption, and these will be deducted from the seventeen (17) withdrawal (W) hours per student as used.
4. The ARP will contain the following clauses:
   a. "Redemption cannot occur and courses cannot be declared for redemption post-graduation. However, courses can be retaken post-graduation in the traditional manner."
   b. "In order to gain ARP credit, students must fill out a request form in the Registrar’s Office prior to retaking the course. A counselor will then approve this form in that office and a copy of the approved request will be sent to the student’s academic advisor(s). At this time withdrawal (W) hours will be deducted from the student's total available W hours and ARP hours will be deducted from the available ARP hours. If sufficient W hours are not available, the ARP will not be available."
   c. "If a student drops the course, no withdrawal hours will be restored nor will the ARP hours be restored."
   d. "If a student retakes a course and earns the same grade or a lower grade, the ARP will not apply, and both grades will be included in the GPR. Neither the W nor the ARP hours will be restored."
   e. "The ARP shall apply only to those courses taken (originally) at Clemson University and only Clemson University courses may be used for redemption purposes."
   f. "Substitute courses cannot be used for redemption." (Course coding changes and course revisions after others were eliminated would not be recognized.)
5. Any grades received under the ARP and their corresponding original grades will remain on the transcript with proper denotation; however, only redeemed grades (not original grades) will be used in calculation of the GPR.
6. The ARP will be applied to all enrolled undergraduate students as of Fall 2003 (the target date for implementation) and all coursework taken by those students during and after the Fall 2003 semester.
7. The ARP is not allowed for a course where academic dishonesty occurred.
1. **Call to Order**: The Faculty Senate Meeting was called to order at 2:30 p.m. by President Kinly Sturkie.

2. **Class of '39 Award for Excellence**: President Sturkie appointed Webb Smathers to assist the Provost’s designee, Renee Roux, to count the ballots. The election of this year’s recipient was then held by secret ballot.

3. **Approval of Minutes**: The Faculty Senate Minutes dated October 8, 2002 were approved as corrected.

3. **“Free Speech”**:
   a. Chris Przirembel, Vice President for Research, solicited support and assistance from the Faculty Senate to distribute information to faculty and students regarding the celebration of research at Clemson University on November 22, 2002 from 1:30-5:00 p.m. at the Brooks Center.

   b. Senator John Meriwether, Professor of Physics, shared his personal web page with members of the Senate. Dr. Meriwether explained how the Senate’s web manager, Anne McMahan, helped with its creation and demonstrated specifics that can be done. Personal web design by Ms. McMahan is a free service to senators upon request.

   c. Jim Pope, Director of Fike Recreation Center, informed the Senate of the progress of the renovations to Fike. The renovations are on time, on budget, and expected date of completion is summer, 2003.

4. **Committee Reports**:
   a. **Senate Committees**:
      1) **Welfare Committee** – Chair Pamela Dunston referred all to the Committee Report dated October 2, 2002 (Attachment A) and noted the issue of tobacco use and smoking on campus as a new issue that will be addressed by the Committee.

      2) **Scholastic Policies Committee** – Chair Nancy Walker submitted the Committee Report dated October 29, 2002 (Attachment B) and informed the Senate that the Council of Undergraduate Studies passed the redemption policy which will now go to the Academic Council for consideration.
3) Research Committee – Chair Nadim Aziz submitted and briefly explained the Committee Report dated October 22, 2002 (Attachment C). Committee will meet next week to finalize details of the February Research Forum to be held on February 6, 2002. Chair Aziz attended a meeting with a representative of the Department of Defense at which the issue of technology control planning at Clemson University was discussed. At this time, faculty must be careful to whom information is sent, especially foreign entities. If any questions arise, Bill Geer can be contacted.

4) Finance Committee – Chair Daryl Guffey submitted and explained the Committee Report dated October 29, 2002 (Attachment D).

5) Policy Committee – Chair Eleanor Hare submitted the Committee Report (Attachment E). Committee met on October 15, 2002 and will next meet on November 19, 2002. Chair Hare asked Senators with Grievance I experience to assist the Policy Committee as the Committee pursues proposals for change. Post-Tenure Review proposal will be submitted under Old Business.

b. University Commissions and Committees:
   1) Budget Accountability Committee – Chair Brenda Vander Mey noted that the Committee met on October 17, 2002 and submitted the Report. An item for consideration will be submitted to the Senate under Old Business.

   2) Joint City/University Committee – Vice President Dale Linvill provided an update to the Senate on construction around town and also stated that a completion date for the Highway 93 bridge continues to be unknown.

   3) President’s Commission on the Status of Black Faculty and Staff at Clemson University – Cathy Sturkie, member of the Commission, invited all to attend the Public Forum sponsored by the Commission on November 14, 2002 from 11:30 a.m. until 1:00 p.m. The Commission plans to speak with black faculty in the near future and would like the Senate to be included in that conversation.

a. Board of Trustees Committee Meetings – President Sturkie asked for Board Committee Reports from those Senate liaisons who attended Committee meetings. Vice President Linvill reported that a rule was passed regarding bio-security and a discussion was held on the role of Clemson and this issue. President Sturkie noted that these meetings are always interesting and encouraged Senators to attend them in January as their schedules permit.

