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1. **Call to Order:** The meeting was called to order at 2:39 p.m. by President Fred Switzer.

2. **Approval of Minutes:** The Faculty Senate Minutes dated December 19, 2000 were approved as corrected.

3. **“Free Speech”:** John Huffman cited problems he has experienced with PeopleSoft facilitating the process for those faculty who have optioned for the TERI Retirement Program, especially the withdrawal of retirement funds earlier than expected and expenditures of grant monies not being up to date.

4. **Committee Reports**
   a. **Senate Committees**
      1) **Research Committee** – Chair Dan Warner stated that this Committee has not met since the last monthly meeting.
      2) **Welfare Committee** – Senator Amod Ogale, Chair, noted that meetings will be held the last Tuesday of each month at 9:00 a.m. in Earle Hall.
      3) **Finance Committee** – Senator Michael Bridgwood reported that there was no report.
      4) **Policy Committee** – Senator John Huffman, Chair, stated that this Committee had not met since the last meeting but will meet next Tuesday at 3:30 p.m. in LL3 of the Cooper Library.
      5) **Scholastic Policies Committee** – Senator Jim Zimmerman, Chair, informed the Senate that the Committee had not met but that some members met with Stan Smith, Registrar, and a programmer to discuss problems involved with plus/minus grading.

   b. **University Commissions and Committees**  None

5. **President’s Remarks:** President Switzer:
   a. mentioned that the Celebration to Honor the Great Class of ’39 and the Ceremony to honor Chip Egan, this year’s Class of ’39 Award for Excellence recipient went well and that a good time was enjoyed by all at both festivities.
b. reminded the Senate that it is time to begin thinking about nominations for Faculty Senate Officers as the slate will soon be presented and that college elections of Senators will be held soon.

c. explained the process and importance of the appointment of Grievance Counselors and urged that names be forwarded of those who may be interested in serving in this capacity.

6. **Old Business:**  None

7. **New Business:**

   a. Election of faculty to the Grievance Board was held by secret ballot. Those elected were: Beth Kunkel and Webb Smathers (AFLS); Lucy Rollin (AAH); Kinly Sturkie (BPA); Hassan Behery (E&S); Deborah Thomason (HEHD); and Marsha McCurley (Library).

   b. President Switzer noted that the Office of Institutional Research will forward the Salary Report to us sometime in January.

   c. Senator Sandy Edge informed the Senate that the President's Faculty Advisory Council met with President Barker earlier today and discussed the impact of Clemson's budget being cut by fifteen (15%) percent. The opportunity will be available to all who choose to provide input to these discussions. Much discussion followed which included additional information on this subject from the Provost.

8. **Adjournment:** The meeting was adjourned by President Switzer at 3:32 p.m.

**Peg Tyler, Secretary**

Absence: Grimes, Bradshaw, Galyean, Bednar (W. Chapman for), Voelker (F. Chamberlain for), Malloy, Brannan, Ellison, Meriwether (Hare for), Backman, Thames (D. Switzer for)
MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
FEBRUARY 13, 2001

1. Call to Order: The Faculty Senate Meeting was called to order at 2:35 p.m. by President Fred S. Switzer, III, who then introduced James F. Barker, President of Clemson University.

2. Special Order of the Day: President Barker stated that he wanted to speak with the Faculty Senate regarding two particular issues: the budget cuts and Rhodes Scholars.

Budget Cuts – President Barker is pleased with how campus has responded to our possible 15% budget cut. Faculty, staff, and students have such a strong sense of where we are going and such a commitment to where we are going. President Barker found that our Board of Trustees and our campus we should take this momentum and go right on through. The Board of Trustees agreed with statements and goals and wants to express appreciation for your work and approach to the challenge in front of us. The attitude of those on campus is inspiring to President Barker and he feels like anything done to undermine the momentum that we have built is not a good idea. This is a 9-inning game and we are only about in the 2nd or first inning. President Barker sees signs that the budget cut may not be as bad as we have heard, but he sees no signs that there will not be a budget cut. Getting to top 20 is doable. The students understand about a tuition increase to increase the quality of their education, but not to balance the budget. President Barker will keep the campus posted of any forthcoming information. He asked the Senate to share the Potential Budget Cut brochure (Attachment A) in order to share the story regarding potential budget cuts for Clemson University. The messages are: higher education is education and higher education is an integral part of economics of South Carolina. President Barker said to do what we have been doing – focus on work and put energy in making classes and research stronger and that when we tell the story, to talk about the two messages he mentioned above.

Rhodes Scholars –President Barker had lunch with the American Secretary of the American Society of the Rhodes Trust and invited him to come to Clemson University, hopefully, in the spring to meet with students and faculty. President Barker talked with him about Clemson University and that we had not had a Rhodes Scholar which is a goal of his. He asked why? President Barker responded that it had to do with raising the overall intellectual energy and climate of Clemson University and that he needed a critique of the process we have built. President Barker described our structure to him as asked how it sounded. He said that he would not change one piece of it and that if we followed through, we would be successful in this goal established by President Barker.
Questions and Answers:

1) Do you have a plan to deal with cuts?

Response by President Barker: Some combination of internal cuts and tuition increases. In order to deal with the budget cuts, it will depend on the cut. At this time there will be no termination of programs—just doing things more efficiently.

2) How is our rapport with the Commission of Higher Education (CHE)?

Response: They are out of the picture right now. There is no aggressive voice for higher education at this time. The three state research universities have gotten together. This whole situation is on a timetable and there is structure among the three institutions. There does need to be a voice for all of higher education. If there is a reason to worry, I would tell you.

3. Approval of Minutes: The Minutes of the January 9, 2001 Faculty Senate meeting were approved as written.

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

Vice President/President-Elect:
John Bednar (Architecture, Arts, & Humanities)
Dale Linvill (Agriculture, Forestry, & Life Sciences)
Kinly Sturkie (Business & Behavioral Sciences)

Secretary:
Kelly Smith (Architecture, Arts, & Humanities)

The floor was opened for additional nominations for each office; however, none were received. Elections will be held in March, 2001 at which time additional nominations will be accepted. Each candidate then provided a statement regarding his thoughts of and plans for the Faculty Senate.

5. "Free Speech": Barb Foltz, Academic Services, spoke to the Senate of the requirement by SACS to have a written policy and procedures for academic advising and shared a proposed document with the Senate which was passed by the Undergraduate Studies Council and will be presented the Academic Council for approval (Attachment B). Dr. Foltz noted that when presented to the Undergraduate Studies Council there was much discussion and that faculty are very interested in this issue. Dr. Foltz also noted that at this time this document is not seen as an implementation document, but as a broad, general policy on what academic advising should be at Clemson University and that the Faculty Senate would be asked to help develop the implementation policies. Feedback from Senators can be emailed to either Dr. Foltz or Dr. Arlene Privette. Provost Doris R. Helms stated clearly that she does not want to take this document to the Academic Council until approved by the Faculty Senate and the Student Senate.
6. Committee Reports
   a. Senate Committees
      1) Research Committee – Senator Dan Warner, Chair, stated that this Committee had not met but that the Research Council had met. The search for the Vice President for Research is continuing. Forty applications have been received; among them some very highly qualified people. The screening of applicants has started. The search for the Director of Research Compliance is also continuing. Revisions to the Faculty Manual are being drafted in order to represent the new research structure.

      2) Welfare Committee – Senator Eleanor Hare informed the Senate that this Committee is in the middle of a parking study and noted specific questions and considerations by Committee. The Welfare Committee will next meet on February 26th.

      3) Finance Committee – Chair John Bednar stated that this Committee met last week and had a very open and frank discussion with David Fleming of the Office of Institutional Research. This Committee has been conducting an investigation into whether or not salary supplements paid to administrators are not removed from that person’s salary when they move from that position. Senator Bednar reported happily that in the Committee’s opinion, the policy of the University is being followed and that salary supplements for administrators have been removed. The committee does not see any abuse of this policy. The committee’s next meeting will be three weeks from Tuesday at 3:30 p.m. in 418 Daniel Hall.

      4) Policy Committee – Senator John Huffman, Chair, submitted the Committee Report dated January 16, 2001 (Attachment C); noted that this Committee last met on January 16, 2001; stated that it will meet again on February 20th at 3:30 p.m. in the Library’s Conference Room. Items will be presented to the Senate under New Business.

      5) Scholastic Policies – Kelly Smith, present Chair of this Committee, stated that the next meeting will be at 10:10 a.m. on Friday in 300 Brackett Hall. Items under consideration include: grade inflation, plus/minus grading, MLK Celebration, and now, the Advising Policy. Senator Smith requested feedback from Senators on the proposed Advising Policy distributed earlier during the meeting and also on the proposed Academic Redemption Policy.

   b. University Commissions and Committees – No Reports Given

   c. Board of Trustees Committees – No Reports Given
d. **Grievance Procedures I and II Activity Overviews** – The Grievance Procedure I Activity Overview (Attachment D) was briefly explained by President Switzer, who as President of the Faculty Senate, acts as chair of the Grievance I hearing panels. Senator Sandy Edge then explained the Grievance Procedure II Activity Overview (Attachment E) and shared the names of the present Grievance Board members.

4. **President’s Report:**
   a. President Switzer reminded the Senate that, as Senators, we have the right to write to our representatives to let them know that higher education should be a priority when it comes to budget cuts and encouraged Senators to do so.


   c. Pat Smart, Faculty Representative to the Board of Trustees, and President Switzer have begun visiting with departments across campus. Please contact Dr. Smart if you would like to schedule a visit.

5. **Old Business**  None

6. **New Business:**
   a. Resolution on Budget Cuts was submitted and moved for adoption by President Switzer. Motion was seconded. Editorial changes to Resolution were suggested. Vote to accept Resolution incorporating suggested editorial changes was taken and passed unanimously. (FS01-2-1 P) (Attachment F).

   b. Senator Huffman submitted for approval, read aloud, and explained the *Faculty Manual* change, Offices and Laboratories for Retired Faculty. Following discussion during which amendments were offered and withdrawn (both friendly and otherwise), vote to accept amended proposed change was taken and passed unanimously (Attachment G).

   c. Senator Huffman submitted for approval, read aloud, and explained the *Faculty Manual* change, Review of Academic Administrators. There being no discussion, vote to accept proposed change was taken and passed unanimously (Attachment H).

   d. President Switzer reminded Senators of Faculty Senate elections within their colleges during the month of March.

   e. Mohamed Abdel-Kader shared information from the Student Senate and listened and responded to thoughts and concerns of members of the Faculty Senate regarding a proposed Academic Redemption Policy. Mr. Abdel-Kader will work with the Senate’s Scholastic Policies Committee on this issue.
7. **Announcements:**
   a. The Faculty Senate has donated monies to the Habitat for Humanity Blitz Build 2001 and to SEEDS, the India Earthquake Relief Effort.
   
   b. Congratulations to Kinly Sturkie who was recently awarded the Outstanding Contribution to Marriage and Family Therapy Award by the American Association for Marriage and Family Therapy.

8. **Adjournment:** President Switzer adjourned the meeting at 4:49 p.m.

Peg Tyler, Faculty Senate Secretary

Cathy Toth Sturkie, Administrative Assistant

Potential Budget Cut for Clemson University

BACKGROUND
The Governor's Executive Budget for 2001-2002 includes a 15 percent budget cut for all state agencies except K-12. For Clemson University, this translates into a loss of more than $25 million in state funding — $16 million from academic and operating budgets and more than $8 million from public service activities. The $16 million budget cut to academics is the equivalent of a 26 percent tuition increase. The $8 million budget cut to public service activities is the equivalent of closing half of the state's Extension offices.

A cut of this magnitude — the largest education budget cut in state history — would seriously hinder Clemson’s ability to fulfill its mission.

WHY HIGHER EDUCATION SHOULD BE EXEMPT FROM BUDGET CUTS
State leaders have said education is the state's number one priority. That includes colleges and universities. Higher education is education. In the 21st century, education doesn’t stop at grade 12.

Colleges and universities are critical to South Carolina's economic development. Investing in higher education now is one way to ensure future economic prosperity.

IMPACT OF HIGHER EDUCATION
• The average income of a person with a four-year college degree is almost twice that of a person with a high school diploma, according to Census data.
• A 1997 study by the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges shows that a dollar invested in higher education has a median return of $4. It stands to reason that the converse may also be true. If you cut Clemson's budget by $25 million, it's like taking $100 million out of the state's economy.
• A $1,000 investment in agricultural research yields $12,000 in returns via improved productivity and higher yields, according to a Yale University study. Clemson's return should be even higher than the average, because South Carolina ranks in the top 10 nationally in converting agricultural research dollars into revenue for the state.
• According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics' employment projections through 2008, most job growth will be in the professional specialty jobs (5.3 million new jobs) and service work (3.9 million), two occupation areas on opposite ends of the education and income spectrum. Which do we want for South Carolina?
• The occupations with the fastest growth will be in computer engineering, computer support, systems analysis and database administration, all fields that generally require more than a high school diploma.
• When Alan Greenspan spoke to the National Governors' Association meeting, he said that education is the key to keeping the U.S. economy on a roll. He said: "If we are to remain preeminent in transforming knowledge into economic value, the U.S. system of higher education must remain the world's leader."

CLEMSON’S IMPACT ON SOUTH CAROLINA
• Over the past five years, Clemson research has led to four new start-up companies from which the University earns royalty income.
• Clemson ranks 26th nationally in income generated from licensed technology. Intellectual properties, such as an orthopedic implant and computer software developed at Clemson, generate $4.6 million per year.
• University architecture students and professors have completed almost 100 projects for cities and towns in 38 counties, generating ideas for parks, downtown revitalization and other developments that have led to an estimated $10 million worth of community improvements.
• Clemson has more than 200 ongoing contracts with agriculture companies and commodity groups. Agricultural research at Clemson has helped South Carolina rank among the nation’s leaders in farm production, ranking 2nd in peach production, 2nd in flu-cured tobacco production and 5th in tomato production.
• Clemson's National Brick Research Center is serving almost 95 percent of the brick manufacturing companies in the nation, including five major producers of brick and ceramic products located in South Carolina.
• Clemson’s rapid prototyping expertise helped Columbia-based Westinghouse Nuclear Fuels earn a $30 million contract by demonstrating the feasibility of its nuclear reactor design and showed Greenville-based Rockwell Automation how to reduce the time needed to acquire prototype parts from 26 weeks to 10 days.
• Clemson’s gas turbine research has a direct impact on industries developing gas turbines in Greenville and aircraft engines in Cincinnati.
• Dunlop Maxflti Sports Corp., a major producer of golf balls and clubs located in Westminster, relies on wind tunnel testing at Clemson to improve design and aerodynamic performance of products.
• Clemson researchers developed filtration systems that helped DuPont Nylon of Lugoff improve the profitability of its polymer production processes.
• Over the past eight years, nonprofit organizations in South Carolina have benefited from the expertise of Clemson marketing students, who have conducted comprehensive marketing analyses that would have cost the organizations an estimated $10,000 each.
• More than 300 companies actively recruit Clemson students and rely on Clemson to provide many of their new hires.

FOR MORE INFORMATION, GO TO: http://www.clemson.edu/budgetcuts/
INTRODUCTION:

Background:
The entire arena of academic advising has been left to each individual unit on campus, without any official University policy and resulting procedures. Various accrediting agencies include advising as criteria. Student surveys also revealed a lack of satisfaction with advising received.

Last year an ad hoc University Advising Committee was formed to explore advising on campus. Included with the charge was the 1995 Wilkinson Report, based upon a thorough review of advising and including recommendations. The Committee reviewed this Report and determined that it remains relevant to the current environment. The decision was to utilize this Report as a draft for developing a University Advising Process. A sub-committee was charged with the task of refining recommendations and developing associated goals, objectives, and procedures/practices for each recommendation.

Current Status:
The sub-committee drafted a white paper outlining a University-wide Academic Advising policy for undergraduate advising. This document will be shared with the Graduate School to determine its relevance for graduate student advising. The sub-committee utilized a wealth of background materials to capture the full spectrum of academic advising. The document carefully outlines objectives and practices for each strategic University level (specifically: University, College, College Academic Advising Center, Academic Unit, Faculty, and Students). Essential aspects of advising and specific directives requiring assessment were included within each level. Consistency among levels was also a prime consideration. The entire process will ensure that all students receive the advising support necessary for completing the rigors of respective University and curricula requirements.

This white paper is submitted by the University Advising Committee (now a University Committee, no longer ad hoc) to the Council on Undergraduate Studies with the ultimate goal of having academic advising implemented throughout the University to increase student retention and academic success. This document is not intended to be an implementation document. Available campus resources that are integral in the process are not identified specifically in this document; the operationalization phase will incorporate such entities.
RECOMMENDATION I:
The University shall adopt a mission statement on academic advising for the purpose of improving the quality of academic advising.

Associated goals:
The University shall include a mission statement about undergraduate academic advising in literature provided to prospective and enrolled students. The following mission statement for the University is recommended:

"Academic advising is an ongoing educational process that connects the student to the University. Academic advising is a process that seeks to address the whole student, connecting academics and student life, supporting the University's mission of preparing the student for learning beyond the confines of the academy. Academic advisors represent and interpret University policies and procedures to the student and help the student navigate the academic and organizational paths of the institution."

(The intent of the mission statement is to communicate and reinforce the important role of the institution and its members in academic advising. Students, parents, faculty, and professional advisors shall be aware of the institution's philosophy regarding the priority of academic advising in the educational process.)

Objectives:
The University shall approve a mission statement of academic advising.

Procedures/Practices:
The University shall develop an entire advising process and present it through appropriate channels to the Provost for formal approval and implementation.
RECOMMENDATION II:
The University shall demonstrate a continuing commitment to effective academic advising through appropriate recognition, communication, policies, and funding.

Associated goals:
1. A permanent University Committee on Academic Advising, reporting directly to the Provost, shall be established, with clear responsibilities for maintaining the integrity of the academic advising mission statement and ensuring appropriate advising procedures and practices are implemented and evaluated.
2. Academic advising shall be included in performance evaluations and other personnel actions.
3. Academic advising information shall be shared through advisor development workshops, advisor manuals and other means.
4. Effective academic advising shall be systematically implemented and assessed.
5. Academic advising will be adequately funded.
6. Adequate time and resources for academic advising shall be included during new student/transfer orientation sessions and other advising sessions.

Objectives:
The University shall:
1. Conduct a systematic, effective program of undergraduate academic advising.
2. Develop procedures to ensure that adequate representation on the University Committee is obtained from the Colleges and other advising-related entities.
3. Develop guidelines for formally including academic advising as a significant criterion for tenure, promotion, and other personnel actions.
4. Collaborate with the Office of Teaching Effectiveness and Innovation (OTEI) to sponsor regular workshops on academic advising for both new and current advisors, including a series of advising seminars featuring nationally recognized speakers.
5. Provide opportunities and resources for advisors to become involved with national and regional advising organizations, including hosting regional meetings and other such involvement. Examples of professional organizations are the National Academic Advising Association (NACADA) and discipline-specific professional organizations.
6. Sponsor awards for excellence in undergraduate academic advising.
7. Ensure that current, accurate advising information is readily available to all advisors. This information shall be convenient and easily accessible.
9. Identify a separate budget level especially for faculty who are heavily involved in academic advising.
Procedures/Practices:
The University shall:
1. Include academic advising training in new faculty orientation.
2. Include adequate time for academic advising in the new student/transfer orientation sessions.
3. Develop an online advisor manual with critical information for advisors, with frequent updates.
4. Develop a University electronic bulletin board for effective communication to advisors of timely and accurate information, including tips on advising, resources and contacts on campus.
5. Develop a campus-wide assessment system and monitor its implementation.
RECOMMENDATION III:
Each College shall develop a plan of action for continued commitment to effective academic advising consistent with the University’s philosophy.

Associated goals:
1. Each College shall ensure that criteria used for tenure, promotion, and other personnel action include academic advising as a specific item.
2. Letters of appointment shall indicate the College’s expectation of involvement in advising.
3. Each College shall have a College Advisory Liaison Committee responsible for facilitating distribution of information on academic advising and coordinating training sessions for advisors. This group would be cognizant of all rules, regulations, policies and changes affecting academic advising. This committee shall serve as liaison between departmental faculty and college-level advising units.
4. Each College shall establish procedures for recognizing excellence in advising.
5. Each College shall routinely provide funds for the enhancement of advising, including support for attendance at advising-related seminars and conferences.
6. Each College shall routinely assess its academic advising program according to an established plan.

Objectives:
Each College shall:
1. Ensure that each student is assigned a qualified advisor upon enrollment.
2. Ensure that each academic unit assigns advisors and advisees in a manner consistent with the University academic advising mission.

Procedures/Practices:
Each College shall:
1. Establish College-wide procedures for assigning students new to the College to academic advisors.
2. Establish permanent training program for advisors within the College.
3. Revise College personnel action documents to adequately reflect the renewed emphasis on advising.
RECOMMENDATION IV:
Academic advising centers shall remain at the College level.

Associated goals:
Each College shall determine the need for a College-level Academic Advising Center and its responsibilities.

Objectives:
The College shall:
1. Locate College Academic Advising Center as adjunct to the Dean’s office, in the College organization structure.
2. Clearly identify and evaluate goals and objectives of the College Academic Advising Center.
3. Adequately staff the College Academic Advising Center and ensure collaboration with other advising entities, either University-wide or departmental.
4. Establish clear lines of communication among Academic Advising Center personnel, advisors, academic unit administrators, and students.
5. Develop and distribute guidelines for responsibilities for both the advisor and advisee.
6. Provide assessment of the programs and services of the College Academic Advising Center.

Procedures/Practices:
Each College shall:
1. Determine need for a College Academic Advising Center.
2. Provide staff and resources for proper operation of the College Academic Advising Center.
3. Establish assessment criteria and procedures for the College Academic Advising Center.
RECOMMENDATION V:
Each academic unit administrator shall implement a plan of action for continued commitment to effective academic advising consistent with University and College philosophies.

Associated goals:
1. Each academic unit shall develop and implement effective and systematic academic advising procedures.
2. Each academic unit shall ensure that criteria used for tenure, promotion, and other personnel action include academic advising as a specific item.
3. Letters of appointment shall indicate the academic unit’s expectation of involvement in advising.
4. Each academic unit shall be represented on the College Advisory Liaison Committee.
5. Each academic unit shall establish procedures for recognizing excellence in advising.
6. Each academic unit shall routinely provide funds for the enhancement of advising, including support for attendance at advising-related seminars and conferences.
7. Each academic unit shall routinely assess its academic advising program.
8. Each academic unit shall assign advisors as necessary to ensure that each student in that academic unit has an academic advisor.

Objectives:
Each academic unit administrator shall:
1. Establish academic advising as a priority for the academic unit.
2. Include annual student evaluations as components of faculty advising effectiveness.
3. Include advising responsibilities as integral components of annual faculty performance evaluations.
4. Ensure that advising responsibilities, including advisor-advisee ratio, are consistent with effective advising.
5. Ensure that advising responsibilities are included in determining faculty workloads.
6. Develop guidelines for formally including academic advising as a significant criteria for tenure, promotion, and other personnel actions.
7. Provide assessment of the programs and services of the academic unit’s academic advising procedures.
8. Assign advisors.

Procedures/Practices:
Each academic unit shall:
1. Ensure that the academic unit administrator is informed of the advising process.
2. Ensure that the academic unit administrator is proactive with the academic advising process.
3. Use established assessment instruments to evaluate effectiveness of the academic advising process.
4. Document and enforce that criteria for tenure, promotion, and other personnel actions recognize the importance of academic advising.
RECOMMENDATION VI:
Academic advisors (faculty and professional staff) shall demonstrate effective academic advising consistent with the University and College philosophies.

Associated goals:
1. Advisors shall assist students with course selection based on curriculum and University requirements.
2. Advisors assist students in exploring career and educational opportunities.
3. Advisors shall utilize available campus resources based upon identified need and make referrals as appropriate.
4. Advisors shall maintain a current knowledge base of curricular, university and professional requirements.

Objectives:
Each academic advisor shall:
1. Provide information that is both current and accurate to advisees.

Procedures/Practices:
Consistent with recommendations of NACADA, the advisor shall:
- Help students define and develop realistic educational career plans.
- Assist students in planning a program consistent with their abilities and interests.
- Monitor progress toward educational/career goals.
- Discuss and reinforce linkages and relationships between occupation/career.
- Interpret and provide rationale for instructional policies, procedures, and requirements.
- Approve all designated educational transactions (e.g., schedule, drops and adds, withdrawals, change of major, waivers, graduation requirements).
- Maintain a paper or electronic advising file for each advisee.
- Refer students when academic, attitudinal, attendance, or other personal problems require intervention by other professionals.
- Inform students of the nature of the advisor/advisee relationship.
- Request reassignment of advisee to another advisor, if necessary.
- Assist advisees in identifying career opportunities.
- Develop a caring relationship with advisees.
- Inform students of special services available to them for remediation, academic assistance, and other needs.
RECOMMENDATION VII:
Students must be informed and accept their personal responsibilities in the advising process.

Associated goals:
1. Adequate time for academic advising shall be included during new student/transfer orientation sessions.
2. Each student shall ultimately be responsible for completing requirements for the degree.
3. Each student shall become an active participant in the advising system.

Objectives:
Each student shall:
1. Keep themselves informed of academic requirements.
2. Seek regular assistance appropriately from qualified advisors within the discipline and academic unit.

Procedures/Practices:
Consistent with recommendations of NACADA, advisees shall have the following responsibilities:

- Clarify their personal values, abilities, interests, and goals.
- Contact and make an appointment with an advisor when required or when in need of assistance. If the student finds it impossible to keep the appointment, the student will notify the advisor.
- Become knowledgeable and adhere to institutional policies, procedures, and requirements.
- Prepare for advising sessions and bring appropriate resources or materials.
- Follow through on actions identified during each advising session.
- Evaluate the advising system, when requested, in order to strengthen the advising process.
- Request reassignment of a different advisor, if necessary.
- Accept final responsibility for all decisions.

Draft approved by University Academic Advising Committee
January 16, 2001
MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE POLICY COMMITTEE
JANUARY 16, 2001

Present: John Huffman, Eleanor Hare, Ron Galyean, Kinly Sturkie, Cathy Sturkie for Alan Schaffer

1. December, 2000 Minutes were approved as written and distributed.

2. Chair John Huffman provided an update on an allegation received from the Department of Languages noting that he responded with the information that the Faculty Senate does not make such determinations.

3. Old Business item regarding offices and laboratories for emeritus faculty was discussed and unanimously approved to forward to the full Senate in February.

4. New Business item:
   a. regarding dismissal following Post Tenure Review was withdrawn by the Chair for consideration. K. Sturkie asked about status of request for Post Tenure Review Overview and accessibility to that information. C. Sturkie will mention to President Switzer to request from Provost again
   b. regarding the review of administrators (Page 9 of Faculty Manual) Policy Committee approved with changes to forward to full Senate.
   c. regarding candidates for Grievance Board. C. Sturkie questioned description of faculty being considered to membership. Does the present description include emeritus faculty? No. The third line will be changed to read after “tenured”, including emeritus... . Passed by Policy Committee. This will be a Constitution change so it will need to be shared with full faculty in advance of May General Faculty Meeting. (This change will be held in abeyance until further proposed changes are made and all will be forwarded at one time since it will be a Constitutional change).
   d. general discussion.

5. Adjourned at 4:20 p.m.
SLATE OF OFFICERS

VICE PRESIDENT/PRESIDENT-ELECT

JOHN BEDNAR
DALE LINVILL
KINLY STURKIE

SECRETARY

KELLY SMITH
CLEMSON UNIVERSITY GRIEVANCE BOARD
GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE ACTIVITY

GRIEVANCE I PROCEDURE PETITIONS

April, 2000 through January, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Grievances</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Withdrawn Grievances</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Grievances found Non-Grievable by Grievance Board</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Grievances found to be Grievable by Grievance Board</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grievances In Process</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Petitions Supported by Hearing Panel</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Petitions Not Supported by Hearing Panel</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Yet Determined Grievable or Non-Grievable</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Hearing Panel Grievance Recommendations Supported by Provost</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Number of Grievances Appealed to President 1
Number of Presidential Decisions Supporting Petitioner 0
Number of Grievances Appealed to Board of Trustees 1
Number of Board of Trustees Decisions Supporting Petitioner 0

Male 5
Female 2

**GRIEVANCE ACTIVITY BY COLLEGE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AAH</th>
<th>AFLS</th>
<th>BPA</th>
<th>E&amp;S</th>
<th>HEHD</th>
<th>LIBRARY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# CLEMSON UNIVERSITY GRIEVANCE BOARD
## GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE ACTIVITY

### GRIEVANCE II PROCEDURE PETITIONS

April, 2000 through January, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Grievances</td>
<td>8</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>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Grievances found to be Grievable by Grievance Board</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grievances In Process</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspended Grievances</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Petitions Supported by Hearing Panel</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Petitions Not Supported by Hearing Panel</td>
<td>2</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 Supported by Provost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Grievances Appealed to President</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Presidential Decisions Supporting Petitioner</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Grievances Appealed to Board of Trustees</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### GRIEVANCE ACTIVITY BY COLLEGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AAH</th>
<th>AFLS</th>
<th>BPA</th>
<th>E&amp;S</th>
<th>HEHD</th>
<th>LIBRARY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### GRIEVANCE ACTIVITY BY NON-ACADEMIC COLLEGE

1
RESOLUTION ON POTENTIAL BUDGET CUT
FOR CLEMSON UNIVERSITY
FS01-2-1 P

Whereas, The Governor’s Executive Budget for 2001-2002 includes a fifteen percent (15%) budget cut for state agencies except K-12 education, a potential loss of more than $25 million in state funding for Clemson University; and

Whereas, A cut of this magnitude would be the largest education budget cut in state history and would seriously hamper Clemson University’s ability to fulfill its obligations to the state of South Carolina; and

Whereas, State leaders have identified education as the state’s number one priority and that education is critical to South Carolina’s economic development; and

Whereas, In a quote from Alan Greenspan to the National Governors’ Association, “If we are to remain preeminent in transforming knowledge into economic value, the U. S. system of higher education must remain the world’s leader”;

Therefore, Be it:

Resolved, That the 2000-2001 Clemson University Faculty Senate strongly urges state government leaders to support the concept that higher education IS education and to conduct its budget deliberations accordingly; and be it

Further Resolved, That the Clemson University Faculty Senate endorses the new vision and mission statement of Clemson University as well as a set of 10-year goals recently approved by the Clemson University Board of Trustees and supports the determination not to retreat from these goals; and be it

Further Resolved, That the Faculty Senate will, to the best of its ability, do what is required to further these goals and to provide quality education to the state of South Carolina, despite potential budget cuts to higher education; and be it

Further Resolved, That the Faculty Senate strongly opposes any budget cut to higher education.

Passed unanimously by the Faculty Senate on February 13, 2001
PROPOSED CHANGE TO THE FACULTY MANUAL

(If approved by the Faculty Senate, this change will appear as a new paragraph at the end of the Section on retirees on pages 16 and 17 of the Faculty Manual.)

Offices and Laboratories for Retired Faculty

Those retired faculty who remain professionally active shall be allocated office and laboratory space to an extent commensurate with the level of their activity. Not less than three nor more than twelve months prior to retirement, the faculty member shall submit to the department chair a brief description of the nature and proposed level of activity. If the faculty member and department chair cannot agree upon the allocation of space, the matter shall be referred to the dean of the college. If the matter cannot be reconciled at that level, it shall be adjudicated by an ad hoc committee consisting of a department chair from another college appointed by the Provost, a member of the Faculty Senate Research Committee appointed by the President of the Faculty Senate, and a chaired professor elected by the chaired professors. This committee shall conduct expeditious hearings which shall include seeking input from affected faculty in the retiree’s department, as well as from the retiree, the department chair, and the dean. The recommendation of this committee shall be final. Annually, three months prior to the anniversary of retirement, the retired faculty member shall submit to the department chair a concise report of activities in the previous year and a description of the proposed activities for the following year. Disagreements on the continuation of space assignments will be resolved in the manner described above.
Review of Academic Administrators

L. Review of Academic Administrators

University policy adopted by the Board of Trustees in January 1981 and modified in May 1998, establishes procedures for the review of academic administrators. Administrative officers of the University serve at the pleasure of their respective supervisors. Thus, appointment to an administrative position, whether as department chair, director, dean, vice provost, or provost does not assure continuance in office for any specific period of time. These individuals will be subject to periodic review as outlined below in lieu of Post-Tenure Review. Individuals wishing to substitute administrative review for Post-Tenure Review must submit parallel documentation. Status as tenured or untenured faculty, however, is not affected by the termination of administrative appointments of such individuals.

In the normal performance of their duties, administrators are subject to evaluations. Such evaluations shall employ the standard Clemson University form for the evaluation of administrators (see Appendices F and G) submitted to the chair of the evaluation committee and will involve the faculty most affected by a particular administrator as well as that administrator's supervisor. In all instances of an administrator's review, a comment period of 15 days shall be provided. The affected faculty or constituent group is defined as follows: a) all tenured and tenure-track members of a department and b) all regular faculty of the appropriate college faculty for academic deans.

Each administrator evaluation committee shall consist of 3-5 members. For a department chair, three members of the committee shall be selected by vote of the regular faculty in the department. For deans and other administrators, three members shall be selected from a slate of nominees or volunteers generated by faculty from the administrator's constituent group by the Faculty Senate Advisory Committee before the close of the Fall semester. The department chairs and other administrators shall have the option to choose an additional member of the committee from the constituent group. In addition, the immediate supervisor shall also have the option to choose an additional member of the committee from the constituent group. This committee procedure shall not preclude any faculty member in the constituent group from providing his/her advice directly to the evaluating officer. In all instances the administrator evaluation committee will provide a written summary of faculty opinion as solicited by the approved Clemson University form. As part of the review process department chairs and collegiate deans will supply the reviewing committee with the following materials: a plan for personal professional growth, a vision statement for the unit's future, a summary of activities and accomplishments including research, teaching and public service since the last review, and a roster of six references outside the unit upon whom the committee could call for professional perspective.

Before the end of a department chair's second year in office and every fourth year thereafter, the appropriate dean shall conduct a formal review of that chair's performance. This review shall include receipt of the written summary from the administrator evaluation committee; it may include interviews and/or other forms of consultation by the dean with each tenured and tenure-track faculty member of the department. At the discretion of the dean, the affected department's faculty Advisory Committee may be enlisted to assist in conducting the formal reviews. When the review process has been completed, the dean shall make a report to the Provost. Subsequently, a brief summary of the decision will be communicated to the department chair involved and the evaluation committee.
Likewise, the Provost shall formally review the performance of deans before the end of the dean's third year in office and every fifth year thereafter, consulting especially with department chairs and directors as well as with faculty through the administrator evaluation system. The Provost will report his/her conclusion to the Dean and the evaluation committee. Likewise, the President of the University shall review the performance of the Provost before the end of the Provost's fifth year in office and every fifth year thereafter, consulting especially with the academic deans and with representative department chairs and faculty. The President's conclusion will be communicated to the University community.

In all instances the evaluation materials generated in the review process shall be treated with the strictest confidence with only those in the review hierarchy entitled to access. The accumulated administrator evaluation forms are sent to Records Management and saved for five years. These evaluations should also be made available to the next evaluation committee.
1. Call to Order: The Faculty Senate Meeting was called to order at 2:35 p.m. by President Fred S. Switzer.

2. Approval of Minutes: The General Faculty and Staff Minutes of December 20, 2000 were approved as distributed; the Faculty Senate Minutes dated February 13, 2001, as corrected.

3. Election of Faculty Senate Officers: The Advisory Committee submitted its slate of candidates for Vice President/President-Elect and Secretary. The floor was opened for additional nominations. There being none, nominations were closed and elections were held by secret ballot.

4. Special Order of the Day – Interim Provost Doris R. Helms provided an update to the Faculty Senate regarding the budget situation.

5. "Free Speech":
   a. In April, Jerry Beckley will take over as President of the Classified Staff Commission and spoke to the Faculty Senate about some ideas he has for the future. First, he plans to put a motion to the floor to change the Classified Staff Commission's name to the Classified Staff Senate. Second, he wants to increase annual giving to the scholarship fund by 10%, and third he wants to set up a few joint ad hoc committees with the Faculty Senate to reduce the amount of time wasted to research at the same issues and join forces. He also plans to ask a vice president of the Classified Staff Commission to attend all Faculty Senate meetings.

   b. Megan Capobianco, Chair of Academic Affairs for the Student Senate, shared and explained the Proposal to Allow Instructors to Publish Student-Assessment Results (Attachment A). The proposed plan would permit instructors to release the responses to nine of the multiple choice questions, the “Would you recommend this instructor to a friend? Y/N” question, and add a multiple choice question stating “This course was primarily: Lecture, Discussion, Hands-on Learning, or a Mixture of more than one of these.” The results would only be published for those instructors who wished to do so. The results would be published on a web-page in hopes of displaying a more accurate evaluation than a page currently published by a student organization which arguably represents only the strongest opinions. It would also hopefully encourage
students to take evaluations more seriously. Faculty Senate was encouraged to approve the proposal at the April meeting, while keeping in mind that even if they did not personally wish to publish, they should consider allowing other faculty members to have the option to do so.