6. President’s Report: President Sturkie reported on the items contained within his Report dated November, 2002 (Attachment F): Additional information and items:
a. Regarding the Deans Evaluation Process - President Sturkie noted that the Provost developed the steps and the limits for the deans' evaluation process. These steps and time limits were reviewed by the Executive Advisory Committee and were modified. The Provost noted that she had accepted modifications from the Executive/Advisory Committee and will forward a copy of this document to the deans and faculty in the respective colleges will receive a copy, as well. A straw vote was taken regarding this process and passed unanimously. President Sturkie noted that professionalism and confidentiality are very important to this evaluation process of deans.

b. The Faculty Senate has subscribed the *Synthesis*, an informative publication regarding the law and policy in higher education. Senators are welcome to utilize the publication which will be housed in the Faculty Senate Office.

c. Intercollegiate Athletics Reform – Information was shared about this group endeavor. As the Faculty Senate receives information, it is forwarded to Cecil Huey, Francie Edwards, and Fran McGuire and to the Executive/Advisory Committee.

d. Car Sports – A strategic plan is now being developed.

7. Old Business:
   a. Senator Hare submitted for approved the latest proposed Post-Tenure Review changes. Senators read each of the three portions. Vote on each portion was taken and all three passed unanimously with the required two-thirds vote necessary for *Faculty Manual* changes (Attachment G).

b. On behalf of the Budget Accountability Committee, Senator Vander Mey submitted a proposed revision to the Executive/Advisory Committee’s Performance-Based Salary Increase Survey (Attachment H). Following much discussion, Call to Question was offered and vote to call question was taken and passed unanimously. Vote was then taken on proposed revisions to Survey and methodology and passed.

8. New Business: None

9. Announcements:
   a. The Celebration hosted by the Faculty Senate honoring the Class of '39 will be held from 6:00 p.m.-8:00 p.m. on January 13, 2003 at the Madren Center.

b. The ceremony honoring Hap Wheeler, the 2002 Class of '39 Award for Excellence recipient will be held at 10:00 a.m., Tuesday, January 14, 2003 at the Bell Monument in the Carillon Garden.

c. Guidelines for the Thomas Green Clemson Award for faculty and staff were shared with the Senate.
d. The Faculty Senate February Research Forum is scheduled for February 6, 2003 from 8:00 a.m. until noon.

e. Senator Camille Cooper informed the Senate that certain portions of the Library will be inaccessible next semester due to improvements to the HVAC system. More details forthcoming.

f. The next Faculty Senate meeting will be Tuesday, December 10, 2002.

10. Adjournment: President Sturkie adjourned the meeting at 4:24 p.m.

[Signatures]

Connie Lee, Faculty Senate Secretary

Cathy Toth Sturkie, Program Assistant

Faculty Senate Welfare Committee Meeting Minutes  
Tuesday, Oct. 2, 2002

Present: Connie Lee, Larry Grimes, Nancy Jackson, Pamela Dunston  
Absent: Paula Heusinkveld

The October 2, 2002, meeting of the Faculty Senate Welfare Committee was called to order by Pamela Dunston at 1:30 p.m. in 402 Tillman Hall.

Old Business:
A. **Spouse/Partner**—the spouse/partner hire project. In addition, Eddie will receive a framed, historical photograph of Tillman Hall.

B. **Gender Equity and Faculty Salaries**—Fran Massey from Human Resources and Catherine Watt, and Ron from Institutional Research attend the Welfare Committee and presented data on faculty salaries. Institutional Research will conduct statistical analysis of faculty salaries provided the Welfare Committee can formulate research questions. In the meantime,
1. Ms. Watt will send committee members an analysis of faculty salaries by faculty rank, college, and gender and,
2. Senator Dunston will meet with Provost Helms and members of the Women’s Commission to inquire about previously analyzed data relating to the topic. Bryon Wiley should be consulted for faculty hiring data.

C. **Faculty/Staff Club**—Senator Jackson received a report from Senator Vander Mey outlining work that had been completed on this topic at an earlier date. Committee members agreed that faculty should be surveyed concerning feelings and participation in faculty gatherings held at the Madren Center. Senator Jackson will contact L. J. Fields and the Clemson House to determine whether a room is available for the purpose of establishing a Faculty/Staff Club.

D. **Health Benefits**—state employees’ health benefits are addressed at the state level and presented through local representative. Last spring (2002) a letter was sent to Senator Webb (Pickens County representative) asking for assistance in improving employee benefits. No response was received. A follow-up letter will be sent to Senator Webb within the next few weeks. Senator Grimes recommended talking to candidates running for office in the upstate to solicit their assistance with this issue. He will gather and submit a list of candidates running for office. Letters will be sent to these individuals requesting their assistance in this matter.

Senator Dunston adjourned the meeting at 2:45 p.m. The next Faculty Senate Welfare Committee meeting will be October 29, at 1:00 in the LL3 Cooper Conference room.
Faculty Senate Executive/Advisory meeting: October 29, 2002

Scholastic Policies Committee Report, Nancy Walker, Chair.

Follow-up on Academic Redemption Policy: N. Walker is on a sub-committee of the Undergraduate Studies Committee whose task is to merge the Faculty Senate and Student Senate versions of the policy. Differences are largely editorial. The finished product will come before the Undergraduate Studies Committee on Friday, November 8.

Academic freedom versus invasion of privacy. A situation was brought to the committee where in the name of academic freedom a faculty member was asking questions that violate students’ right to privacy. There is no mechanism to deal with such a situation unless a student brings a grievance during the semester while taking the class. The next task for this committee is to develop a policy statement to deal with this kind of situation.

Course Syllabi: we will explore methods of informing students about university-wide policies (such as integrity statement, +/- grading) that are currently expected to be included in all course syllabi.

Future items:
Professors are not able to drop students for excessive absences when their W hours are exhausted
Professors are not able to drop students if they have not paid all their fees (registration services resolved this one at least for this semester.
Students scheduling overlapping classes.
Courses scheduling field trips causing students to miss other classes or exams. Especially the difficulty make-up exams in large classes.
Meeting Minutes  
Faculty Senate Research Committee  

Tuesday, October 22, 2002  
3:30 P.M.  
Library Second Floor Conference Room (LL3)  

Present: Abramovitch, Aziz, Chapman, Katsiyannis, Makram, and Warner  
Absent: Taylor and Zennder  

1. Minutes of the September 17, 2002 meeting were approved without change.  
2. Subcommittees: Two subcommittees were formed as follows:  
   Research Ethics Policy Subcommittee: Dan Warner (Facilitator), Antonis Katsiyannis and Elham Makram. This subcommittee is charged with revising the Research Ethics Policy.  
   Consulting Policy Subcommittee: Rudy Abramovitch (Facilitator), Wayne Chapman, and Mary Anne Taylor. This subcommittee is charged with evaluating the Consulting Policy in comparison with peer institutions as it relates to faculty research.  
3. Research Ethics Policy. Dan Warner and Antonis Katsiyannis briefed the committee on some revisions/editing of the policy that took place since last meeting. The subcommittee will submit a revised copy of the Policy to the full Committee for discussion at the November meeting.  
4. Intellectual Property and Copyright. Dan Warner agreed to represent the Committee on the Intellectual Property Task Force and will report to the Committee on the activities of the Task Force.  
5. Dollarship vs. Scholarship. The committee discussed the how funding is viewed and evaluated and how it contributes to the University’s mission in scholarship and in improving the University’s reputation. The Committee agreed to request that this topic be included in the Senate Spring Forum.  
6. Research Compliance. Antonis Katsiyannis discussed the issue of quality of some of the proposals that are submitted to research compliance committees and how this issue has become of concern and has created an added workload burden on the review committees. Nadim Aziz has a scheduled meeting with Hal Farris, Associate VP for Research to discuss this and other issues related to research compliance office and the related committees.  
7. Spring Forum. The Committee agreed to propose that the Senate Spring Forum focus on research issues. The following topics are proposed: Research Ethics Policy, Dollarship vs. Scholarship, and Research Compliance.  

The meeting was adjourned at 4:45 P.M.  
Respectfully submitted by  
Nadim M. Aziz,  
October 29, 2002
Finance Committee Report
Faculty Senate Executive/Advisory Committee Meeting (October 29, 2002)

The finance committee met on Tuesday (October 15) at 11AM in 323 Sirrine Hall. Present were James Burns, Daryl Guffey, Gary Lickfield, and Webb Smathers.

I. Old Business
   a. Memo to Provost Helms—Senator Smathers distributed copies of the finance committee’s memo to Provost Helms concerning dollar flows between academic departments and the large number of institutes and centers. The committee discussed the contents of the memo and voted unanimously to send it to the Provost. A copy of the memo is attached.
   b. Reimbursement for use of personal automobiles—Senator Guffey spoke with Scott Ludlow. Mr. Ludlow stated that research funds were required by federal law to be distributed in the same manner as other funds. (See attached portion of Management and Budget Circular A-21). Furthermore state law requires the 4-cent differential in reimbursement when using one’s personal vehicle when a state vehicle is available. See the attached information. The first section provides the University policy and the second section provides the “Authority,” state law (State of South Carolina 2002. Appropriations Act, Section 72.36, Paragraph J).
   c. Summer School Funding—Senator Guffey reported that he had spoken with Dean Trapnell. Dean Trapnell stated that the College plans for summer school knowing that some courses will not be self-sufficient, such as graduate courses. He said that planning begins during the fall semester. The college/departments begin tracking enrollment numbers no later than April to determine if problems exist so they can be addressed as early as possible. The College allows departments to plan for summer school knowing that some courses will not be self-sufficient. The college looks at the academic unit (department) overall in assessing financial sufficiency, not one course at a time. This procedure allows a small graduate class to proceed when it is not self-sufficient. That is, “excess” revenues from larger classes within the unit cover the cost. This process is important for the sustainability of the graduate programs. Usually the College/department knows about the need to reduce the pay for certain courses fairly early. He said the College/department seldom makes reduced pay an issue “late” in the process. Senators Lickfield and Smathers confirmed that similar processes occur in the College of Engineering and Science and the College of Agriculture, Forestry and Life Sciences.

Senator Burns reported a different system was used in the College of Architecture, Arts, and Humanities. The departments in AAH do not follow a common policy in planning summer school courses. Each department determines when a class will or will not make, and this often goes down to the wire (with classes on occasion being cancelled the day before instruction is to begin). There are no plans made at the college
level to offer classes that are not cost effective, and they have very few graduate courses taught in the summer. Historically the college has left these matters to the discretion of the chairs.