6. Committee Reports

a. Senate Committees

1) Policy Committee – Senator John Huffman, Chair, introduced, briefly explained, and moved for acceptance three items of New Business for consideration by the Senate:

   a) Faculty Manual Change – Procedures for Renewal of Appointment, Tenure, and Promotion. There being no discussion, vote was taken and proposed change passed unanimously (Attachment B).

   b) Faculty Manual Change – Changes to Grievance Board. There being no discussion, vote was taken and proposed change passed (Attachment C).

   c) Faculty Manual Change – Advisory Committee Composition. There being no discussion, vote was taken and proposed change passed (Attachment D).

2) Research Committee – Senator Dan Warner, Chair, noted that the search for the Vice President for Research is proceeding and the list of candidates has been pared down to the top ten who are being called for references.

3) Welfare Committee – Senator Amod Ogale stated that the two issues being addressed by the Committee now are the listing (or lack thereof) of faculty within the telephone directory and parking.

4) Finance Committee – No report.

5) Scholastic Policies – Kelly Smith, Chair, submitted the Committee Report dated March 9, 2001 (Attachment E) and stated that this Committee had discussed a statement regarding online teaching evaluations and were quite divided. Senator Smith then shared information regarding a possible penalty change in the Academic Dishonesty Policy (Attachment F). The Scholastic Policies Committee will draft an opinion for consideration by the Faculty Senate at the April meeting. The Scholastic Policies Committee submitted the Advising Policy Recommendation (Attachment G) which is a rewording of the recommendation submitted by the students. Senator Smith will bring this to the floor of the Senate in April for consideration. In the meantime, Senators are to forward any comments to him by March 20th.

b. University Commissions and Committees – None
7. **President’s Report**: President Switzer shared the following information with the Faculty Senate:

   a. He traveled to Columbia to celebrate a resolution honoring Clemson University as the Public College of the Year. Clemson was given a plaque and a framed version of the resolution to display.

   b. The Governor’s Office has replied to the Faculty Senate Resolution on Potential Budget Cuts for Clemson University (Attachment H).

   c. He has spoken with Jim Daniels and legislators about the fact that education doesn’t stop at Grade 12 and that higher education funding should be discussed in terms of investments, not costs.

   d. Representative David Wilkins is an advocate and friend of higher education and would be a person with whom Senators could communicate personally about the issue of higher education and budget cuts.

   e. The *ad hoc* Faculty Performance Appraisal Committee is busy at work and any comments regarding how performance appraisals are done may be forwarded to President Switzer.

   f. The Presidential 5K Walk/Run will be held on April 7 with proceeds going to the Library.

   g. Provost Search Update - Three candidates are soon coming to campus for interviews. Schedules will be forwarded to Senators.

   h. Faculty Senate Election results are: Kinly Sturkie as Vice President/President-Elect and Kelly Smith as Secretary.

8. **Old Business** None

9. a. On behalf of the Executive/Advisory Committee, President Switzer submitted and explained the importance of the Online Faculty Evaluation Statement. Friendly amendments to the statement were offered and accepted. Vote on amended statement was taken and passed. (Attachment I). This statement will be forwarded to the Provost.

   b. It was determined by the Faculty Senate to forward the Proposal to Allow Instructors to Publish Student-Assessment Results to the Executive/Advisory Committee to address.
10. **Announcements:**
   a. Books for the Clemson Authors Display are to be delivered to Senator Tyler by March 15, 2001 for display at the Madren Center for the next few months.

   b. The Faculty Senate Spring Reception will be held at the Madren Center from 5-7:00 p.m. on Tuesday, April 10, 2001.

11. **Adjournment:** President Switzer adjourned the meeting at 4:35 p.m.

    [Signature]
    Peg Tyler, Faculty Senate Secretary

    [Signature]
    Cathy Toth Sturkie, Administrative Assistant

Absent: L. Grimes (N. Walker for), H. Hupp, D. Bradshaw, J. Zimmerman, D. Allison, J. Bednar (F. Chamberlain for), B. Malloy, M. Bridgwood, J. Meriwether (E. Hare for)
Proposal to Allow Instructors to Publish Student-Assessment Results

Student Senate Academic Affairs Committee
February 20, 2001

Background: Currently, student evaluations of instructors remain a part of each faculty member's personnel file. These evaluations are the property of each faculty member and are not available for viewing by the public without the permission of that faculty member. The evaluations are viewed by the department heads and deans of the faculty member's college for overall evaluation and consideration for things such as promotion and tenure.

At the present time, some faculty members publish their evaluations on their own web page or allow students to view them with their permission. There is also at least one unofficial web-page run by an organization on campus that allows students to "rate their professors." This site is often looked down upon since it does not accurately reflect how all students feel about an instructor, but often times how those with the strongest opinions feel.

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 member's permission. Only evaluations of instructors who release their information to the public will be published. An initial outline of how this will be done follows:

1) Nine questions of great importance have been selected from the list of 16 "bubble-in" questions. These are the questions answered on a scale of 1 to 5, from “Not at all” to “Very Much.” The rationale for choosing these nine particular questions can be found in further pages produced by Academic Affairs Committee members.

2) The bubble-in responses will be displayed in a manner similar to the following: 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.

   | #of 1's | #of 2's | #of 3's | #of 4's | #of 5's |
|------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Q#1  |        |        |        |        |        |
| Q#2  |        |        |        |        |        |

3) 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's and the number of no's will be displayed.

4) An instructor's evaluations would be published by course. If, for instance, the instructor teaches two different courses (not sections, but courses) then the instructor would have two different summaries of responses.
5) An overall rating for an instructor will not be published.

6) Evaluation summaries will be posted online. DCIT offers client support and could help to get an initial web-page up and running.

7) Student Government, especially Student Senate, will lead this effort. It will require virtually no effort by faculty. The Academics Affairs Committee will send out a mass email 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 evaluation release. No other effort should be required.

8) 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.”

9) Upon initial implementation, evaluations only from the previous semester would be entered into the database. As time passes, subsequent evaluations will be added each semester to a maximum of four semesters of evaluations posted.

* Please note that this is only an initial draft. Academic Affairs is extremely open to any and all suggestions for implementation. After extensive research and preparation, the committee feels an effort such as this would help both students and faculty take evaluations more seriously and may motivate faculty to find ways to make their current teaching methods even better. Our main objective, as always, is to find ways to make a Clemson education the best it can possibly be.
Proposed Faculty Manual Change

Pages 19 and 20

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

Page 20, second paragraph line 4, after "....or school director." The dean shall promptly inform in writing the affected faculty member of the results and rationale for his/her recommendation. (The following replaces the sentence beginning "The dean's recommendation shall....") If the dean's recommendation does not concur with those of the peer review committee and/or department chair/school director the dean shall discuss the recommendation with the peer review committee and department chair/school director. This discussion shall occur prior to the dean informing the affected faculty member of the results of and rationale for the recommendation.

Passed unanimously by the Faculty Senate on March 13, 2001.
If approved by the Faculty Senate, two-thirds of the faculty at a general faculty meeting, and the Board of Trustees, this change to the Constitution will replace Article II, The Faculty Senate, Section 8. Boards, The Grievance Board:

The Grievance Board, through three-member hearing panels, hears grievances brought to it in accordance with Faculty Grievance Procedure II. The Board will hold regular monthly meetings and may meet occasionally with grievance counselors as necessary. The Board shall report its activities to the faculty through the President of the Faculty Senate at the last general faculty meeting each academic year.

The Faculty Senate elects the Grievance Board members from a pool of nominees named by the Executive and Advisory Committees in a joint meeting, and from nominations made from the floor of the Senate. Members of the Board must be, or must have been, tenured professors or associate professors and shall be members, alternates, or former members of the Faculty Senate; retired, as well as current, faculty meeting these requirements may be elected. The Grievance Board shall consist of one representative from the library and three representatives from each college; their term of service shall be for three years. The Senate shall hold an election each January to fill any vacancies. The Grievance Board shall elect its chair with final approval by the Advisory Committee.

Passed by the Faculty Senate

The Advisory Committee: shall be composed of the officers of the Faculty Senate, a Senator from the library, two members from each college elected by the delegation of that college prior to the April meeting, and also the Immediate Past President of the Faculty Senate, the Chair of the Grievance Board, and the Faculty Representative to the Board of Trustees (all three shall serve in a non-voting capacity and only the Chair of the Grievance Board will serve on grievance hearings).

Passed by the Faculty Senate on March 13, 2001.
1) Our main order of business was the approval of a revised version of the academic advising document recently produced by the ad hoc committee on advising (attached). A University-wide advising policy is required by SACS, so the senate needs to approve something along these lines no later than the April Senate meeting. The Academic Council will enact an official policy during its May meeting.

2) A motion was made in response to the recent Executive/Advisory committee resolution concerning online evaluation of teaching:

   "The Scholastic Policies Committee is in favor of further investigation of online, out of class evaluation of teaching."

   This motion passed unanimously.

3) The committee considered the issue of making teaching evaluations available to the students online on a voluntary basis (see attached). After another lengthy discussion, it was decided that the committee was not going to come to a resolution of this issue and must pass it on to the senate at large.

OTHER ISSUES BEFORE THE COMMITTEE (INPUT SOLICITED):

   a. student initiative on grade redemption
   b. +/- grading
   c. MLK scheduling
   d. Academic Integrity policy issues
MEMORANDUM

TO: Council on Undergraduate Studies

FROM: George E. Carter, Jr., Ph. D., Associate Dean for Undergraduate Academic Services

RE: Possible Change in Academic Dishonesty Penalty

I would like for the Council to consider whether or not a policy change should be formulated that would prevent a student’s withdrawing from a course to prevent receiving an F grade for academic dishonesty.

On several occasions, I have talked with students who have been charged with academic dishonesty during the first half of the semester and assigned a first offense penalty of a final grade of F by the faculty member for such misconduct. Often times the student waives the right to an academic integrity hearing and subsequently withdraws from the course to avoid the F. This leaves the charge of academic dishonesty in a hidden file as the only penalty, thereby removing any visible penalty. Under the current withdrawal policy, such action is entirely appropriate.

However, a number of faculty members have indicated their wishes that the F remain and the course not be dropped if a student is guilty of academic dishonesty.

I request that the Council examine this issue and, if necessary, formulate a new policy to cover what some faculty have described as a “loophole” in the academic integrity policy.

Thank you.

GEC/jlm
Advising Policy Recommendation – Faculty Senate Scholastic Policies Committee

INTRODUCTION:

There is a widely felt need to formulate new, university-wide advising procedures for Clemson. For one thing, student surveys reveal a lack of satisfaction with the advising process. More importantly, some form of systematic advising policy is required by accrediting agencies like SACS. Specifically, SACS requirement 4.2.5 states:

“Each institution must conduct a systematic, effective program of undergraduate academic advising. A qualified advisor should be assigned early in the student’s program and should recognize the individuality of students and their particular needs and goals. Advisors should be proficient in using data to help determine students’ major fields of interest, should have access to each advisee’s records, and should have appropriate training or background and experience to carry out their responsibilities effectively. An institution must insure that the number of advisees assigned to faculty or professional staff is reasonable.

An effective orientation program must be made available to all full- and part-time undergraduate students. Orientation and advisement programs must be evaluated regularly and [the data] used to enhance the assistance to students.”

If the SACS requirements are to be the driving force of change, it seems we must change our policies to insure that there is:

1) a systematic, university-wide policy on advising.
2) appropriate training available for advisors.
3) a clear limit on the number of advisees assigned to any one advisor.
4) some kind of regular assessment of advising used to improve the process.

Recently, an ad hoc University Advising Committee was formed to explore advising on campus. The committee produced a report which was approved as a concept document by the University Commission on Undergraduate Studies. However, since advising is the province of the faculty, the policy has now been delivered to the faculty senate for review before any action is taken by the Academic Council. What follows is meant to be a basic framework which can be approved by the faculty senate immediately in order to have a framework in place for SACS review, with an eye toward more specific policies being developed next year by the elected members of the new University Advising Committee.
Specific guidelines to implement the goals outlined below will be developed by the University Advising Committee whose members are elected according to the procedures laid down in the faculty manual.

GOAL I:
The University shall adopt a mission statement on academic advising.

The following mission statement for the University is recommended:

"Academic advising is an ongoing educational process that connects the student to the University. Academic advising supports the University’s mission of preparing the student for learning beyond the confines of the academy. Academic advisors represent and interpret University policies and procedures to the student and help the student navigate the academic and organizational paths of the institution."

GOAL II:
The University shall demonstrate a continuing commitment to effective academic advising through appropriate recognition, communication, policies, and funding.

Strategies for Implementation:
1. Academic advising shall be systematically assessed university-wide.
2. Guidelines shall be developed for the inclusion of effective academic advising as a significant criterion for tenure, promotion, and other personnel actions for all faculty and staff whose duties include advising or the supervision of advising.
3. Academic advising information shall be shared through advisor development workshops, advisor manuals and other means.
4. Academic advising will be adequately funded.
5. Adequate time and resources for academic advising shall be included during new student/transfer orientation sessions and other advising sessions.
6. A policy setting an upper limit on the number of advisees per advisor shall be developed.

GOAL III:
Each College shall develop a plan of action for continued commitment to effective academic advising consistent with the University’s philosophy.

Strategies for Implementation:
1. Each College shall ensure that guidelines are developed for the inclusion of effective academic advising as a significant criterion for tenure, promotion, and other personnel actions for all faculty and staff whose duties include advising or the supervision of advising.
2. Each College shall routinely provide funds for the enhancement of advising, including support for attendance at advising-related seminars and conferences.
3. Each College shall routinely assess its academic advising program according to an established plan.

GOAL IV:
Academic advisors (faculty and professional staff) shall demonstrate effective academic advising consistent with the University and College philosophies.

Strategies for Implementation:
1. Advisors shall assist students with course selection based on curriculum and University requirements.
2. Advisors shall assist students in exploring career and educational opportunities.
3. Advisors shall utilize available campus resources based upon identified need and make referrals as appropriate.
4. Advisors shall maintain a current knowledge base of curricular, university and professional requirements.

GOAL V:
Students shall be informed of their personal responsibilities in the advising process.

Strategies for Implementation:
1. Adequate time for academic advising shall be included during new student/transfer orientation sessions.
2. Each student shall ultimately be responsible for completing requirements for the degree.
3. Each student shall become an active participant in the advising system.
March 8, 2001

Dr. Fred Switzer  
President  
Faculty Senate  
Clemson University  
Box 345104  
Clemson, South Carolina 29634-5104

Dear Dr. Switzer:

Thank you for your recent letter to Governor Hodges and for sharing with us a copy of the Faculty Senate’s Resolution. He appreciates your having provided him with your input and has asked me to respond on his behalf.

As you may know, the Governor is proposing providing colleges and universities with $60 million in bond money for deferred maintenance and $5 million in a Higher Education Research Investment Fund. This funding will help higher education institutions offset their portion of the base budget cuts. The Governor’s recommended expenditure for higher education is $786 million. This does not include the $60 million in deferred maintenance that will be available next year. This $60 million will replace about one-half of the cut.

We are continuing to look at ways to reduce the impact of cuts on our colleges and universities.

The House Ways and Means Committee has submitted their budget proposal to the full House, which will begin debate the week of March 12. If you have not already done so, I encourage you to share your concerns with your legislators.

Again, thank you for writing, and if we may be of service in the future, please let us know.

Sincerely,

Douglas E. McTeer, Jr.  
Director of Education Policy
Online Faculty Evaluation Statement

We oppose out-of-class online student evaluations of teaching until the sampling problem has been adequately addressed.

Passed by the Faculty Senate on March 13, 2001.
1. Call to Order: The Faculty Senate Meeting was called to order at 2:33 p.m. by President Fred S. Switzer.

2. Approval of Minutes: The Faculty Senate Minutes dated March 13, 2001 were approved as written.

3. Free Speech:

4. Committee Reports

a. Senate Committees
   1) Research Committee – Senator Dan Warner, Chair, informed the Senate that the search for the Vice President for Research continues at a rapid pace.


   3) Finance Committee – Chair John Bednar updated the Faculty Senate on the Committee’s work regarding administrative salaries when transferred from administrator status to that of a faculty member.

   4) Policy Committee – Senator John Huffman, Chair, submitted and briefly explained the Policy Committee Final Report (Attachment B).

b. University Commissions and Committees

   1) Provost Search Committee – President Switzer noted that all Senators should have received an email message containing the Search Committee’s recommendation to President Barker. President Switzer further noted that the feedback was much the same from all constituent groups across campus (that both candidates were qualified but that neither really fits the needs of Clemson University at this time). President Switzer also commented that the Search Committee had outside events to work around, such as the budget cuts, but nevertheless, worked hard to identify good candidates to bring to campus for interviews. Larry LaForge, Chair of the Search Committee, was congratulated and thanked for his leadership as Chair of this Committee.
Motion was made and passed to postpone the Scholastic Policies Committee Report until later in the meeting.

2) President Switzer introduced Mary Ann Taylor, Chair of the ad hoc Committee on Faculty Performance Appraisals. Dr. Taylor submitted and explained the Committee Report (Attachment C). Much discussion followed regarding additional issues the committee should address. Dr. Taylor stated that she hopes to meet with the Provost soon to continue discussions regarding the Committee's findings. Peg Tyler and Linda Nilson are also members of this Committee.

4a.


5. Old Business - President Switzer
   a. noted that a second Clemson Authors Display is now present in the Madren Center thanks to the efforts of Senator Tyler and
   b. provided information regarding the Board of Trustees Committee meetings and the full Board meeting on April 19th and 20th.
   c. Senator Smith provided a brief history of the Advising Policy Recommendation (which is only a policy statement and not an implementation statement) noting that this Recommendation satisfies the SACS requirements. A motion to accept Policy as presented was received. Vote to accept was taken and passed unanimously (Attachment E).
   d. Senator Huffman submitted and moved for approval the Faculty Manual Change on Post Tenure Review – TERI Program. Vote to accept proposed change was taken and passed (Attachment F).
   e. President Switzer referred the item regarding academic integrity and the possibility for a student to withdraw from a course and avoid a hearing to the Scholastic Policies Committee for review.

6. Outgoing Remarks and Introduction of Senate President: Outgoing remarks were made by President Fred S. Switzer, III who then introduced C. Alan Grubb as the Faculty Senate President for 2001-02. New officers were installed at approximately 3:30 p.m.