II. The next meeting is scheduled for Tuesday (November 19) at 11AM.

On the federal research funds the controlling authority is the Management and Budget Circular A-21. The following quote is taken directly from the circular. The key statement is (d) that requires consistency in expenditure of federal funds with "established institutional policies and practices."

http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/circulars/a021/a021.html

3. Reasonable costs. A cost may be considered reasonable if the nature of the goods or services acquired or applied, and the amount involved therefor, reflect the action that a prudent person would have taken under the circumstances prevailing at the time the decision to incur the cost was made. Major considerations involved in the determination of the reasonableness of a cost are: (a) whether or not the cost is of a type generally recognized as necessary for the operation of the institution or the performance of the sponsored agreement; (b) the restraints or requirements imposed by such factors as arm's-length bargaining, Federal and State laws and regulations, and sponsored agreement terms and conditions; (c) whether or not the individuals concerned acted with due prudence in the circumstances, considering their responsibilities to the institution, its employees, its students, the Federal Government, and the public at large; and, (d) the extent to which the actions taken with respect to the incurrence of the cost are consistent with established institutional policies and practices applicable to the work of the institution generally, including sponsored agreements (emphasis added). (OMB Circular A-21, Section C. 3.)

Clemson University Travel Guidelines

Travel by Automobile

Automobile transportation may be used when common carrier transportation cannot be satisfactorily, or to reduce expenses when two or more University employees are traveling together.

When planning to travel by car, contact Transportation Services in advance to reserve a Motor Pool vehicle. File the request either by paper form or refer to the web link at Transportation Services prior to picking up the car.

University employees may use their own automobile for official travel provided the University will incur no added expenses above that of other forms of transportation available. Reimbursement for personal automobiles is as follows:

$.345 per mile, if a University owned vehicle is unavailable.
$.345 per mile for travel to and from nearby airports or train depots when official travel is by airplane or train.

$.305 per mile when an employee wishes to use their own automobile even though a Motor Pool vehicle is available.

Tax fare and reasonable tolls will be reimbursed to the individual. Receipts must be furnished if claiming airport, hotel or parking garage charges of more than $5.00.

No reimbursement will be made to operators of state owned vehicles who must pay fines for moving or non-moving violations.

AUTHORITY

State of South Carolina 2002. Appropriations Act, Section 72.36, Paragraph J.

J. When an employee of the State shall use his or her personal automobile in traveling on necessary official business, a charge to equal the standard business mileage rate as established by the Internal Revenue Service will be allowed for the use of such automobile and the employee shall bear the expense of supplies and upkeep thereof. Whenever State provided motor pool vehicles are reasonably available and their use is practical and an employee of the State shall request for his own benefit to use his or her personal vehicle in traveling on necessary official business, a charge of 4 cents per mile less than the standard business mileage rate as established by the Internal Revenue Service will be allocated for the use of such vehicle and the employee shall bear the expense of supplies and upkeep thereof (emphasis added). . . .
Dear Provost Helms:

Several questions have been posed to various Faculty Senators recently relative to dollar flows between academic departments and the large number of institutes and centers. The Faculty Senate Finance Committee has been asked (and has determined) to seek information that will clarify and lead to a better understanding of these dollar flows between and among academic departments, institutes and centers.

The committee requests your office's assistance in providing, or authorizing the provision of, information in sufficient detail that these dollar flows can be determined. We certainly recognize the important roles that many institutes and centers play in carrying out and advancing Clemson's missions and goals. The Finance Committee would like to analyze the data to see if some academic programs are being hindered by linkages with institutes and centers. If there are negatives, there may be ways that a connection could enhance Clemson University's academic programs.

Parenthetically, I have given this issue some thought in the past. You may recall my suggestion to President Barker that one method to enhance academic power at Clemson would be to associate tenure and non-tenure track faculty with functioning rolls in academic units. I recognize that many serve dual rolls currently. In times of austere budgets, additional faculty expertise could greatly enhance functionality and performance of departments.

Will you authorize the Chief Financial Officer, and others to be determined, to assist in this effort to analyze the dollar flows between academic units, institutes and centers? Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Webb Smathers, Professor
Agricultural and Applied Economics
Writing for the Faculty Senate Finance Committee
Report of the Policy Committee

The Policy Committee met Tuesday, October 15, 2002 in LL3 Cooper Library at 3:30 p.m.

Attending: Beth Daniell; Eleanor Hare, Chair; John Meriwether; Doug Rippy
Guests: Kinly Sturkie; Pat Smart; Cathy Sturkie
Absent: Jean Bertrand; John Huffman; Chuck Linnell

Old Business

PTR procedure, one more time.
We revised the wording on iv-6. Most of the time allotted for the meeting was spend re-writing iv-7, #7 of the Faculty Manual. We amended wording of iv-7, #8 (See attached.)

GP-I
We received feedback from the Grievance Board on the changes we had considered for GP-I last time — the phrase about "if in the judgement of the Advisory Committee." But what seemed clear is that Grievance Board thinks that the wording we have will be problematic. We think we need to spend more time on this, so this agenda item was tabled until the next meeting.

New Business

We discussed a request to add Senior Provost and Dean of UGS Jerry Reel to the Academic Council to parallel the membership of the Graduate Dean. We expect to re-visit this issue at our next meeting.

Due to time constraints, Dean Keineth's proposals about PTR were also postponed until a future meeting.

Next Meeting
We will meet at 3:30 in the Library Conference Room (LL3) on November 19. The meeting after that is planned for December 12.
Budget Accountability Committee
Report on Meeting

The Budget Accountability Committee of the Faculty Senate of Clemson University met 9:00-10:30 a.m., Thursday, October 17, 2002 in Brackett 110.

Persons present: Cathy Bell, David Fleming, Darryl Guffy, Dexter Hawkins, Dori Helms, Thornton Kirby, Dale Linvill, Lawrence Nichols, Doug Rippy, Brenda Vander Mey, Catherine Watt

- The discussion regarding a reasonable and equitable Philosophy of Compensation did not get very far. The idea behind this is that a statement that identified what Clemson values vis-à-vis compensating and rewarding personnel could help guide those in charge of such decisions. The committee will pursue this issue further.

- Thus far, there have only been two requests to see the Total Compensation Report.

- There were no comments regarding the FY 2002-2003 Budget Document for Clemson University (distributed by Alan Godfrey).

- In response to a complaint of unfair and invidious raises in one department, the Provost indicated that persons with such complaints should provide documentation and formalize their complaints to her. However, faculty should first consult the Faculty Manual.

- Survey to garner opinions about Performance-Based Pay Raises:
  The group rejected a draft of instrument that apparently was being created to evaluate the performance-based pay raises. It was considered insufficient and poorly done. Suggestions were made for a survey that would be acceptable. However, a communication breakdown was operating. (To be elaborated on in Senate meeting.) The faculty members of the BAC have created a survey that combines elements of the first with other issues having bearing on compensation of faculty. If approved, the survey would be mailed out. This protects privacy concerns, allows people to take their time, and does not have some of the technical disadvantages of web-based surveys.

Other:

- CUBS soon will be able to keep historical records on pay and raises.
- The names of individuals receiving this round of performance-based pay raises will be published. The BAC requested that the Provost preface the list with a note to the effect that some faculty, for a variety of reasons, did not nominate themselves for raises.
- Visitors been invited to attend BAC meetings if they wish. Respectfully submitted,
  Brenda J. Vander Mey, Chair, Budget Accountability Committee
FACULTY OPINIONS ON COMPENSATION
PROPOSED SURVEY, TIMELINE & COST
November, 2002

Proposed: To conduct a survey of all persons with faculty status at Clemson University in relation to the most recent round of performance-based pay raises, and their ideas about other strategies for faculty compensation.

Areas covered on the survey: Performance-Based Pay Raises Criteria and Procedures; Appropriateness of Published Guidelines that were Used to Determine Performance-Based Raises; Perceptions of Adherence to the Guidelines; Appropriateness of Communication Regarding Performance-Based Pay Raises, Timelines & Self-Nomination; Options for Rewarding Outstanding Performance; Questions for those who asked for Raises; Questions for Those who did not Self-Nominate; Background Questions

Methodology: Paper survey, sent to on-campus faculty (n=1,146) through Interoffice Mail; First Class Mail to off-campus faculty (n=47). One e-mail announcing that survey has been released, please check your mail. Two e-mail thank you/reminders. Data entered into SPSS. Word & Excel used for report.

Timeline: Submit materials to IRB ASAP. Release survey, and e-mail announcement, on January 8, 2003; First thank you/reminder e-mail on January 22, 2003; Second e-mail thank you/reminder on January 29, 2003. Close study February 12, 2003. Send thank you e-mail.

Data will be entered as surveys arrive. Data entry should be concluded by February 19, 2003. Preliminary report February 26, 2003. Final report upon approval of the Executive Advisory Committee of the Faculty Senate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Release Survey</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Entry</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Reminder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Reminder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close Study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Estimated Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Survey Printing (7 pages, 2030 copies, stapled, folded)</td>
<td>$633.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cover Letter Printing (Single sheet, 2030 copies)</td>
<td>109.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage for Off-Campus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out and Return, $1.29 each, by 47</td>
<td>121.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return Envelopes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5&quot; x 10.5&quot;, 100 ct. box, $17.80 per, 21 bx.)</td>
<td>373.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Send envelopes on campus will be interoffice, use existing envelopes.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Send envelopes, off campus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9.5&quot; x 12&quot;, 100ct. box, @ $15.80, 1 box)</td>
<td>15.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labels for Returned Surveys</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(30 label sheets, 100 ct. box, @ 15.25, 1 bx)</td>
<td>15.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Help (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>($6.50 hour, .18 fringe, 15 hrs. per wk, 8 wk.)</td>
<td>920.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Printing (limited copies; post report on web)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Bl &amp; Wh., 20 pages, $.03 page, 50 copies)</td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc. (ink cartridges, phone calls for off campus)</td>
<td>150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Sub-total</td>
<td>$2,370.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency (10%)</td>
<td>237.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL ESTIMATED COST</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,607.26</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Call For Nominations: Faculty Representative to the Board.
Nominations due by November 29th.
Submitted to President of Faculty Senate.
All Tenured Faculty Eligible.
Must Submit a Vita and Statement of Interest.
Selection Committee Members - Sam Wang (AAH); Michael Crino (BBS); Melanie Cooper (E&S); Fran McGuire (HEHD); Gordon Halfacre (AFLS); Priscilla Munson (Library).

Deans Evaluation Process.
Comment Period – January 6 until January 27.
Routing: College Committee Chair or Provost.
Materials to Committee may be anonymous.
Provost will not accept anonymous letters.
Participants Confidentiality Statement.
Summary Report: Routing directly to Provost or through Faculty Senate President.
Provost Final Report: Will not identify persons with whom she has met, but will note number of constituent groups.

Deans Searches – AFLS and HEHD.

Grade Redemption Policy.
The Ongoing Process.
"The State" and "The Chronicle."

Revision of Form 3.

Board of Trustees Meetings: President’s Report Card.