Peg Tyler, Faculty Senate Secretary
7. **New Business:** President Grubb began his term by stating to the Faculty Senators that he is pleased and proud to serve as President of the Faculty Senate. He believes that the Faculty Senate is the one institution that is the voice of the faculty and that the Faculty Senate has the respect of the Faculty.

   a. President Grubb submitted the Resolution by the Clemson University Faculty Senate for consideration (Attachment G) and Interim Provost Helms provided an explanation. Senator Huffman moved to bring this item to the floor for discussion. Vote was taken and passed with the required two-thirds vote. Following discussion, President Grubb forwarded resolution to the Policy Committee for further consideration to be submitted for action to the Senate during the summer. Comments are to be sent to Senator Huffman.

   b. New Senators were individually introduced and welcomed by President Grubb.

   c. President Grubb encouraged Senators to complete and return the Committee Preference Questionnaires so that assignments may be made to standing committees.

   d. President Grubb then 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.

   e. Senator Doug Rippy moved to continue the *ad hoc* Faculty Performance Appraisal Committee and motion was seconded. Motion was passed by acclamation to continue this Committee.

8. **Announcements:**

   a. Congratulations to Professor Kenneth Marcus as the recipient of the 2001 South Carolina Governor's Award for Excellence in Science for his outstanding achievement in the field of scientific research.

9. **Adjournment:** President Grubb adjourned the meeting at 3:47 p.m.

   [Signature]
   Kelly Smith, Faculty Senate Secretary

   [Signature]
   Cathy Toth Sturkie, Administrative Assistant
Faculty Senate
Welfare Committee
Annual Summary 2000-01

Members:
Amod Ogale (Chair); Larry Grimes, Chuck Linnell, Brenda Thames, Dale Linvill, Burt Lee, Eleanor Hare

Meeting Dates:
August 28, September 25, Oct 30, Nov 27, Dec 18, Jan 30, Feb 27, March 27

Issues Discussed:
1. Corresponded with the Provost regarding the notification of Post-Tenure Review Outcome to the faculty member;
2. Recommended the formation of a committee to assess Faculty Activity System
3. Discussed graduated rates for parking,
4. Discussed retirement benefits for faculty on 9-month appointment
5. Conducted a faculty parking survey
The Policy Committee considered a number of matters during the 2000–2001 term of office. The more important items upon which action was taken were:

- A policy to protect the ombudsman from retaliation. This is similar to the policy protecting anyone involved in a grievance from retaliation. Approved by the Provost.
- The policy regarding retaliation against anyone involved in grievance proceedings was strengthened. Approved by the Provost.
- Evaluation of School Directors, Assistant Deans, Associate Deans and other academic administrators not previously subject to review. This policy extends the review process to include all academic administrators. Approved by the Provost. The 2001-2002 Policy Committee will need to develop procedures for carrying out these reviews.
- Post-tenure review for faculty in the TERI program. Faculty in the TERI program will not undergo post-tenure review. There is some question about the status of this resolution.
- The description of the rank of instructor rank was revised in order to clarify the conditions under which promotion to assistant professor is possible. Approved by the Provost and the Board of Trustees.
- The description of the position of lecturer was revised in order to provide a measure of job security for those who have been in these positions for several years. Approved by the Provost and the Board of Trustees.
- A new position, that of senior lecturer was established. This will provide recognition and additional job security for lecturers who have provided several years of meritorious service. Approved by the Provost and the Board of Trustees.
- A Faculty Manual revision in the section on retired faculty was passed which affirms that retired faculty who remain professionally active will have office and laboratory space. Approved by the Provost.
- A revision in the Faculty Constitution was passed which will expand the size of the Grievance Board and change its composition to include retired faculty. Approved by the Provost. These changes must be voted upon by the faculty at the May general faculty meeting.
- A change in the composition of the Faculty Senate Advisory Committee to add the Chair of the Grievance Board as a non-voting member. Approved by the Provost. This change must be voted upon by the faculty at the May general faculty meeting.
Committee members: Tom Straka (Forest Resources), Hassan Behery (Textile Fibers and Polymer Science)
Committee chair: Mary Anne Taylor

This committee was charged with reviewing the current system of evaluating faculty performance and making specific recommendations for strengthening this process.

Thus far, information on problems with the current system has been compiled from department chairs’ feedback, and from interviews with university personnel charged with handling various forms of faculty complaints. While a number of very specific suggestions for change were received, we chose to focus on broad-based areas for change since these will have the most significant impact on the system. Many of the complaints regarding the existing system fall into three general areas:

1. Disagreements in the evaluations given to faculty within the Tenure and Promotions (TPR) Committees of the Departments. Individual members of TPR committees may provide somewhat idiosyncratic feedback to faculty members regarding their performance.

2. Disagreement between the faculty chair’s evaluation and the TPR committee’s evaluation. These two evaluations of a faculty member’s overall performance as well as evaluations in teaching, research, service and other areas often are in significant disagreement.

3. Problems in the nature of the feedback given to faculty members from department chairs and TPR members. Specifically, evaluators have misinterpreted some of the teaching evaluation data. In addition, feedback is sometimes vague or confusing.

At this point, remedies for each of these three problem areas are being developed, based on past research on evaluation systems. Briefly, the solutions to the first two problems center on development of clear, valid, consistent criteria for evaluating faculty performance. The solution to the third problem involves providing training for TPR committee chairs and to department chairs on two issues: a) the appropriate use and interpretation of student teaching evaluation data. (Dr. Linda Nielson is able to provide this training) and b) how to provide clear, effective performance feedback to faculty members. The committee will produce a detailed discussion of existing problems and proposed solutions in a final report.

Comments on the project may be addressed to:
Mary Anne Taylor (TaylorM@Clemson.edu; 656-4714, 310G Brackett Hall)
FINAL REPORT
SCHOLASTIC POLICIES COMMITTEE  2000-01 ACADEMIC YEAR

Business completed:
1) Using MY CLE for online evaluation of instructors.
   - An experiment using selected graduate classes was conducted and evaluated.
   - A cautionary resolution recommending against these unless problems of low
     response rate have been addressed has now been passed by the senate.

2) Advising policy revisions necessary to bring University in line with SACS
   requirements.
   - A new policy was written by the committee
   - This policy was approved by the Senate, and has been forwarded
     to the Academic Council for implementation.

3) MLK day scheduling concerns.
   - This issue has been forwarded to the Undergraduate Council.

4) Online publication, on a voluntary basis, of student evaluation of instructors (SGA
   initiative).
   - Policy discussed at length without progress.
   - The policy has been forwarded to Executive/Advisory Committee,
     where it was recently tabled for this year.

Old business still on docket
1) Possibly altering withdrawal/grading policy so that students are not allowed to
   withdraw from a course in which they have been found guilty of academic
   dishonesty in such a way as to avoid academic penalty.

2) The propriety of holding matriculated students to changes in the prerequisites for
   courses required for their major.

3) Grade Redemption Policy which would allow students to retake courses in order to
   improve their GPR (SGA initiative).

4) Possible changes in the red form, including: a question about recommendation for a
   teaching award (SGA initiative), collection of the forms only by designated
   students (many faculty complaints), etc.

5) Grade inflation: Do we have it and, if so, what should be done about it?

Possible items for future consideration
1) Eliminating freshman rush (faculty suggestion)
2) Alterations in University withdrawal policy (faculty suggestion)
Proposal by the Scholastic Policies Committee of the faculty senate, 4/6/01:

1) We propose that the University begin planning to initiate a new +/- system of grading making use of the following grades:

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

2) Cumulative GPR's will not exceed 4.0 - GPR's above that will be rounded down to 4.0.

3) This policy will go into effect at the same time and in the same way for all students. Our target date for implementation is Fall of 2003.

4) The new grading policy will be reviewed during its fourth year. Elements of the review may include: effect on GPR, instructor compliance, student and instructor attitudes, graduate and professional school attitudes, implementation difficulties, etc.

5) After approval by the Scholastic Policies committee, this proposal will be presented at the next full senate meeting.
INTRODUCTION:

There is a widely felt need to formulate new, university-wide advising procedures for Clemson. For one thing, student surveys reveal a lack of satisfaction with the advising process. More importantly, some form of systematic advising policy at both the undergraduate and graduate levels is required by accrediting agencies like SACS. Advising requirements are governed by SACS criteria 4.2.5 (at the undergraduate level) and 4.3.6 (at the graduate level). SACS requirement 4.2.5 states:

"Each institution must conduct a systematic, effective program of undergraduate academic advising. A qualified advisor should be assigned early in the student’s program and should recognize the individuality of students and their particular needs and goals. Advisors should be proficient in using data to help determine students’ major fields of interest, should have access to each advisee’s records, and should have appropriate training or background and experience to carry out their responsibilities effectively. An institution must insure that the number of advisees assigned to faculty or professional staff is reasonable.

An effective orientation program must be made available to all full- and part-time undergraduate students. Orientation and advisement programs must be evaluated regularly and [the data] used to enhance the assistance to students."

SACS requirement 4.3.6 has similar requirements for graduate advising.

If the SACS requirements are to be the driving force of change, it seems we must change our policies to insure that there is:

1) a systematic, university-wide policy on advising.
2) appropriate training available for advisors.
3) a clear limit on the number of advisees assigned to any one advisor.
4) some kind of regular assessment of advising used to improve the process.

Recently, an ad hoc University Advising Committee was formed to explore advising on campus. The committee produced a report which was approved as a concept document by the University Commission on Undergraduate Studies. However, since advising is the province of the faculty, the policy has now been delivered to the faculty senate for review before any action is taken by the Academic Council. What follows is meant to be a basic framework which can be approved by the faculty senate immediately in order to have a framework in place for SACS review, with an eye toward more specific policies being developed next year by the elected members of the new University Advising Committee.
Specific guidelines to implement the goals outlined below will be developed by the University Advising Committee whose members are elected according to the procedures laid down in the faculty manual.

**GOAL I:**
The University shall adopt a mission statement on academic advising.

The following mission statement for the University is recommended:

"Academic advising is an ongoing educational process that connects the student to the University. Academic advising supports the University’s mission of preparing the student for learning beyond the confines of the academy. Academic advisors represent and interpret University policies and procedures to the student and help the student navigate the academic and organizational paths of the institution."

**GOAL II:**
The University shall demonstrate a continuing commitment to effective academic undergraduate and graduate advising through appropriate recognition, communication, policies, and funding.

**Strategies for Implementation:**
1. Academic advising shall be systematically assessed university-wide.
2. Guidelines shall be developed for the inclusion of effective academic advising as a significant criterion for tenure, promotion, and other personnel actions for all faculty and staff whose duties include advising or the supervision of advising.
3. Academic advising information shall be shared through advisor development workshops, advisor manuals and other means.
4. Academic advising will be adequately funded.
5. Adequate time and resources for academic advising shall be included during new student/transfer orientation sessions and other advising sessions.
6. A policy setting an upper limit on the number of advisees per advisor shall be developed.

**GOAL III:**
Each College and Department shall develop a plan of action for continued commitment to effective academic advising consistent with the University’s philosophy.

**Strategies for Implementation:**
1. Each College and Department shall ensure that guidelines are developed for the inclusion of effective academic advising as a significant criterion for tenure, promotion, and other personnel actions for all faculty and staff whose duties include advising or the
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supervision of advising.

2. Each College and Department shall routinely provide funds for the enhancement of advising, including support for attendance at advising-related seminars and conferences.

3. Each College and Department shall routinely assess its academic advising program according to an established plan.

GOAL IV:

Academic advisors (faculty and professional staff) shall demonstrate effective academic advising consistent with the University, College and Departmental philosophies.

Strategies for Implementation:

1. Advisors shall assist students with course selection based on curriculum and University requirements.

2. Advisors shall assist students in exploring career and educational opportunities.

3. Advisors shall utilize available campus resources based upon identified need and make referrals as appropriate.

4. Advisors shall be familiar with available curricular, university and professional requirements.

GOAL V:

Students shall be informed of their personal responsibilities in the advising process.

Strategies for Implementation:

1. Adequate time for academic advising shall be included during new student/transfer orientation sessions.

2. Each student shall ultimately be responsible for completing requirements for the degree.

3. Each student shall become an active participant in the advising system.
H. Post Tenure Review

Purpose: Post-tenure review (PTR) serves to evaluate rigorously a faculty member’s professional contributions. The review should be used to ensure that all faculty serve the needs of the students and the institution and that excellent faculty are identified and rewarded. The post-tenure review must be linked to the annual reviews. Although the focus of PTR is on the performance of the individual since his or her last tenure or post-tenure review, the overall contribution of the individual faculty member to Clemson University should not be neglected.

Scope: All faculty members holding a tenured faculty position shall be subject to PTR except:

a. a faculty member planning to retire by August 15th of the same academic year in which the post-tenure review would occur providing that a binding letter of intent to retire is signed thereby waiving the PTR.

b. a faculty member enrolled in the Teacher & Employee Retention Incentive (TERI) program.

c. a collegiate dean will substitute his/her third year reappointment review and the one for every fifth year thereafter for the PTR.

d. a department chair’s second year review and the one for every fourth year thereafter will substitute for the PTR.

e. an academic administrator returning to his or her academic department would be subject to PTR during the third year after rejoining the department.
Resolution by the Clemson University Faculty Senate

Whereas, Clemson University faces a budget shortfall of a considerable magnitude; and
Whereas, one method to reduce the shortfall would consist of early retirements; and
Whereas, an institution of higher education is authorized to implement an early retirement program for "faculty;" and
Whereas, while the Clemson University county Extension agents are not "academic" faculty, they are county faculty in that they are responsible for disseminating the products of academic research to the people of the State of South Carolina through the Cooperative Extension Service; and
Whereas, it is a proper duty for the county Extension agents to teach the proper use of academic research to the citizens of the State of South Carolina and to inform the academic faculty of the needs of the people; and
Whereas, county Extension agents have long been considered as members of "Extension Faculty;" and Whereas, the term 'faculty' is inclusive of more than just the tenured faculty and the tenure-track faculty; and
Whereas, there is no reason not to consider the county Extension agents as faculty for the sole purpose of the statutory early retirement programs.

Therefore, Be It:

Resolved, that the Faculty Senate of Clemson University declares its support of county Extension agents as members of the "faculty" in the application of Section 59-103-150, SC Code of Laws (1976, amended).
MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
MAY 8, 2001

1. Call to Order: The Faculty Senate Meeting was called to order at 2:28 p.m. by President Alan Grubb.

2. Approval of Minutes: The Faculty Senate Minutes dated April 10, 2001 were approved as distributed.

3. Free Speech: Senator Pamela Dunston introduced the Faculty Senate to Elga, a puppy that she is raising for Canine Companions for Independence. She is a Labrador and Golden Retriever cross. Pamela is responsible for teaching Elga 25 basic commands, introducing her to a variety of people, and socializing her in a variety of environments and situations. CCI puppies like Elga are placed with puppy raisers when they are 8 weeks old and remain with the puppy raiser until 16 months of age. In November, Pamela will turn Elga in to the Southeast Regional center in Orlando, FL, where she will continue in the advanced training program for an additional 8 months. Upon graduation, Elga will be matched to a person with a physical disability. Elga and her partner will attend team training for 3 weeks so they can learn to work together. CCI provides highly trained assistance dogs like Elga to individuals with disabilities free of charge. When Elga is working, she wears a Gentle Leader head collar and vest. When individuals see Elga, they should not pet or give her commands unless they receive permission from Pamela. For more information about assistance dogs and the program visit CCI’s website at www.caninecompanions.org

Dexter Hawkins, Vice President/President-Elect of the Classified Staff Commission announced that the Commission had approved a name change to the Classified Staff Senate and will share this information with President Barker.

4. Special Order of the Day: Gerald Vander Mey, Campus Developer, briefly explained the new Master Plan for the University which has been developed over the past few years and noting that others were hired ten months ago to assist with the planning. Mr. Vander Mey then introduced guests from architectural firms who expanded on his explanation (Arthur Lidsky, President of Dober, Lidsky, Craig & Associates; George Mathey also of Dober, Lidsky, Craig; Amy Stubbs of Craig, Gaulden & Davis; and Bill Eubanks of Seamon Whiteside & Associates). This explanation included information about the campus related to peer institutions and Clemson University, itself. Mr. Lidsky noted that this is not an actual plan yet but is at the
discovery stage. Hopefully, a master plan can be established by fall of this year. President Grubb asked for the listing of 100+ suggestions for change from various campus colleges and divisions referred to in the presentation for possible use as a retreat topic in September. The architects stated they desire to come back in the fall to hear the Senate’s reaction.

5. **Committee Reports**
   a. **Senate Committees**
      1) **Research Committee** – Senator Dan Warner, Chair, thanked those Senators who attended the open forums and meetings for the Vice President for Research candidates.

      2) **Welfare Committee** – Senator Connie Lee, Chair, noted that the first meeting of this Committee will follow today’s Senate meeting.

      3) **Finance Committee** – Chair Steve Miller stated that there was no report.

      4) **Policy Committee** – Senator Eleanor Hare for John Huffman, Chair, submitted the Committee Report dated April 26, 2001 (Attachment A) and announced that the next meeting will be at 3:30 p.m. on May 22nd in the Library’s Conference Room (LL3).

      5) **Scholastic Policies** – Senator Kelly Smith for Jim Zimmerman, Chair, stated that there was no report.

   b. **University Commissions and Committees**: None

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

6. **Old Business**: None

7. **President’s Remarks**: President Grubb
   a. informed the Faculty Senate of the plans to hold the Faculty Senate Retreat in September and asked that suggestions for topics be forwarded to him;

   b. asked the Policy Committee to look into the issue of the Freedom of Information Act and access to files;

   c. noted that the new General Education Pilot courses will be considered by the Scholastic Policies Committee in addition to the process by which these courses were approved (as pilot courses); and
d. reported that the Academic Council received a summation of the budget situation; addressed the adjustment of admissions procedures (in and out-of-state acceptances, SAT scores); and were informed that SATs are up at Clemson and that we have accepted twenty-one (21) National Scholars.

Provost Helms stated that both 8.7% and 12% budget cut versions are being considered by the administration (planning on 12%) and that the good news is that the academic cut was held at 2.6%. Belt-tightening will be undertaken by all.

e. President Grubb stated that the Clemson University Authors Display and reception was enjoyed by all. Peg Tyler was thanked for setting up the display and for accepting overall responsibility for it and Kelly Durham and Joe Turner of First Sun Corporation were also thanked for continuing to sponsor the reception to honor those faculty members who works are contained within the display.

8. New Business:
   a. Senator Mickey Hall submitted and moved for endorsement a Philosophical Statement on Alcohol at Clemson University which was seconded. There being no discussion, vote was taken and endorsement of statement passed unanimously. (Attachment B).

   b. On behalf of the Scholastic Policies Committee, Senator Kelly Smith submitted and moved for acceptance the proposed plan to initiate a new plus-minus system of grading. Following much discussion, vote to accept proposal as presented was taken and passed (Attachment C).