Summer School – Course Availability and Pay.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Kinly Sturkie
FROM: Alan Schaffer

RE: Proposed Faculty Manual change

At its last meeting the Senate’s Policy Committee approved the following changes in the Faculty Manual description of the post-tenure review process:

First, on page iv-6, Guidelines, change (a) to read: “The primary bases for PTR are the individual’s contributions in the areas of teaching, research and/or scholarship, and service. The best judges of those contributions are the individual’s departmental colleagues and the department chair who has annually evaluated the individual’s work.”

Second, delete the existing paragraph 7 on page iv-7 and substitute the following: “After delivery of the faculty member’s file to the PTR committee the process continues along the following lines:

(a) After separately reviewing the file, the PTR committee and the department chair send their reports to the faculty member who will have two weeks in which to respond. After two weeks the committee and the chair independently send their report and any responses to the dean. The faculty member’s file remains in the department.
(b) If the dean finds that both reports rate the faculty member as “satisfactory,” the dean has two weeks from receipt of the reports and any responses to certify that the proper procedure has been followed and in writing to inform the faculty member, the department chair, and the chair of the PTR committee of the “satisfactory” rating. The file is then returned to the faculty member.
(c) If the dean finds that either the PTR committee or the chair, but not both, rated the faculty member as “unsatisfactory,” the dean may request the file from the department. The dean has two weeks from receipt of the reports and responses to certify that the proper procedure has been followed and in writing to inform the faculty member, the department chair, and the chair of the PTR committee of the “satisfactory” rating. The Provost may request the file through the dean within two weeks of receiving notification by the dean of the rating.
(d) If the dean finds that both the PTR committee and the chair rated the faculty member as “unsatisfactory,” the dean shall request the file from the department. The dean has two weeks from receipt of the file to certify that the proper procedure has been followed and in writing to inform the faculty
member, the department chair, and the chair of the PTR committee of the two "unsatisfactory" ratings. The dean shall also inform the faculty member that two weeks are allowed during which a disclaimer may be filed. After the time to file a disclaimer has elapsed, all reports, responses, and any disclaimer are added to the file and forwarded to the Provost. Within three weeks of receiving the file, the Provost sends a report establishing the outcome to the faculty member, with copies to the dean, the department chair, and the chair of the PTR committee. A disclaimer to the Provost's rating may be filed within two weeks of receipt of the rating.

Third, paragraph 8 on page iv-7 is unchanged but the description after Outcome is changed to read:

"In accordance with paragraph 7, the following rating system will be used in all stages of the review by the PTR committee, the department chair, and the Provost:

(a) satisfactory
(b) unsatisfactory

Any "unsatisfactory" rating requires documentation. In cases involving an outcome of "unsatisfactory," the burden of proving such performance is on the university. For the faculty member to receive an "unsatisfactory" outcome, the PTR committee, the department chair, and the Provost must so recommend."

Professor Hare, chair of the Policy Committee, asks that this report be put on the agenda for the November meeting of the Faculty Senate.

cc: Prof. Eleanor Hare
    Cathy Sturkie √
1. **Call to Order:** The Faculty Senate meeting was called to order at 2:33 p.m. by President Kinly Sturkie. Gordon Halfacre, Dexter Hawkins, Anna Simon, and Dori Helms were recognized by President Sturkie.

2. **Approval of Minutes:** The Faculty Senate Minutes of November 12, 2002 were approved as distributed.

3. **Free Speech:** None

4. **Committee Reports:**
   a. **Senate Committees:**
      1) **Welfare Committee** – Chair Pamela Dunston noted that our letter requesting the improvement to state employee benefits to our House Legislator will be mailed tomorrow. She will meet with the Women’s Commission in January to discuss gender salary equity. The big problem of tobacco use on campus is being looked at closely by Senator Harold Hupp.

      2) **Scholastic Policies** – Chair Nancy Walker submitted the Committee Report dated November 29, 2002 (Attachment A) and noted that the Grade Redemption Policy was passed by the Academic Council. A new report regarding electronic vs. paper-based evaluations by students of teaching was submitted and shows that 74% of the respondents completed paper evaluations while 43% of respondents completed web-based evaluations. This was not in the original analysis. Another trial period is being considered.

      3) **Research Committee** – Chair Nadim Aziz stated that there is no report.

      4) **Finance Committee** – Chair Daryl Guffey stated that the Committee met on November 19, 2002 and talked about the dollar flow from centers and institutes. Senator Guffey would appreciate Lead Senators asking their colleagues for information about this issue. This Committee is also looking at different reimbursements for summer school. Senator Guffey submitted the Committee’s Report (Attachment B).
5) Policy Committee – Chair Eleanor Hare submitted the Committee Report dated November 19, 2002 (Attachment C). The Committee met with Wickes Westcott to discuss Form 3 issues.

b. University Commissions and Committees
   1) Budget Accountability Committee – Senator Brenda Vander Mey stated that the IRB had approved the information to be contained in the Performance-Based Salary Increase Survey. The Survey will be mailed to all faculty as soon as possible. The Cooperative 2002 Salary Study has just been released. A copy will be placed in the Faculty Senate Office for perusal.

2) Undergraduate Curriculum Committee – Senator Walker noted that the most recent draft of competencies that will constitute the General Education Experience at Clemson is in the agenda packet (Attachment D). The Committee will meet again this Friday, so comments (regarding competencies only) may be forwarded to her prior to that time.