9. Announcements:
   a. President Grubb reminded members of the Executive/Advisory Committee of the next meeting on May 15th at 2:30 p.m. in the Library's Conference Room.

   b. An appeal was made by President Grubb for a Senator to volunteer to be the Faculty Senate parliamentarian for this academic year.

   c. The Provost stated her concern of the lack of communication between the Deans and the Faculty Senate and asked the Senate's help on ways to enhance the communication. Discussion was held during which suggestions were offered.
10. **Adjournment**: President Grubb adjourned the meeting at 4:10 p.m.

[Signature]
Kelly Smith, Faculty Senate Secretary

[Signature]
Cathy Toth Sturkie, Administrative Assistant

POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING

APRIL 26, 2001

Present: J. Burns, A. Grubb, D. Rippy, C. Linnell, E. Hare, J. Huffman, C. Sturkie
for A. Schaffer

1. Remarks by Chair – Huffman noted that meetings will be 1 1/2 hours maximum or
less, if possible. As soon as a room is reserved for meetings, a schedule of
meetings for the year will be forwarded to Committee members.

2. Old Business None

3. New Business
   a. Faculty Status for County Extension Agents (attached) – Huffman will ask
      Provost what she suggests for title for extension agents. Grubb will soon
      speak with Provost to find out if this proposed resolution is to be
temporary (as Committee believes) or not. Committee will wait to hear
what Grubb learns from Provost. Huffman will wait to contact Provost
until we know whether this is to be a Manual change.

   b. Faculty Manual Change from George Carter regarding Academic Integrity
      Committee and the Academic Grievance Committee (attached) – Schaffer
      will put in language for Faculty Manual and run by Policy Committee.
      Schaffer will also email Page 36 of Manual to George Carter.

      During discussion, it was noted that evidently there are several University
committees in operation that have not been incorporated within the
Manual. Schaffer will prepare a memo as Editorial Consultant to those to
whom committees report (President, Provost, other VPs, CFO) requesting
the identification and information of those committees so they can be
included.

      It was suggested during discussion by Hare that a listing of Committees be
established on the Web supported and paid for by the Provost. If and
when Anne McMahan begins as the regular Senate web manager, this
could be a University information item she could perform.

   c. Possible Agenda Items for 2001-02 – Prioritize

      1) Extension of tenure clock due to pregnancy – Committee will not
         pursue due to many other extension situations that could arise.
2) Tenure clock for individuals who start in January – Schaffer to do a proposed *Manual* change extending tenure time 6 months (tenure time to begin the following August).

3) Policy for dealing with student complaints against a professor – Schaffer to write something up to include items about employees having access to personnel files; administration to inform faculty of the existence of unsubstantiated complaints against them (which could result in a Grievance); and some kind of instruction/listing of just what can be included in personnel files.

4) Ethics statement regarding dishonesty in grievance hearings – Schaffer to do draft a statement for the *Manual* such as, “it will be expected of all parties to a grievance to be completely truthful” and “it is appropriate for both Grievance I and II Hearing Panels to request from the Provost a letter of reprimand regarding any named party for whom discovery is made for such reprimand.”

5) Insuring that faculty are “in the loop” on academic matters – it was determined that it is the responsibility of all faculty and the Faculty Senate to keep their eyes open at all times to insure that academic matters have the inclusion of faculty input at the appropriate time.

6) Review composition and chain of command for the committee structure of the undergraduate council – Huffman will ask Reel/Carter about the actual functioning of this Council before any action to rework is taken.

7) Possible arbitration board for grievances – Huffman will get the opinion of and information from the University Ombudsman, Gordon Halfacre.

8) Rotating department chairs – Huffman will get more information – this item and others (such as evaluation of department chairs) may be undertaken during the Senate Retreat. The whole idea of department chairs/program coordinators might be a Retreat topic.

9) Policy to insure that administrators cannot unilaterally change grades – Grubb asked Policy Committee to wait on this until he speaks with the Provost.

10) Questions regarding administrative supplements – Grubb will talk with Bednar to find out if this should continue to be pursued.

4. Adjournment – 4:41 p.m.
TO:  
Faculty Senate  
Student Senate  
Graduate Student Government  
Classified Staff Commission

FROM:  Alcohol Summit Task Force

DATE:  March 29, 2001

On March 28, 2001, the Alcohol Summit voted to adopt the following statement regarding alcohol to provide a framework for University policies and practices. We respectfully request that this statement be reviewed and endorsed by Faculty Senate, Student Senate, Graduate Student Government and the Classified Staff Commission.

Philosophical Statement on Alcohol at Clemson University

Clemson University is committed to providing a campus environment free from the abuse of alcohol and the illegal use of alcohol and other drugs. The University will comply with all federal, state, and local laws and policies on the use and abuse of alcohol and other drugs. The legal drinking age in the state of South Carolina is 21. Clemson University provides individuals of legal age who choose to drink an environment that promotes safety and responsible drinking. Each individual retains responsibility for his or her own actions at all times regardless of his or her mental or physical state, even if altered by alcoholic beverages or other drugs. Clemson University values the concepts of informed decision making, promotion of healthy behaviors, prevention of disease, and treatment and rehabilitation of dysfunction.

JSS/gmb
c: Alcohol Summit Task Force
Joy S. Smith, Chair, Associate Vice President for Student Affairs & Dean of Students
Mary Poore, Associate Vice President for Municipal Services
Verna Howell, Associate Vice President for Student Affairs & Exec Director, Univ Housing
Rusty Guill, Assistant to the Vice President for Student Affairs
George Clay, Executive Director of Health Services
Parvin Lewis, Director, Health Education, Redfern
Stefani Goodenow, Health Education, Redfern
Arthur Logan, Counselor, Counseling & Psychological Services
Hugh Spitler, Assistant Professor, Public Health
Thea McCrary, Captain, CU Police Department
Robin Denny, Director, News Services
Alesia Smith, Director, Judicial Services
Elaine Richardson, Associate Professor, Animal & Veterinary Sciences
George Smith, Director, University Union & Hendrix Student Center
Mandy Hays, Director, Activities & Student Organizations, Union & Hendrix Student Center
Gary Campbell, Director, Residential Life, University Housing
Bill D’Andrea, Athlete Coach, Athlete Enrichment
Rita Bolt, Student Body President 2000-2001
Mo Abdel-Kader, Student Body Vice President 2000-2001
Dayton Stout, Attorney General 2000-2001 (Student Government)
Julie Clark, Health & Human Awareness Committee Chair (Student Senate)
Ted Doyle, Graduate Student Government Representative
Angelo Mitsopolous, IFC (Inter-Fraternity Council), President
Amy Birch, Panhellenic Council President
Dawnjalice Brown, Pan-Hellenic Council President
Matt Webber, Residence Hall Council President
Jaganathan "Josh" Kowacick, International Students Representative
Ben Walker, Club Sports President
Chief Johnson Link, Chief of Police, City of Clemson
Esther Revis-Wagner, Downtown Merchant, Community Representative
Proposal by the Scholastic Policies Committee of the faculty senate, 4/6/01:

1) We propose that the University begin planning to initiate a new +/- system of grading making use of the following grades:

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

2) Cumulative GPR's will not exceed 4.0 - GPR's above that will be rounded down to 4.0.

3) This policy will go into effect at the same time and in the same way for all students. Our target date for implementation is Fall of 2003.

4) The new grading policy will be reviewed during its fourth year. Elements of the review may include: effect on GPR, instructor compliance, student and instructor attitudes, graduate and professional school attitudes, implementation difficulties, etc.

5) After approval by the Scholastic Policies committee, this proposal will be presented at the next full senate meeting.
MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
JUNE 12, 2001

1. **Call to Order:** The Faculty Senate Meeting was called to order at 2:29 p.m. by President Alan Grubb.

2. **Approval of Minutes:** The Faculty Senate Minutes dated May 8, 2001 were approved as distributed; the General Faculty Minutes of May 10, 2001, as corrected.

3. **Free Speech:** President Grubb requested that the Faculty Senators inform their colleagues of the existence of the free speech opportunity noting that they are welcome to come and present. If one is interested, s/he should contact Cathy Sturkie in advance as there are guidelines to follow.

4. **Committee Reports**
   a. **Senate Committees**
      1) **Research Committee** – Senator Dan Warner, Chair, stated that there was not a Committee report but that the Commission on Higher Education has made available to Clemson University about $375,000 to be used to address infrastructure barriers. Requests for Proposals (RFP's) will go out soon seeking faculty grants. Senator Warner asked Senators to bring this information to the attention of their colleagues. Senator Warner then announced that Chris Przirembel was the new Vice President for Research.

      2) **Welfare Committee** – Senator Pamela Dunston, noted that the Welfare Committee is looking into the following issues: summer sick leave for nine-month employees; spousal/partner employment; salary inversion; nine-month faculty being paid over twelve months. During discussion, President Grubb noted that the Provost has stated that there is nothing to the rumor that there will be dry promotions.

      3) **Finance Committee** – No report.

      4) **Policy Committee** – Senator John Huffman, Chair, stated that this Committee met on May 17th and discussed three *Faculty Manual* changes; streamlining the Undergraduate Council; and the possibility of probationary periods for faculty who become parents during that period. Items will be brought forward for consideration during both Old and New Business.

      5) **Scholastic Policies** – Senator Jim Zimmerman, Chair, stated that there was no report.
b. University Commissions and Committees:

(1) Provost Search Committee – President Grubb stated that this newly-formed Committee has met once and that he is the only person from the Faculty Senate. Fran McGuire is chair of this Committee and will follow the same procedures that were followed in the previous search. Requests for nominations should appear around September 1st. This is a national search that allows internal candidates. It is hoped that the search process is completed by the end of January or early February.

6. Old Business:
a. Senator Huffman submitted and briefly explained the Extension Faculty Listing in Faculty Manual and accepted a friendly amendment to change the title from “field” faculty to “county” faculty. There was no discussion. Vote was taken to accept amended Faculty Manual change and passed unanimously (Attachment A).

7. President’s Remarks: President Grubb
   a. reminded all of the Faculty Senate Retreat to be held on Tuesday, September 11, 2001;
   b. noted that an interesting presentation at the President’s Cabinet was that by Gary Melton regarding the Family and Neighborhood Life Institute, a precursor to restructuring our many institutes to redefine the role and activity of land grant universities in the 21st Century; and
   c. stated that the Clemson Authors Display will be dismantled at the end of this month. Senator Camille Cooper will coordinate the next display and ideas may be forwarded to her. President Grubb said that this is a very worthy way to recognize faculty research and publications.

8. New Business:
a. Senator Huffman submitted, explained, and moved acceptance of the Faculty Manual change, Honesty in Grievance Hearings. Following much discussion, this issue was returned to the Policy Committee.
   b. Senator Huffman submitted, explained, and moved acceptance of the Faculty Manual change, Probationary Period for Faculty. Following discussion, Senator Huffman withdrew this issue from consideration. Provost Dori Helms asked Senator Huffman to please look at the Annual Review cycle at the same time the Policy Committee re-addresses the issue of a probationary period for faculty.

9. Announcements:
a. President Grubb announced that there will not be a Faculty Senate meeting in July.
b. At the request of President Grubb, Provost Helms provided a budget update to the Faculty Senate and stated that the Board of Trustees will meet on June 20 to determine the amount of Clemson’s tuition increase. Questions were then asked of the Provost regarding LIFE Scholarships; permission from Legislature for a significant tuition increase; and the process of the program director search within the Division of Public Service and Agriculture.

10. **Adjournment**: President Grubb adjourned the meeting at 3:40 p.m.

\[Signature\]
Kelly Smith, Faculty Senate Secretary

\[Signature\]
Cathy Toth Sturkie, Administrative Assistant

MEMORANDUM

TO: D. Helms, Provost
FROM: A. Schaffer, Editorial Consultant

RE: Faculty Manual change for extension faculty

At its meeting on June 12th the Faculty Senate approved the creation of a new faculty section in addition to “Regular” and “Special” faculty. The new section would be termed “Other Ranks” and would include the following description:

“County Faculty. Faculty working in the various counties of the state through the Cooperative Extension Service are collectively known as “county faculty” without academic ranks. Because of their physical separation from the university proper, county faculty are organized separately. County faculty are not eligible for service in the Faculty Senate, nor shall they be counted in determining the Faculty Senate apportionment for their college.”

This new section would be inserted into the Faculty Manual, Part III, The Faculty, as a new Section F on page 15 after receiving your approval and the approval of the Board of Trustees.

cc: Alan Grubb
    Cathy Sturkie
THERE WAS NO

FACULTY SENATE MEETING

IN

JULY, 2001
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 Faculty Senate Minutes dated June 12, 2001 were approved as written. President Grubb announced with gratitude that Senator Brenda Vander Mey had volunteered to be the Senate Parliamentarian.

3. “Free Speech”: Senate Alternate Ken Backman inquired about the eligibility of those faculty enrolled in the TERI Program serving on Promotion and Tenure/Post-Tenure Review Committees. Senator John Huffman responded that they were, in fact, eligible to serve in this capacity and actually had all rights and privileges as faculty.

4. Special Order of the Day – Arlene Privette and Bonnie Page presented an overview of the Academic Support Center and asked for the support of the Faculty Senate. The Center was established to enhance the academic success of students. The programs to be implemented include: free tutoring, supplemental instruction, and academic skills groups (Attachment A).

Anne McMahan, Web Manager for the Faculty Senate, was introduced by President Grubb. Ms. McMahan described what she developed as the new Faculty Senate Website citing links and subject headings.

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 noted that the Welfare Committee was charged with four issues to pursue. There is no sick leave for nine-month faculty at this time due to South Carolina policy rather than Clemson University policy. The issues of spousal/partner employment, salary inversion, and nine-month faculty getting paid over twelve months will continue to be pursued. Recycling will be addressed during the Faculty Senate Retreat and social security numbers are presently being phased out as identification numbers at Clemson University.

      3) Finance Committee – Chair Steve Miller stated that there was no report.
4) **Policy Committee** – Senator John Huffman, Chair, noted that the Committee met on July 17; that items will come up under Old and New Business; and that the next Committee meeting date is August 23 at 3:30 p.m. in the Library’s Conference Room.

5) **Scholastic Policies** – Senator Jim Zimmerman, Chair, submitted and briefly explained the Committee Report dated July 11, 2001 (Attachment B).

b. University Commissions and Committees: None

6. **Old Business:**
   a. Senator Huffman submitted; briefly explained; and moved acceptance of the Faculty Manual change of probationary period. There was no discussion. Vote was taken to accept Faculty Manual change and passed unanimously (Attachment C).

b. Senator Huffman submitted; briefly explained; and moved acceptance of the Faculty Manual change of a statement of honesty in grievance proceedings. There was no discussion. Vote was taken to accept Faculty Manual change and passed unanimously (Attachment D).

c. Professor of Psychology, Mary Anne Taylor, submitted for acceptance the Report from the ad hoc Committee on Faculty Performance Appraisal and provided an overview of the Report. Senators were urged to read this report carefully. The report will be forwarded to an appropriate committee to determine possible implementation methods (Attachment E).

7. **President’s Remarks:**
   a. President Grubb noted that problems arose during the summer regarding Faculty Manual violations and reminded the Senate of the importance of the Faculty Manual and the Senate’s role in making sure that it is adhered to. The first violation brought to the attention of President Grubb regarded program directors in Public Service and Agriculture. Once the violation was presented to John Kelly, Vice President, it was immediately corrected in a cooperative manner. The second violation discovered concerned appointments of both an interim and permanent associate dean in the College of Health, Education, and Human Development.

   b. President Grubb stated that he and Dan Warner, Chair of the Research Committee, worked on an issue regarding the Research Ethics Policy and the discovery that revisions were made to the existing Policy but were not submitted to either the Faculty Senate or the Board of Trustees for approval. This is an opportunity for the Faculty Senate to revisit the Research Ethics Policy and recommend necessary changes. The Research and Policy Committees will examine the Policy for final approval by the Faculty Senate, the Provost, and the Board of Trustees.
c. President Grubb introduced Senator Mark Snyder who, along with Rudy Abramovitch, is an editor of the Faculty Senate publication, *Open Forum*. Senator Snyder submitted for consideration an example of a redesigned letterhead and reworded disclaimer for the publication which was seconded. There was no discussion. Vote was taken to bring to floor for consideration and passed with the required two-thirds vote of those present. Senator Snyder then made a motion to accept redesigned letterhead and reworded disclaimer and motion was seconded. During discussion, a friendly amendment was offered to the disclaimer and was accepted. Motion to Table was offered by Senator Brenda Vander Mey. Vote to table motion was taken and failed. Call to Question was stated and seconded. Vote to call question was taken and passed. Vote to accept motion to accept redesigned *Open Forum* letterhead and amended disclaimer was taken and passed (Attachment F).

8. New Business:
   a. Senator Huffman submitted, explained, and moved acceptance of the *Faculty Manual* change, Composition of University Honors Committee. There was no discussion. Vote to accept *Manual* change was taken and passed unanimously (Attachment G).

   b. Senator Huffman submitted, explained, and moved acceptance of the *Faculty Manual* change, Time Limit for Submission of Documents in a Grievance. Following a brief discussion, vote to accept *Manual* change was taken and passed unanimously (Attachment H).

   c. Senator Huffman moved, submitted, and explained the Resolution on Searches and Search Committees. Motion was seconded. Following discussion, vote to adopt resolution was taken and passed (FS01-8-1 P) (Attachment I).

   d. Senate Alternate Nancy Porter inquired about the policy for study leave within the post-tenure review process and faculty in interim positions. As Chair of the Policy Committee, Senator Huffman will pursue.

9. Announcements:
   a. Senator Camille Cooper reminded the Senate to visit the First Sun Connector at the Martin Inn to see the faculty display. President Grubb stated the Senate’s thanks to Joe Turner and Kelly Durham for this initiative to recognize and advertise the efforts of faculty in such a prominent location.

   b. President Grubb reminded the Senate of the Faculty Senate Retreat to be held on Tuesday, September 11 at the Madren Center beginning with breakfast at 8:00 a.m.

10. Adjournment: President Grubb adjourned the meeting at 4:34 p.m.
Academic Support Center
www.clemson.edu/asc

Providing academic support services to help YOU maximize your potential

Fall 2001 Programs:

- FREE tutoring
- Supplemental Instruction
- Academic skills workshops

Areas of Tutoring:

- ENGL 101, 102
- MTHSC 101, 102, 106, 108
- PHYS 122, 200, 207
- CH 101, 102, 223
- BIOL 103, 110
- ACCT 201, 202, 204, 301, 302
- CPSC 101, 111
Supplemental Instruction offered in:

MTHSC 106 section 5
MTHSC 106 section 12
MTHSC 106 section 13
MTHSC 106 section 16

Academic Skills Workshops:

• Keeping In Motion
• Speed Reading
• Time Management
• Stress Management

"Tutoring Tonight"

Check out the web site at www.clemson.edu/asc to see all tutoring activities across campus for any given day.

For additional information:
Call 656-6452
Visit 321 Brackett Hall
Email: demiseb@demon.edu
Scholastic Policies Committee

July 11, 2001

Present: Frances Chamberlain, Camille Cooper, Mickey Hall, Ed Moise, Brenda Vander Mey, Jim Zimmerman

The purpose of this meeting was to examine what was currently on our agenda, what had been sent to us since our last meeting, and to set meeting times for the fall.

Scheduling of Meetings
Available times for meetings is even worse than originally thought. A time of Tuesdays at 3:30 was settled upon. Most dates will be one week after Faculty Senate meetings and therefore one week before Advisory/Executive Committee meetings. All meetings are scheduled in the Jordan Room. Undergraduate and Graduate Student leaders are specifically invited to participate in all meetings.

The tentative meeting dates for the fall are September 18, October 2, October 23, and November 20.

Current Agenda
- Plus-Minus grading will continue to be part of our effort. Stan Smith earlier provided the entire Faculty Senate with data on the current use by “Top 50 Public Schools” (US News and World Report). In this group only the University of Iowa uses the system we have proposed. Dr. Zimmerman was copied on a memo from Dr. Reel to President Grubb indicating that Dr. Reel would be submitting the proposal to the Undergraduate Studies Council at the first regular meeting in the autumn.

- Jim Zimmerman reported that in a meeting with the Provost it was decided to expand the testing of replacing the “Red Forms” with electronic evaluations for student evaluation of teaching. With the assistance of the Assessment Office courses will be selected that will have multiple sections, preferably courses where one instructor will teach more than one section of the same class. A subselection of courses will involve Laptop courses. The Assessment Office will help determine the numbers needed to be able to draw appropriate conclusions.

- General Education is an area that we wish to track. It was decided to ask President Grubb to request the Provost ensure that any committee dealing with changes in the General Education requirements have a representative from the Scholastic Policies Committee.
• We need to continue to be involved in whatever policies are proposed concerning the University's advising policy.

Items Brought to the Committee Since the Last Meeting

• An email from Drew Land (Student Senate President) to Kelly Smith. This email informed Dr. Smith that Mr. Land had requested the Provost to purchase unlimited access to a site that could be used to detect plagiarism. Included was a copy of a Washington Post article. The Committee will consider endorsing the concept of this request at a later date.

• The above discussion on plagiarism led to a discussion on the need for better education of the faculty concerning intellectual property rights. This will be a subject to be discussed in the Committee.

• The Committee was asked to check on the status of requiring students to purchase laptop computers. Jim Zimmerman indicated he would try to find out.

• What is the status of making changes in the Spring semester's academic schedule to better accommodate Martin Luther King day? It was decided to ask President Grubb to make this inquiry to the Provost.

• A situation was described in an email where a student with a GPR well below the minimum required for graduation was able to miss class because of a University sanctioned activity. A request was made to develop policies that would restrict this type of activity. This is something the Committee will look into.

Student Senate Projects

Grade Redemption

Electronic Posting of Professor Evaluations

Electronic Posting of Course Syllabi
MEMORANDUM

TO: Alan Grubb, President
FROM: Alan Schaffer, Editor

RE: Faculty Manual change of probationary period

At its July meeting, the Policy Committee accepted the following change to the section of the Faculty Manual dealing with the probationary period for untenured faculty, Part IV, page 21:

"The probationary period for all faculty begins in August of the calendar year in which the individual is officially added to the faculty roster. However, faculty officially joining the university after October 1st of a calendar year shall have their probationary period begin with the following August."

If accepted by the Senate and approved by the Provost, this change will be added to the final paragraph on page 21 of the Manual.

I would appreciate it if you would put this on the agenda for the August meeting of the Faculty Senate.

cc: John Huffman
Cathy Sturkie
MEMORANDUM

TO: Alan Grubb, President
FROM: Alan Schaffer, Editor

RE: Statement of honesty in grievance proceedings

At its meeting in July, the Policy Committee unanimously accepted the following wording concerning honesty in grievance proceedings:

"All parties to a grievance, including witnesses, are expected to adhere to the highest standard of honesty expected of all faculty members at all times."

If accepted by the Senate and approved by the Provost, the statement will be inserted in the Grievance section of the Faculty Manual.

I would appreciate it if you would place this item on the agenda for the August meeting of the Faculty Senate.

cc: John Huffman
Cathy Sturkie
Survey of Grading Systems
The Top 50 Public National Universities

In recent months the University has discussed changing its grading system from the present ABCDF to one that includes plus and minus grades. This survey was prepared to assist the University in making a decision on this matter. The survey covers all of the “top 50” public national universities listed in the August 30, 1999 edition of *U.S. News & World Report* magazine. See list below.

Among the schools, ten different grading schemes were identified. Three grading schemes are dominant and currently are used by 38 of the 51 schools. (Note: Because several of the schools are “tied” at the end of the ranking, the *U.S. News & World Report* actually lists 51 schools.) Each of the ten schemes are shown on the following pages, and the schools using each particular one are listed below the grading scheme. A brief comment above each scheme identifies one or more unique features of the scheme. The number to the left of the school’s name is its “rank” order, and in parenthesis to the right of each school’s name is the edition date of the catalog reviewed.

Stan Smith, Registrar
June 20, 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>School name (State)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>University of California–Berkeley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>University of Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Univ. of California–Los Angeles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>University of Michigan–Ann Arbor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>U. of North Carolina–Chapel Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>College of William and Mary (VA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Univ. of California–San Diego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>U. of Illinois–Urbana–Champaign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Univ. of Wisconsin–Madison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Georgia Institute of Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>University of California–Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Univ. of California–Santa Barbara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>University of Texas–Austin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>University of Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>University of California–Irvine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>University of Florida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Purdue Univ.–West Lafayette (IN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Texas A&amp;M Univ.–College Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Univ. of Minnesota–Twin Cities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>University of Iowa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Miami University–Oxford (OH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Rutgers–New Brunswick (NJ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>SUNY–Binghampton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>University of Delaware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>University of Georgia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Univ. of Maryland–College Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Colorado School of Mines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Ohio State University–Columbus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Virginia Tech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Indiana University–Bloomington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Michigan State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Ohio University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Univ. of California–Riverside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Univ. of California–Santa Cruz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>University of Colorado–Boulder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>University of Connecticut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>Auburn University (AL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>Clemson University (SC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>Iowa State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>University of Kansas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>University of Pittsburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>University of Vermont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>Florida State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>University of New Hampshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>Univ. of Tennessee–Knoxville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>Michigan Technological University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>University of Arizona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>Univ. of Massachusetts–Amherst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>Univ. of Missouri–Columbia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The highly ranked University of Virginia
### Scheme A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Univariate of Technology (2000-2001)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **A**
  - 10 Georgia Institute of Technology (2000-2001)
- **B**
  - 13 Univ. of Texas-Austin (1999-2000)
- **C**
  - 18 Purdue Univ. (1999-2000)
  - 18 Texas A&M Univ.-College Station (1999-2000)
  - 22 Univ. of Georgia (2000-2002)
  - 22 Univ. of Maryland (1998-1999)
  - 28 Colorado School of Mines (2000-2001)
  - 38 Auburn Univ. (2000-2001)
  - 38 Clemson Univ. (2001-2002)

### Scheme B

(Does not include A+)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Univariate of Technology (2000-2001)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C+</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **A**
  - 5 Univ. of North Carolina-Chapel Hill (2000-2001)
- **B**
  - 6 College of William and Mary (2000-2001)
  - 18 Univ. of Minnesota-Twin Cities (2000-2001)
  - 22 Univ. of Delaware (2000-2001)
  - 31 Ohio Univ. (2000-2001)
  - 31 Univ. of Colorado-Boulder (2000-2001)
  - 31 Univ. of Connecticut (2000-2001)
  - 32 Iowa State Univ. (1999-2001)
  - 38 Univ. of Kansas (2000-2002)
  - 45 Florida State Univ. (2000-2001)
  - 45 Univ. of New Hampshire (2000-2001)

### Scheme C

(A+ receives 4 grade points)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Univariate of Technology (2000-2001)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A+</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C+</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **A**
  - 1 Univ. of California-Berkeley (1999-2001)
- **B**
  - 2 Univ. of Virginia (2000-2001)
  - 3 Univ. of California-Los Angeles (1999-2001)
  - 3 Univ. of Michigan-Ann Arbor (1999-2001)
  - 7 Univ. of California-San Diego (2000-2001)
  - 8 Univ. of Illinois-Urbana-Champaign (1999-2001)
  - 12 Univ. of California-Davis (1999-2000)
  - 13 Univ. of California-Santa Barbara (2000-2001)
  - 16 Univ. of California-Irvine (2000-2001)
  - 31 Univ. of California-Riverside (2000-2001)
  - 38 NC State Univ.-Raleigh (1999-2000)
  - 38 Univ. of Pittsburgh (1999-2002)
  - 38 Univ. of Vermont (2000-2001)
  - 48 Univ. of Missouri-Columbia (1999-2001)

### Scheme D

(A+ receives 4.3 grade points)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Univariate of Technology (2000-2001)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A+</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C+</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **A**
  - 21 Univ. of Iowa (2000-2002)

**Scheme E**  
(Plus for B and C grades only)  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Numerical Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C+</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 8 Univ. of Wisconsin-Madison (1999-2001)
- 45 Univ. of Tennessee-Knoxville (2000-2001)

**Scheme F**  
(Plus, minus not used at low end)  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Numerical Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 10 Penn State Univ. (2000-2002)

**Scheme G**  
(Faculty submit numerical grades from 4.0 to 0.7 in 0.1 increments. Numerical grades are equivalent to the following letter grades.)  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Numerical Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>4.0-3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-</td>
<td>3.8-3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
<td>3.4-3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>3.1-2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-</td>
<td>2.8-2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C+</td>
<td>2.4-2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>2.1-1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-</td>
<td>1.8-1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D+</td>
<td>1.4-1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>1.1-0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-</td>
<td>0.8-0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 13 Univ. of Washington (2000-2002)

**Scheme H**  
(Plus used only)  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Numerical Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C+</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D+</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 16 Univ. of Florida (1999-2000)
- 28 Ohio State University-Columbus (1999-2000)
- 48 Univ. of Massachusetts-Amherst (2000-2001)

**Scheme I**  
(Plus, minus not used for D grade)  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Numerical Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 22 State Univ. of NY-Binghamton (2000-2001)

**Scheme J**  
(Instructor prepares narrative evaluation for each student in each course. In addition, student chooses Pass/No Record option or letter grade ABCDF option for each course.)  

- 31 Univ. of California-Santa Cruz (2000-2001)
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There are many compelling reasons for having a clear set of standards for evaluating faculty performance. Positive outcomes of a strong performance appraisal system at Clemson University can be identified at the level of the individual, the department, and the institution as a whole.

First, a valid and effective performance appraisal system has benefits for individual faculty. Consistent and relevant evaluations of performance can serve a dual purpose. Such feedback provides information on one's performance relative to peers, and serves as a rationale for differentiation in faculty workload and pay. It can also provide developmental feedback for Clemson faculty. This latter type of feedback can help both tenured and untenured faculty guide their career and also helps them focus their efforts in pursuing tenure, promotion, or other organizational rewards. Thus, a solid, valid performance appraisal system has the potential to provide highly motivating feedback to faculty. Conversely, the inconsistent use of evaluative criteria across faculty or the use of invalid information in faculty evaluations often leads to perceptions of unfairness in the system and fails to provide the feedback needed to guide one's efforts (Gilliland, 1993; Arvey & Sackett, 1993). When faculty believe that outcomes of performance appraisal are unfair, this may trigger an intensive analysis of the procedures used to evaluate their performance (Greenberg, 1990). Perceptions of unfair procedures are linked to a variety of significant outcomes for Clemson, from general feelings of dissatisfaction and mistrust of the University to litigation against the system.

Second, the use of a strong performance appraisal system has benefits at the departmental level. Tenure and promotion (T & P) committees need to have a set of guidelines for reviewing and rating performance of faculty to ensure that there is some consistency in the way faculty members are evaluated. This does not mean that all faculty members have to have equal performance in the three areas of research, teaching and service. However, there should be a flexible system of guidelines for reviewing performance and setting performance standards so that those individuals with similar or comparable performance levels receive similar evaluations. In addition, a set of flexible standards will help T & P members consider clear feedback to ensure that faculty members are given guidance regarding how to improve their performance. In the absence of these standards, a faculty member may be given conflicting feedback from different members of the T&P committee. In fact, in the absence of a clear performance appraisal system, faculty members may receive as many different evaluations of their performance as there are T & P members. A valid performance appraisal system should increase the consistency of evaluations within T & P committees. This should be reflected in more agreement in the evaluations of individual faculty and in more consistent judgments of the relative performance of different faculty members. Similar discrepancies may arise when department chairs are required to make evaluations of departmental faculty which are independent of the evaluations made by Tenure and Promotion Committees. When there is not a clear and consistent set of standards for evaluating performance, this often leads to widely divergent performance evaluations of faculty performance. For instance, some faculty may receive feedback from the T & P committee indicating that their performance is satisfactory and then receive negative feedback from the chair. The likely result of such disagreement is inconsistent performance information that creates dissatisfaction among faculty and feelings of mistrust in the department (Smith & Reilly, Millsap, Pearlman & Steffey, 1993).
The third major level at which a fair and valid performance appraisal system can produce significant benefits for Clemson is at the institutional level. Fair performance appraisal systems provide constructive feedback that can lead to better, more focused performance of faculty members (Wilk & Redmon, 1998). The goals of Clemson University cannot be reached without the commitment of faculty, and this requires clear, timely, and fair critiques of faculty performance. Dissatisfaction with performance appraisals may lead to mistrust of the department, rejection of departmental goals and the University goals as a whole. A second reason why Clemson should be interested in improving performance appraisals is the clear link between non-standardized performance reviews and litigation. Disagreement among those rating the performance of an individual is empirically and logically related to litigation. Those who are dissatisfied with a performance appraisal are more likely to litigate, and are more likely to prevail when the performance evaluations from different evaluators are in disagreement (Werner & Bolino, 1997).

The goal of the Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Performance Appraisals was to identify shortcomings in the current performance appraisal system and to propose specific, practical solutions for these problems. It is our belief that a fair and valid performance appraisal system at Clemson should lead to more positive outcomes and fewer negative outcomes for Clemson at the level of the individual, the department, and the University as a whole.
Review of the Existing Performance Appraisal System

As a first step in the process of understanding issues in Clemson University's performance appraisal system, an attempt was made to identify consistent, cross-department complaints regarding the existing system. Information on the current performance appraisal system was gathered from a variety of sources. Meetings with department chairs, faculty members, and with those involved with various aspects of the faculty grievance process provided valuable insight into specific problems with the existing system.

It is important to note that there is considerable cross-department variation in the way performance appraisals are conducted. Similarly, there are appreciable differences in the satisfaction of faculty and department heads with the existing system. A number of very specific individualized problems were identified along with more general weaknesses in the system. It was the feeling of the committee that identifying extensive, fundamental issues in performance appraisal and proposing remedies for these problems would provide the greatest benefit for the largest number of Clemson faculty. This does not mean that we view complaints unique to a given individual as unimportant. We simply wish to address the larger problems first, and believe many of the individual-level issues may be resolved when the more widespread flaws in the system are remedied.

This critique of the existing system is not meant to imply that all problems exist in all departments. Many T & P committee members, department heads and deans are interested in maintaining a fair performance appraisal system. However, the issues identified in the following segments emerged often, and were responsible for leading to a number of more specific problems. The frequency with which these major issues emerged and the fact that they compromise fundamental elements of a valid, fair, and legally defensible performance justified their priority in our review of the system.

The three major areas for improvement in our review of the system were as follows:

1. Increasing the validity and consistency in the standards used to evaluate faculty by T & P committee members, department heads and deans

2. Increasing the consistency in the sources of performance appraisal data (e.g.: some departments use peer evaluations of teaching; some do not) and improving the timing of performance appraisal information.

3. Improving the accuracy of interpreting teaching evaluations.

Remediying the first two areas requires an extensive review and possible revision of the way appraisals are conducted. These two issues will be addressed in the first segment, entitled, "Developing an Effective Performance Appraisal System at Clemson." The third issue is more specific and is dealt with in the second segment, entitled "Training on interpretation of teaching evaluations."

In each of these two segments, pervasive problems in the current system and general recommendations for change are reviewed first. In segment one, these general recommendations take the form of an overview of the basic elements of a legitimate performance appraisal system. In segment two, the general recommendations for change involve a discussion of a training program for improving the accuracy of interpreting teaching evaluations.

The general recommendations for change in each of the two segments are followed by a discussion of specific strategies or procedures for producing the recommended changes.
Developing an Effective Performance Appraisal System at Clemson

As noted earlier, a first step in this process was identifying problems with the existing system at Clemson. Typical problems are illustrated by the following general examples:

Example A: A faculty member was told by one member of the T & P committee that they needed to focus their efforts on raising their teaching evaluations; another member of the committee told the faculty member that teaching was not important, and they needed to put more effort into publishing.

Example B: The department chair, T & P Committee members, and the dean differed in terms of evaluations of a specific candidate’s performance evaluation and readiness for tenure/promotion.

Example C: A faculty member was not given specific, constructive feedback regarding the changes in performance needed to receive tenure until the penultimate year. The timing was such that reaching the given standard for tenure was not possible, given the timeframe for publishing.

Example D: Department heads were instructed to force performance evaluations of all faculty into a "normal distribution," where only a predetermined number of faculty were allowed to receive a rating of "excellent."

This led to the following goals for improvement of the current system at Clemson:

1. Increasing the validity and consistency in the standards used to evaluate faculty by T & P committee members, department heads and deans

2. Increasing the consistency in the sources of performance appraisal data (e.g., some departments use peer evaluations of teaching; some do not) and improving the timing of performance appraisal information.