5. President’s Report: President Sturkie commented on the following:
   a. Election process for offices of Faculty Senate President/President-Elect and Secretary will begin in January.
   b. Election to Grievance Board and Grievance Counselor membership will be held at the January Faculty Senate Meeting. Information will be sent to you soon. President Sturkie encouraged Senators to seriously consider this service.
   c. Alfred P. (Hap) Wheeler was elected by the Faculty Senate to be the 2002 Class of ’39 Award for Excellence recipient.
   d. Lee Morrissey has received the Student Government Association Award for Excellence in Teaching.
   e. The Academic Council passed the grade redemption policy (9-3).
   f. Alan Grubb was selected to a three-year term as the Faculty Representative to the Board of Trustees.
   g. The dean’s evaluation process has been accepted by the Provost and has been forwarded to the deans.
   h. A Grievance I Hearing was held on November 21, 2002. President Sturkie thanked the members of the Hearing Panel for their diligent and fair work.

Senator Huffman asked the Provost to comment on the budget cuts that were just announced (4 ½% cut and another ½% set aside) and asked if she had any idea of implementation. The Provost responded that Clemson had originally put aside enough money up to a 7% cut without altering the budget, so we probably won’t feel the cut at Clemson. However, the caveat is that because there was an increase of salaries this year and an increase in fringe benefits and a decrease of out-of-state students, there is a revenue loss this year that was not accounted for.
6. **Old Business:**
   a. Senator Webb Smathers moved to rescind the prohibition in place regarding the Faculty Activity System and the international component. Motion was seconded. Vote was taken to bring issue to floor for consideration and passed with the required two-thirds vote. Senators Smathers then explained the history of this issue. Vote was taken to rescind prohibition and passed.

7. **New Business:**
   a. Senator Hare submitted the proposed change to the *Faculty Manual* adding the Senior Vice Provost to the Academic Council as a voting member. There being no discussion, vote was taken and motion to accept proposed change passed unanimously (Attachment E).

8. **Announcements:**
   a. The Class of '39 Celebration will be held from 6-8:00 p.m. on Monday, January 13, 2003 at the Madren Center. Invitations will be mailed this week.
   b. The ceremony to honor Hap Wheeler, this year’s Class of '39 Award for Excellence recipient will be held on Tuesday, January 14, 2003 at the Bell Tower.
   c. The Faculty Senate February Research Forum will be held on February 6, 2003 from 8:00 a.m. until noon.
   d. Senator Beth Daniell shared copies of a *Greenville News* articles, “Ambitions are World Class” and “20,000 Jobs Projected in Auto Park” and requested clarification of the articles' contents. The Faculty Senate will invite a representative from the News to join us at the Senate meeting in January.

9. **Adjournment:** President Sturkie adjourned the meeting at 3:28 p.m.

Cathy Toth Sturkie, Program Assistant

Connie Lee, Secretary

The committee met and discussed continuing our efforts to develop a statement or policy related to students’ right to privacy. We will work on this in January.

We reviewed the General Education Competencies that are being proposed by the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee (attached). There were questions about how to assess competencies without teaching to the assessment. Also, if a department or college can document how a course satisfies a competency can departmental courses be used as a general ed requirement? I expect the Undergrad Curriculum Committee in its next few meetings will address these issues. (I am a member of that committee and was asked by Dr. Reel to bring the draft of competencies to the Senate).

We considered the increased requirement for information in our printed syllabi. The committee proposes that Clemson move toward electronic syllabi. Senior Vice Provost Jerry Reel has been contacted to initiate discussions about this.

Submitted by:
Nancy Walker
Chair
Finance Committee Report  
Faculty Senate Executive/Advisory Committee Meeting (November 26)

The finance committee met on Tuesday (November 19) at 11AM in 323 Sirrine Hall. Present were Daryl Guffey, Gary Lickfield, Dennis Placone, Pat Smart and Webb Smathers.

I. Old Business
   a. Dollar flows from departments to centers/institutes—The committee reviewed the response from the Provost. The members then discussed the appropriate course of action. After a rather lengthy discussion the following was decided: (1) Senator Smathers and Professor Smart will contact David Fleming, Elaine Price, and others to obtain a list of all the institutes/centers on campus. (2) The lead senators from each college will be asked, at the next Ex-Ad Committee meeting, to collect information from the senators in their college, or any other interested party in their respective colleges, about various centers/institutes. The request is for both positive and potentially negative items of interest related to centers/institutes.

II. New Business
   a. The finance committee received a concern that AAH received less of the tuition associated with courses offered in summer school than other colleges. The concern stated that prior to 2002 four of the colleges received 76% of the tuition for courses taught. AAH received 64%. During 2002 four colleges received 64% while AAH received only 52%. Senator Placone will investigate this issue and report to the Finance Committee in January.

III. Next Meeting—11AM, January 21, 2003
Report from the Policy Committee  
November 19, 2002

Attending: Eleanor Hare, Chair; Doug Rippy; Beth Daniell, John Meriwether, Alan Schaffer, John Huffman.  
Guests: Wickes Westcott, Pat Smart  
Absent: Jean Bertrand, Chuck Linnell

Form 3 changes. Wickes Westcott, from Institutional Research, presented a modified version of Form 3 to the Committee for information and suggestions. In response to comments from the SACS review, it is necessary that department chairs document approval for each faculty member teaching graduate classes that the faculty member is qualified to do so. It had been decided that Form 3 should be modified to include this information. The Committee suggested minor modifications, such as the addition of dates to some signature lines, to improve the format of the document.

Mr. Westcott said that the Provost’s office hopes to have the new forms ready for evaluations, starting in January 2003.