General recommendations for change

Several aspects of a valid, fair and defensible performance appraisal system can be identified by a review of the existing research in this area. These recommendations take into account technical and non-technical aspects of performance appraisal. The technical aspects incorporate specific attributes of the performance appraisal system, such as the way specific standards for judging performance are developed. The non-technical aspects incorporate a consideration of the human element of performance appraisal. Many faculty are very committed to their profession. Evaluation of their performance should include some sensitivity to this level of involvement and to the general well being of all standard and non-standard faculty members.
Improving the technical aspects of performance appraisal for faculty

In 2000, a collaborative effort of the American Council on Education, the American Association of University Professors, and the United Educators produced a document which outlines good practice in tenure evaluation (see Appendix A1). Many of the recommendations in this document are directly relevant to evaluation of faculty for all faculty, not just those seeking tenure. The thrust of the recommendations is that the performance appraisal system should be based on standards that are clear and used consistently. The recommendations of this document are consistent with guidelines for professionally developed, legally defensible performance appraisal systems (cf.: Werner & Bolino, 1997). The techniques for designing performance appraisal systems and implementing them have evolved over the last 75 years, so there is a well-established body of research and recommendations for this process (Austin & Villanova, 1992). The following set of recommendations draws from these documents but is revised to meet the needs of Clemson University.

Briefly, these recommendations are as follows:

1. Performance evaluations should comprehensively list all the major criteria used for evaluation (e.g. teaching, research and service).

2. An acceptable range of weights attached to each criterion should be developed (e.g. that research will be weighed between 10-40% of all faculty members' evaluation). The preferred weight an individual faculty member will attach to this activity can be negotiated with the head/TPR committee. This will allow faculty members to appropriately focus their efforts. More explicit weights and criteria also facilitate the evaluation process for the T & P committee members and the Department Chair.

For non-standard faculty whose duties fall outside the realm of teaching, service, and research, the same process should be applied. Performance standards relevant to their positions should be developed; indicators of each criterion should be developed, and annual performance evaluations should be conducted for them.

3. Indicators of performance should be developed and discussed in each department (e.g.: relative importance of grants vs. publications as indicators of research productivity). It is clear that development of these indicators is a controversial area (cf. Magner, 1997). This step will take considerable time and effort on the part of faculty and administrators. This is best viewed as a long-term investment with considerable payoff in terms of more valid and fair performance appraisals.

4. The evaluators at all stages in the evaluation process should know-and apply-the criteria.

5. Faculty, department heads, and deans should strive to increase consistency of performance evaluations. While academic performance is complex, it is not a mystical construct that defies definition. It is quite possible and very desirable to define aspects of performance and indicators of performance that can be used by multiple evaluators.

While multiple evaluations of performance are desirable, evaluations that provide conflicting or contradictory feedback to faculty members should be avoided. When performance is defined correctly and indicators are developed to aid performance evaluation, widely discrepant evaluations should not occur. A system for resolving conflict in evaluations between all sources (T&P members, Department Chairs and Deans) should be in place.

The evaluation system should address the proper procedure for evaluations when “rotating chairs” of a department are in existence to ensure consistency and continuity of evaluations.
Specific recommendation from Department Heads:

There is some feeling on the part of Department Heads that the current evaluation system involves many redundancies. Forms and processes used to evaluate faculty for tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review could be streamlined.

Improving the non-technical aspects of the performance appraisal system

While development of appropriate and valid standards for performance is a critical step in improving any appraisal system, the criteria mean little if they are not used to provide effective feedback to Clemson faculty. Based on the professional literature, the following recommendations are proposed for strengthening the performance evaluation system.

1. Every new standard and non-standard faculty member should be given a clear explanation of the requirements for tenure and promotion.

2. Each standard and non-standard faculty member should be given annual feedback. Annual evaluations should provide specific feedback regarding the level of performance in the area of teaching, research, service, and other criteria as appropriate.

3. Non-tenured faculty should be given clear and consistent feedback regarding their progress toward tenure. This should happen each year, so that untenured faculty can identify any performance problems early in the process and attempt to remedy this problem.

Specific feedback goes beyond a one-word adjective describing each aspect of performance so the faculty member knows what is expected of their performance. Training on performance evaluations and feedback should be given to deans, department heads, and T & P committee chairs. Legal and technical aspects of performance evaluations should be incorporated into training. This seminar could take place simultaneously with the training on teaching evaluations referred to in the second major segment. Mandatory attendance is needed to ensure that all evaluators are exposed to this information.

4. Written notice of denial of tenure is necessary but should be accompanied with the offer to meet with committees/administrators involved in the decision. The same should be true for denial of promotion to full professor.

5. Faculty should have a "voice" in the development of performance appraisal systems. In other words, direct involvement of faculty is desirable when a system is formulated.

6. Faculty perceptions of the fairness of performance evaluations should be carefully considered and valued. The factors that influence fairness include whether the system is viewed as merit-based, work-related, objective, legal and representing important aspects of the work (Arvey & Sackett, 1993).

The extent to which faculty believe their performance rating is fair could be captured in an evaluation of Deans and Department Heads. While it is certainly not the case that a single disgruntled faculty member's rating would indicate a problem in the system, widespread perceptions of unfairness could prompt some review of the existing performance appraisal process. This review and ensuing revisions could benefit both faculty and administrators. In addition, the evaluation of perceived fairness could benefit those administrators whose time and effort spent on the performance appraisal process is appreciated by faculty but not currently recognized in a formal evaluation.
Specific techniques for improving performance appraisal at Clemson

As noted earlier, mandatory training on the technical and non-technical aspects of performance appraisal could benefit Deans, Department Heads, and T & P Committee Chairs. While many evaluators at Clemson may strive to provide fair and accurate evaluations, problems in the current system suggest that training in the fundamentals of giving performance feedback and on the legalities of performance evaluations could benefit many faculty members.

Such training could include, but is not limited to:

1. Increasing consistency in evaluations: resolving discrepancies between evaluators.
2. Advantages in clear standards of performance
3. How to give clear feedback (emphasis on corrective feedback, since this is especially problematic)
4. Two types of feedback: feedback on performance relative to other faculty vs developmental feedback for individual faculty members
5. Distributions of faculty performance: why “bell-shaped” distributions are not expected
6. Legal aspects of performance appraisal

A more comprehensive change in the performance appraisal system requires a thorough inspection of the current system used to evaluate faculty performance. This involves a joint, collaborative process between Deans, Department Chairs, and faculty members. All parties are involved in reviewing and developing standards for evaluating faculty performance. In addition, it involves development of indicators of performance (e.g.: deciding how student evaluations will be used to appraise faculty teaching).

Arreola & Aleamoni have developed a very comprehensive system that can produce valid indicators of faculty performance. An overview of this system is in Appendix A2, entitled “Report on the CEDA Workshop on Faculty Evaluation.” In addition, this report by Fred Switzer incorporates a discussion of the strengths and weaknesses of this system. Briefly, this system involves the systematic development of clear standards for performance and concrete indicators of performance. Therefore, this system can be used to improve the technical aspects of Clemson’s existing system.

This system could also be used to “streamline” the current evaluation system for faculty, eliminating the redundancies identified by department heads. A unified, single process for evaluating each faculty member would improve efficiency in the performance appraisal process.

Arreola and Aleamoni’s technique also involves administrators and faculty and assigns great importance to their opinions and expertise. This suggests that Arreola and Aleamoni’s system could also address many of the non-technical recommendations for change to Clemson’s system.

A full explanation of the system is contained in the publication, “Developing a Comprehensive Faculty Evaluation System” by Raoul A. Arreola.
Training on interpretation of teaching evaluations

This segment deals with the third goal of the Ad Hoc Committee: Improving the accuracy of interpreting teaching evaluations.

This problem was manifested in several ways. The following general scenarios represent typical complaints of faculty.

Example A: Even though the performance of two faculty members exceeds the department mean, one faculty member is rated lower because the ratings of faculty are being forced into a "bell-shaped curve" which dictates that only a certain percentage of faculty are rated as "excellent."

Example B: Peer reviews are conducted for some faculty members as a way to supplement student teaching evaluations, but not for others.

Example C: Items measuring independent aspects of teaching are averaged and the composite is used to evaluate teaching.

General Recommendations

1. These errors in evaluation stem from statistical misinterpretation or misuse of student teaching evaluations in some instances. In other instances, the errors stem from inconsistent use of indicators of teaching performance. This latter issue, consistency in the data that is used to evaluate teaching (peer reviews, student evaluations, etc) can be addressed by working through Arreola’s suggestions for improving performance appraisal, as discussed in the previous segment. Teaching is one of the major performance dimensions that could be evaluated using Arreola’s process for developing clear criteria and agreed-upon indicators of teaching performance.

2. Other ways to improve the evaluations process include specific training to avoid many of the errors in the existing system. This training could be conducted in-house, and modules for providing this training have already been developed by Linda Nilson in the Office of Teaching Effectiveness and Innovation.

3. The use and validity of student teaching evaluations is debated at many academic institutions (White, 2000; Wilson, 1998) and Clemson is no exception. Training on the strengths and weaknesses of teaching evaluations and the appropriate use and interpretation of student teaching evaluations is needed.
Specific Techniques for Improving Accuracy in Evaluation of Teaching

1. As noted, Arreola’s system is optimal for improving the way teaching evaluations feed into faculty performance. This system could also improve the specificity of feedback given to faculty members. This process is strongly recommended as a means of making lasting changes in faculty teaching evaluations.

2. Training for Chairs of T & P committees, Department Chairs, and Deans could help remedy many of the complaints from faculty. As in the performance appraisal training, mandatory attendance ensures that this information is disseminated to those central in the appraisal process. The content of the training could incorporate, but is not limited to:

   c. Training on the “real” and “perceived” bases of bias in student evaluations (Cashin, 1995). See Appendix B3.
   d. Training on how to appropriately interpret data from student evaluations.

Prototypes for this type of training are incorporated in Appendix B4 and B5. Both training modules were developed by Dr. Nilson. The first training module, “Assessing Teaching: Integrating Collegial and Student Evaluations within Standards of Scholarship” addresses issues 2a and 2b. The second module, “Assessing Teaching: Making Sense out of Teaching Evaluations” covers bias and statistical interpretation of ratings (2c and 2d above).
In conclusion, the Faculty Senate Ad Hoc Committee for Faculty Performance Appraisal identified consistent, core issues in performance appraisal. While the existing system at Clemson University certainly has strengths, the appraisal of faculty performance could be improved by reviewing and revising the existing system as needed. Arreola's model for evaluating faculty performance is suggested as a comprehensive and professionally sound means of improving performance appraisals. Accountability of decision-makers for performance appraisals and involvement of faculty and administrators in the development of performance appraisal criteria are seen as key elements of an effective system. Other recommendations include specific training for improving performance feedback as well as the improving the evaluation of teaching.

The hope of the committee members is that this document provides useful, pragmatic recommendations leading to a performance appraisal system that benefits both faculty and administration. Commitment of Clemson University administrators and faculty to this process is needed to achieve this goal.
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Introduction

This report provides guidance on conducting tenure evaluations that are thoughtful and just. Flawed tenure processes can exact a heavy toll on the unsuccessful candidate, his or her colleagues, and the institution. Our hope is that the good practices offered here may lessen the frequency and impact of disputes over tenure. We seek not to debate the merits of tenure in American higher education, but rather we seek to examine the tenure process and offer some suggestions to those responsible for conducting it.

Each year, thousands of nontenured faculty members undergo evaluations of their work, and each year a smaller but still significant number are evaluated for tenure. A recent study quantified some faculty concerns about the process. Of 378 faculty members surveyed at 19 four-year institutions, 37 percent said that standards for tenure and promotion were unclear. This sentiment existed even among senior faculty members who had themselves received tenure. It is no startling revelation that problems occasionally arise in tenure reviews. Most academics can recount a first- or second-hand tale about a difficult case. Unsuccessful candidates may file appeals on their campuses challenging tenure denial, and, with increasing frequency, they resort to the courts for redress of perceived discrimination, breach of contract, or other legal wrongs. Judges then have the final responsibility to assess tenure standards and procedures.

This report originated at a meeting convened by the American Council on Education (ACE), the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), and United Educators Insurance (UE). These collaborating organizations have complementary interests in American higher education:

The American Council on Education
ACE is a comprehensive association of the nation’s colleges and universities dedicated to analysis of higher education issues and advocacy on behalf of quality higher education and adult education programs. Counted among ACE’s members are more than 1,800 accredited, degree-granting colleges and universities and higher education-related associations, organizations, and corporations. For further information, visit www.acenet.edu.

The American Association of University Professors
AAUP is a nonprofit charitable and educational organization that supports and defends the principles of academic freedom and tenure and promotes policies to ensure academic due process. AAUP has more than 45,000 members at colleges and universities throughout the country. For further information, visit www.aaup.org.
United Educators Insurance Risk Retention Group, Inc.

Founded in 1987, UE provides insurance to colleges, universities, and related organizations. It is owned and governed by over 1,000 member institutions. UE offers policies that cover legal disputes over the denial of tenure. For further information, visit www.ue.org.

Following the meeting, the organizations developed the specific recommendations offered here. We hope this report will promote self-reflection by those who evaluate tenure-track faculty, as well as general institutional dialogue and improvement.

Ann H. Franke, Esq.
Vice President for Education and Risk Management
United Educators Insurance
Practical suggestions for the tenure evaluation process fall into four major themes. These suggestions speak to various audiences—notably department chairs, senior faculty who participate in evaluating tenure-track faculty, and academic administrators.

Clarity in Standards and Procedures for Tenure Evaluation
Institutions should ensure that their stated criteria for tenure match the criteria that, in actual practice, the institutions apply. Department chairs and other responsible administrators should clearly communicate all criteria, including any special requirements applicable within a department or a college, to a tenure-track faculty member early in his or her career at the institution. When the tenure review occurs, complications can arise if positive developments (such as the acceptance of a book for publication) or negative allegations (such as harassment charges) come to light. Institutions should anticipate these possibilities and develop procedures in advance for handling them. Another potential source of difficulty lies in personal opinions expressed to those responsible for conducting the review. An institution should adopt a consistent approach to handling private letters and conversations, outside the normal review process, concerning the merits of a tenure candidate.

Consistency in Tenure Decisions
Tenure decisions must be consistent over time among candidates with different personal characteristics—such as race, gender, disability, and national origin. Protections in law and institutional policy against discrimination apply with full force to the tenure process. Consistency also requires that the formal evaluations of a single individual over time reflect a coherent set of expectations and a consistent analysis of the individual's performance. Department chairs and other colleagues should not convey excessive optimism about a candidate's prospects for tenure. A negative tenure decision should not be the first criticism the individual receives. Everyone who participates in reviews must scrupulously follow tenure policies and procedures, and administrators should take special care when reviewing candidates from their own disciplines.

Candor in the Evaluation of Tenure-Track Faculty
The department chair or other responsible administrator should clearly explain to every tenure-track faculty member the standards for reappointment and tenure and the cycle for evaluations of his or her progress in meeting these requirements. Periodic evaluations should be candid and expressed in plain English. They should include specific examples illustrating the quality of performance, constructive criticism of any potential areas
for improvement, and practical guidance for future efforts.

Caring for Unsuccessful Candidates

Faculty and administrators must treat an unsuccessful tenure candidate with professionalism and decency. The person responsible for conveying the disappointing news should use compassion, and colleagues should take care not to isolate the person socially. Active efforts to assist the candidate in relocating to another position redound to the mutual benefit of the individual and the institution.
Chapter 1
Clarity in Standards and Procedures for Tenure Evaluation

Most colleges and universities have well-articulated tenure policies. Over time, their faculty and administrators have collaborated on crafting standards and procedures that fit their unique institutional circumstances. Experience suggests, however, that some aspects of a tenure policy may nonetheless be overlooked, creating the potential for uncertainty or conflict. Faculty and administrations that anticipate these issues and develop thoughtful and consistent approaches to them will be best positioned to defend their decisions.

The tenure policy should comprehensively list all the major criteria used for evaluation. “Teaching, research, and service” is the standard trilogy for evaluating faculty. Some institutions have enlarged these criteria with additional factors, while others rely on the traditional three. Whatever the formulation, an institution should assess, through its appropriate decision-making bodies, whether its policies accurately reflect the actual operation of its tenure system. Do tenure evaluators sometimes use unstated factors? Examples might include student enrollment, success in attracting external funding, or long-term institutional needs.

If a tenure denial is based on a criterion that does not appear in the written policy, the unsuccessful candidate may challenge the decision as unfair and improper. Some courts are sympathetic to these claims. Other courts give campuses latitude in interpreting, for example, “research” as including the ability to attract external funding, or “teaching” as including social skills in relating to students. The safest course is to articulate written standards that reflect the major criteria that are actually used.

The evaluators at all stages in the tenure process should know—and apply—the criteria.

After the institution identifies the major criteria, the next logical steps are to distribute and follow them. Many people may be involved in a tenure evaluation: senior faculty in the candidate’s department; members of a campus-wide tenure committee; the dean; the provost; the president; and, on most campuses, the governing board. Each evaluator at each stage must know and apply the proper criteria.

Has the candidate’s department adopted special requirements relevant to its discipline? Fields such as studio and performing arts, for example, often require creative output in forms other than traditional scholarly publishing. Computer scientists might use software development to demonstrate professional achievements. Even departments such as history or mathematics may have tailored criteria specific to their particular goals. The institution should take special care in evaluating interdisciplinary scholars to ensure that all evaluators measure the can-
candidate against the same yardstick. Whatever the criteria, all evaluators should know and apply them.

The tenure policy should address whether tenure evaluators will consider positive events occurring after the tenure application has been submitted.

Most institutions require candidates to submit comprehensive applications detailing their achievements. The policy should specify whether the evaluation will take into account developments occurring after the candidate has completed his or her application. A faculty tenure committee may need to be alert to the possibility, for example, that a publisher may finally accept a candidate’s manuscript after the tenure review has begun. Will this positive development carry weight in the tenure process? If so, who is responsible for supplementing the application with the new information? Can the candidate add the new information at any stage of the process, or is it at some point too late? If the candidate adds new information, should he or she receive reconsideration at any earlier stages?

While subsequent developments are most often positive, such as a new publication or improved teaching evaluations, they need not be. After applying for tenure, the candidate might suffer a decline in teaching evaluations, receive a harsh review of a recent book, or, in rare instances, be found to have engaged in sexual harassment or plagiarism. Commentators sometimes use the terms “static” and “dynamic” to distinguish between those tenure systems that accept new information during the review process and those that do not. An institution is well-advised to adopt policies that make clear in advance which approach it will use and, of course, to adhere to its policies. Positive developments can extend the tenure process; negative developments, as discussed below, may interrupt it.

The tenure policy should indicate what steps the institution will take if a faculty member under consideration for tenure is charged with misconduct or if other negative events emerge.