The committee observed that the evaluation process, which is currently in the Appendix to the Faculty Manual, needs to be included in the text, instead of the Appendix.

Dean Keinath had requested that the Committee consider methods of reducing the frequency of faculty evaluations. He asked the Committee to consider three different proposals -- eliminate annual review for tenured faculty; merge annual review with PRT; or biannual evaluations. The Committee checked CHE requirements and found that annual reviews and also post-tenure review are required of all faculty. We will contact Dean Keinath for any other suggestions to simplify faculty evaluations.

We agreed to add Senior VP and Dean of Undergraduate Studies (Jerry Reel) to the voting membership of Academic Council.

Changes to GP-I (continued from October 15). The Committee continues to examine the 30-day deadline for filing a GP-I petition. We are contacting the University General Counsel (Ben Anderson) to determine the historical perspective for the thirty day time period.

Next Meeting: Thursday (not Tuesday), December 12, 2002 in the Library Conference Room at 3:30.
FORM 3: EVALUATION SUMMARY

EVALUATION OF ACADEMIC PERSONNEL

Name ______________________________________ Rank ________________________

Department ____________________________ College ________________________

I. Narrative of Evaluation (attach additional sheets as necessary)

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

II. Total Performance Rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Marginal</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The faculty member's record of scholarly research or creative activity and record of substantial achievement in publication, presentation, or other means of making work available for peer review is characteristic of the discipline and qualifies the member to teach and advise at the graduate level. Yes_____ or No______

Evaluated by ____________________________ Date ____________

I have read the Chair's evaluation ________________ Date ____________

I have filed a disclaimer to the Chair's evaluation ____________________ Date ____________

Read by Dean ____________________________ Date ____________

Dean's Comments

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

I have read the Dean's Comments ____________________ Date ____________

I have filed a disclaimer to the Dean's Comments ____________________ Date ____________
On November 15, 2002, the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee completed its identification of draft competencies that will constitute the General Education Experience at Clemson University. This group of competencies has not been reviewed as amended; therefore, this list is only a working document.

It is through a General Education experience at Clemson University that undergraduate students will...

**Written & Oral Communication Skills**
1. Prepare and deliver organized, coherent presentations appropriate for topic, audience, and occasion.
2. Write coherent, well-supported and carefully edited essays appropriate for a range of different audiences and purposes.
3. Employ the full range of the writing process from rough draft to edited product.
4. Incorporate accurately multiple resources (library, computer, experience) into speeches and written documents.

**Critical Thinking and Reasoning Skills**
1. Summarize, analyze, and evaluate fictional and non-fictional texts.
2. Differentiate deductive and inductive reasoning processes.
3. Analyze critically the value of information to determine quality, quantity, and bias.
4. Recognize parallels between and among disciplines and illustrate the application of knowledge, skills, or abilities learned in one discipline to another.

**Scientific & Technological Literacy**
1. Demonstrate mathematical literacy through solving problems, communicating concepts, comprehending mathematical reasoning, using mathematical methods and using multiple representations.
2. Explain and apply the methodologies of a natural science in the laboratory or experimental settings.
3. Understand the principles and theories of a natural science.

**Social & Cross-Cultural Awareness**
1. Understand social science methodologies.
2. Explore the causes and consequences of human actions.
3. Understand world cultures in historical and contemporary perspective.
4. Understand the importance of language in cultural context.

**Arts & Humanities**
1. Experience productions of the performing and visual arts.
2. Examine literature and the arts as expressions of the human experience.
3. Understand the history and role of literary and artistic expressions.

**Ethical Judgment**
1. Analyze the ethical dimensions of the natural and social sciences, humanities and the arts.
2. Explore the religious and secular foundations for ethical decisions.
Policy Committee
Recommendation of Faculty Manual Change

The Policy Committee met November 19 and recommended that the senior vice president and dean of undergraduate studies, currently a nonvoting member of the Academic Council, be given voting privileges in the Council.

Faculty Manual, Section VI-1, Academic Council:

"The academic council reviews and recommends academic policy to the Provost. Such matters may be routed to the President through the Provost by a majority vote. The council receives reports and recommendations from committees and groups reporting to it. The academic council also reviews recommendations regarding university-wide academic policy that emanate from the office of the Provost, the faculty senate, the student senate, collegiate faculties, as well as from ad hoc committees appointed by the President or Provost. The academic council shall view its role primarily as an oversight body guiding and advising the university with regard to academic policy.

"Membership consists of the following: The Provost (chair); two members from each college and from the library; the college and library deans; one faculty member from each college and the library elected for a staggered three-year term; two undergraduate students; the president of the student body and the president of the student senate; president of the graduate student government; president of the faculty senate. Nonvoting are: president-elect of the faculty senate; dean of student life; president of the classified staff senate; extension senate chair; graduate school dean; senior vice provost for undergraduate students."
INFORMATION REGARDING FACULTY SENATE OFFICERS

The Advisory Committee of the Faculty Senate will prepare a slate (containing no less than two names) of nominees for the Senate offices of Vice President/President-Elect and Secretary at its meeting on January 28th.

The nominees will be made known to the Senate at the February meeting.

The elections of officers will take place at the March meeting of the Faculty Senate.

If you wish to suggest a name, please inform your representative to the Advisory Committee.

We have requested that for each nominee, there be an accompanying resume and/or statement. These resumes and/or statements will be made available to all senators.

Each nominee will be given the opportunity to make an oral statement to the Senate at the February meeting.