The problem of unexpected negative information is infrequent but can prove very troublesome. An allegation of misconduct may be made against a faculty member who is undergoing tenure evaluation. For example, a senior professor may allege during the departmental tenure deliberations that the candidate has included on his resume a paper that was actually written entirely by a graduate student. Unsigned or signed letters alleging sexual harassment may arrive from students. Someone may offer a rumor that the candidate has been charged with domestic violence, whether recently or in the distant past.

We strongly encourage institutions to seek legal advice in these situations before completing the tenure review. Beyond this generic advice, institutions take varied approaches.

Some institutions will channel such allegations into a campus dispute resolution mechanism, such as the college or university sexual harassment procedure. The institution will suspend the tenure process until completing the other proceeding. Other institutions give the candidate notice of the allegations and an opportunity to respond directly to the tenure committee. Under a hybrid approach, the institution might offer the candidate the option of a separate proceeding or consideration directly by the tenure committee. Still other institutions may decline to receive or consider in the tenure process any unsubstantiated or unresolved allegations of misconduct. An AAUP investigating committee concluded in one case that a probationary faculty member charged with misconduct during the course of a tenure evaluation should have received written charges stated with particularity, time to for-
mulate a response, and an opportunity to appear before the decision makers to present the response. Advice of legal counsel may well be helpful in ensuring compliance with institutional policy and legal responsibilities in these complex situations.4

Evidence of serious misconduct might come to light after tenure has been awarded. Rather than revisiting the award of tenure, the better course is to invoke the regular disciplinary process applicable to tenured faculty.

The tenure policy should address the voting protocol when an evaluator serves at more than one level of review.

A member of the candidate’s department may serve on the campus-wide promotion and tenure committee. If someone “wears multiple hats,” the question arises whether that individual votes once or twice on the tenure candidacy. Consider, for example, a full professor in biology who serves on the college-wide review committee. If an assistant professor in biology has applied for tenure, would the senior colleague vote only within the department, only on the college-wide committee, or at both levels? Smaller institutions may face this question most often. There is no single correct answer. The best approach is to anticipate the situation, address it through clear written policies, and then follow the policies consistently.

Individual faculty members may wish to express their own opinions about a tenure candidate to members of the campus-wide promotion and tenure committee or to the administration. The tenure policy should address how the recipients should treat these individual opinions.

Consider this scenario. A senior faculty member strongly believes that a junior colleague should not receive tenure. She is, however, unable to convince the department, which votes to recommend the award of tenure. She writes a separate letter to an acquaintance on the promotion and tenure committee, or to the dean, forcefully explaining her opposition to the candidate. Is such a letter proper under the institution’s policies? How should the recipient handle it? Should the tenure candidate be informed about the letter?

Senior faculty members often hold strong opinions about tenure candidates. They may seek to express their opinions, whether positive or negative, privately to individuals with influence in the evaluation process. They may write letters or e-mails or engage in conversations. From a policy standpoint, the institution’s rules should clarify whether such individual opinions may be properly conveyed and considered. If so, how should the recipient use the information? Should it be shared with evaluators who were involved earlier in the process, or should it be shared with the candidate?

The press has reported on one illustrative situation at New York University. A candidate who directed an ethnic studies program received a departmental vote of 17 to 1 in favor of tenure. The lone dissenter, a former dean, wrote a private 10-page letter to the incumbent dean sharply criticizing the candidate’s scholarship. Unknown to the candidate or the department, the letter became part of the tenure file. According to the press account, the promotion and tenure committee voted 8 to 2 against tenure, relying in part on the critical letter. The letter writer and the department disagreed over the propriety of the separate letter. Was it an exercise of the dissenter’s right to express his opinion or a subversion of the department’s democratic process? The administration ultimately offered the scholar a tenured position.5

From a litigation standpoint, a senior professor needs to understand that her letter may become public through the discovery process. If the candidate about whom she
write the letter is denied tenure, that individual may file suit and would receive access to the letter. Suppose, however, that the private, critical letter is unpersuasive and the candidate receives tenure. The letter remains in the institution’s files. Now suppose another scholar is denied tenure. The letter will come to light in a lawsuit if the court compares the evaluations of the successful and unsuccessful candidates. The trial judge can also order disclosure of verbal comments.

This problem is not hypothetical. In one tenure battle that landed in court, a senior historian had written a “confidential” letter to the dean of the faculty questioning whether a male historian had been evaluated less rigorously than female historians during their tenure candidacies. The male historian received tenure. A female scientist who subsequently was denied tenure sued and compared her qualifications to those of the male historian. The “confidential” letter from the senior history professor was presented as evidence at the trial and was reported in the press.

Given the realities of academic life, some individual faculty members may well wish to share their unsolicited opinions about candidates with decision makers in the tenure process. The best course is for institutional policy to address the possibility. Key issues are whether the candidate receives notice about the communication and what weight, if any, the recipient may place on that communication. Good institutional rules will offer guidance so that all participants in the tenure process share a common understanding.

### Checklist on Clarity

- The tenure policy should clearly state the criteria for tenure and should encompass all the major factors actually relied upon in evaluating tenure applications.
- Evaluators at all stages of the tenure process should know and apply the criteria appropriate to the candidate.
- The tenure rules should clearly explain whether evaluators will consider positive events subsequent to the submission of the tenure application—such as acceptance of a manuscript for publication—in making their evaluations.
- The institution should formulate a plan for handling allegations of misconduct or other negative information that may arise during the tenure process.
- A senior faculty member who serves on a college-wide tenure committee should know, in advance, whether he or she should vote on a tenure candidate in the department, at the college-wide level, or both.
- The institution’s rules should address what weight, if any, decisionmakers should give to informal and unsolicited opinions they receive about tenure candidates and whether candidates should be informed about such unsolicited communication.
Chapter 2
Consistency in Tenure Decisions

Institutions strive for the highest standards of fairness in individual tenure decisions. They evaluate each candidate with great care, conducting a time-consuming and elaborate review. The process places the candidate’s achievements under intense scrutiny as his or her application proceeds through the various levels of review. The goal is a correct judgment based on the merits of the individual’s qualifications. Sometimes, though, evaluators overlook the role of consistency. The fairness of the tenure process depends not just on the outcome of an individual decision, but also on the consistency of multiple decisions over time.

The faculty, administration, and governing board should strive for consistency in the operation of the institution’s tenure evaluation process.

The challenge of consistency of evaluation is well known to anyone who has graded a large stack of student essays. Does the professor judge the first paper by the same standards as the one at the bottom of the pile? Consistency in tenure decisions presents a larger challenge. Evaluators make tenure decisions primarily on an individual basis rather than a comparative one. Student essays are graded within a relatively short time frame, but tenure decisions are made on an ongoing, periodic basis and through a process of successive recommendations leading to a decision. Candidates come from different disciplines. Most significantly, tenure decisions require a highly nuanced assessment of professional achievement.

From a legal standpoint, consistency in tenure decisions is a central concern. In 1972, Congress decided that colleges and universities must abide by the federal laws prohibiting employment discrimination. Tenure decisions thus receive close scrutiny from judges and juries as to whether the institution has equitably treated tenure candidates of different races, genders, national origins, religions, ages, or disability status. Sexual orientation may be relevant under state or local law or campus policy. Institutional policies typically list the types of discrimination that the institution prohibits. Inconsistency in tenure decisions, legally termed “disparate treatment,” is the essence of legal challenges alleging that an institution’s tenure process is discriminatory.

The courts typically allow an unsuccessful tenure candidate who sues for discrimination to compare his or her situation to those of scholars who have received tenure. An African-American electrical engineer suing for racial discrimination, for example, will point to the qualifications of white electrical engineering faculty members who have received tenure. A court may allow the plaintiff to compare his candidacy to those of white professors in other departments such as civil engineering, physics, or even more remote fields such as languages or social sciences. Yet different disciplines may apply different standards for tenure. Clinical programs are a good
example. Departmental tenure standards that articulate the different criteria will facilitate the legal review of the consistency of decisions.

Given that judges and juries will compare the institution’s tenure decisions over time and across disciplines, faculty and administrators need to pay heed to the consistency of tenure decisions. Reviewers at each level, from the department to the ultimate decision maker, should ask, “How does this candidate compare to others we have evaluated for tenure in the recent past?” Each tenure candidate is unique, and the evaluation process is anything but mechanical.

Even in the face of these difficulties, however, the institution needs to be alert to inconsistencies, particularly gross or blatant ones. One institution gives its university-wide committee a special role in checking for consistency. The committee members’ terms are staggered so that at any given time at least one member of the committee has served for six years. With each new tenure decision, the committee compares the candidate to the candidates it has evaluated over the past six years. Whether using this type of mechanism or others, the committee best devotes its attention to the consistency of decisions before a lawsuit is filed rather than after.

The faculty and administration should strive for consistency over time in their review of the work of each nontenured faculty member. It is important for the department chair and other reviewers to be consistent over time when evaluating an individual candidate. An assistant professor, for example, receives five successive annual evaluations from her department chair that praise her for excellent teaching. In the sixth year, the department chair begins to criticize her teaching. The change may be due to an actual decline in the candidate’s performance, or it may be due to a change in the chair’s approach to the evaluation. The institution should strive for consistency in the successive evaluations of an individual candidate. If challenged in a lawsuit, an institution is placed at a distinct disadvantage if an unsuccessful candidate for tenure received only excellent evaluations up to the point of tenure rejection.

Consistency in successive evaluations, of course, does not require that evaluators photocopy the same written comments and reuse them annually. Successive evaluations should, rather, faithfully reflect the candidate’s performance, including both improvements and declines. A careful department chair will review the prior evaluation before writing the next one as a check on both the expectations that were conveyed and the candidate’s progress in meeting them. The evaluations may also be useful items to include in the tenure application file. Faculty and administrators who conduct tenure reviews may benefit from seeing the earlier annual evaluations. If a candidate received earlier excellent evaluations but is rejected for tenure, he or she will be understandably frustrated by what appears to be capricious and misleading actions.

A department’s counseling of nontenured faculty members should be consistent with its and the institution’s tenure requirements. The department bears the major responsibility for ensuring that a tenure candidate receives appropriate ongoing counseling during the probationary period. In several recent tenure disputes, departments have been faulted for providing inconsistent counseling or guidance to a junior faculty member.

In one situation, the president of a research university addressed a grievance filed by an unsuccessful tenure candidate. In deciding the grievance, the president wrote to the candidate explaining that he was assessing “whether you were substantially misled about your progress in meeting University standards.” The president concluded, “In light of the exceptionally incautious feedback that you received from your department, you may not
have taken every opportunity available to you to make more progress on your second project before your tenure review..." Based on this flaw in the department's treatment of the candidate, the president upheld the grievance, offering as a remedy additional time and another tenure review.

Departmental evaluations that are inconsistent with the institution's requirements can also be problematic. At Trinity College in Connecticut, the chemistry department had supported the tenure candidacy of Dr. Leslie Craine. When the college's Appointments and Promotions Committee voted against Craine, the department wrote to the committee asking for reconsideration. As quoted in the Chronicle of Higher Education, the department blamed itself for not doing a better job of counseling Craine. Two years before the tenure decision, the department had evaluated whether Craine was on target for tenure. The department explained to her the publication requirement and, two years later, in the department's opinion she had satisfied the requirement. After the negative tenure decision, the department wrote to the committee, "To change the rules between the second and the final [review assessing her progress towards tenure] is fundamentally unfair." According to the press account, the department faulted itself for causing the institution to treat Craine inconsistently over time.

These cases illustrate the serious problems that can arise if a department's approach to a tenure candidate is inconsistent with the institution's requirements as interpreted by other bodies.

Tenure files should contain the proper information and should be retained after the decision. The tenure process is laden with paper. The department chair and other responsible officials should take care in assembling the review materials. They need to attend to what is compiled and who is responsible for its safekeeping. The candidate may later complain that the department chair or dean improperly excluded certain items favorable to her from her tenure dossier. Alternatively, she might complain that the chair or dean improperly included unfavorable items. Consistency is key. In challenging the composition of the dossier, an unsuccessful candidate will use other tenure files to illustrate proper and improper items. Some institutions give the candidate the right to inspect the dossier during the tenure process or shortly thereafter.

Safekeeping the materials is critical if the institution must later explain its decision. Occasionally a situation may arise in which the tenure dossier disappears after the decision is made. Under federal regulations, institutions receiving federal funds are required to retain records concerning promotion or termination for at least two years after the date of the action (29 CFR § 1602.49, 41 CFR § 60-1.12). State laws or institutional protocols may specify a longer period. One recommended approach is the retention of all employment records through the duration of the individual's employment and for seven years thereafter. If the candidate is in the same discipline as an administrator involved in the tenure process, the administrator should handle the tenure application consistently with other applications.

An administrator should take care in reviewing the tenure application of a candidate specializing in the same discipline as the administrator. The administrator should treat the application the same way as those of candidates in other fields. While the administrator can certainly draw on his or her detailed knowledge of the discipline, the safest course is not to deviate in other respects from the normal tenure review process.

Consider, for example, a provost who is a political scientist. She might be tempted, when reviewing the tenure application of an assistant professor in political science, to call a few trusted colleagues at other institutions.
for their opinions. If she departs from normal practice, and if the candidate is rejected, the candidate may argue that the outsiders were unduly influential. The candidate might argue further that the provost specifically sought negative opinions in an effort to scuttle the tenure application.

Another example is the administrator who will soon return to the faculty. If the administrator recommends against tenure for a candidate from the same field, the individual may allege that the administrator acted out of biased self-interest. The candidate may assert that the administrator wished to save a "slot" for his or her return to the faculty or did not want to compete with the more successful junior scholar.

Fortunately, these situations are relatively uncommon. They underscore, however, that special circumstances enhance the need for consistency.

All reviewers should follow tenure procedures to the letter. An unsuccessful tenure candidate may seek to overturn the decision by pointing to irregularities in the handling of his or her tenure review. It is easy to state the abstract proposition that a college or university should faithfully and consistently follow its own procedures. Turning this abstraction into a reality requires ongoing vigilance and attention to detail.

The use of outside letters of reference offers a ready illustration. In one case at Kansas State University, a federal judge noted a departure from institutional rules on external letters:

The tenured faculty voted without having reviewed letters from faculty outside of the school (outside reviewers), which was the school’s practice, although the school’s written procedures provide for such information to be available or review prior to voting. In another case, the University of Minnesota solicited more than 40 external review letters about a female mathematician, while the normal number would have been six to 10.

The best written rules are not always easily applied to actual situations, but all evaluators should strive to adhere as scrupulously as possible to the institution’s tenure review procedures. Letters of reference are one potential point of contention. A fuller list of the key steps in the tenure process that require close attention includes:

- Compilation of the tenure application file.
- Procedures for identifying external referees.
- Voting eligibility of departmental members (including faculty on leave).
- Availability of written materials to committees and individual administrators who vote on the candidacy.
- Informal communications made outside the official review process about the candidate.

One institution has built a procedural check into its tenure process. Before notifying a candidate of tenure denial, those evaluators who have had major responsibility for the review meet and work through a checklist to confirm that they have handled each procedural element of the tenure process correctly. Such a review can flag missing materials, missed deadlines, or other irregularities.

Departures from the tenure procedures may be reviewed in the unpleasant context of litigation. The institution will probably argue that the irregularity was not legally defective. Even if the institution prevails, the distraction and expense of litigation might have been avoided had the procedural error never arisen.
Checklist on Consistency

✓ Ensure that tenure decisions are consistent over time among candidates who have different personal characteristics that are legally protected such as race, gender, disability, ethnic origin, and religion.

✓ Ensure that the formal evaluations of non-tenured faculty and what they are told informally about the quality of their work are based on a consistent set of expectations. A negative tenure decision should not be the first criticism of the individual’s performance.

✓ The department should provide advice to faculty during the probationary period that is consistent with its and the institution’s expectations for tenure. Departments should be cautious about conveying excessive optimism about prospects for tenure.

✓ The tenure application dossier should include all required materials and exclude items that the institution has not used for other candidates.

✓ Administrators should take special care, when reviewing candidates in their own disciplines, that they not depart from standard tenure processes.

✓ All reviewers should scrupulously follow tenure procedures. Deviations can be used as evidence that the institution breached its obligation to conduct a fair review.
Chapter 3
Candor in the Evaluation of Tenure-Track Faculty

The concepts of clarity, consistency, and candor are useful in analyzing tenure evaluation procedures. Admittedly, though, the categories overlap somewhat. If, for example, tenure criteria are not clear, then it will be difficult if not impossible to counsel a tenure-track faculty member candidly about his or her progress in meeting them. Examining institutional processes from the perspective of tenure-track faculty can be instructive. Here are some observations from tenure-track faculty that illustrate the stresses they face. Their concerns also illustrate the overlapping nature of clarity, consistency, and candor:

“What does it take to get tenure? That’s the million dollar question. Standards change, and you never know how many articles you need.”

“I had a book contract, and in my second year review, they said I should concentrate on articles, not the book. So I did. In my fourth year review, they said, ‘Where’s the book?’”

“I’m in business, but my field is in psychology, so about half my work is published in psychological journals. My department chair told me that was fine.” The dean of this individual, however, told the interviewers, “What advice would I give to a young faculty member? I’d tell them to publish in business journals. We are a professional field and we should service the profession. To publish elsewhere would be a risk.”

“Almost 50 percent of my time is spent on committees. The problem is that we don’t have enough senior faculty to go around, and those who are senior don’t want to serve. The department chair feels he doesn’t have a choice, and the dean seems oblivious. There are always good reasons to put me on a committee; it’s just that I don’t think it will help me get tenure.”

A faculty member at a small college described her third-year review: “That year the review was just a mess so it wasn’t particularly helpful . . . They wanted names of three potential reviewers and so I did my research about people who were in appropriate institutions and so on and submitted the names. Then some time passed and finally I got word that all the reviewers had to be local and none of the reviewers I had given them were local. That meant that in a matter of two or three days I had to come up with new names. It was incredibly stressful.”

Responsibility for candor falls most squarely on the department chair or other individual charged with the direct, ongoing review of a tenure-track faculty member.
Mathematician John B. Conway has described for fellow department chairs the overriding importance of candor in evaluations:  

"On humanitarian and professional grounds, junior faculty should get a clear understanding of their status long before tenure is considered.  

"It is the head's solemn duty to report to the candidate any bad news that comes out of the retention review. In a serious situation, the candidate should be asked to respond in writing. No one likes to communicate bad news. (Well, almost no one.) But it is absolutely essential that you do this, especially now. A head who puts on kid gloves at such a time is doing no one a favor. If the report is so bad that it seems irredeemable, terminate the candidate now before tenure is considered.  

"There is the legal question, but there is also your obligation as a human being and the unofficial mentor of this young colleague. Do you really want them to spend the next few years thinking there is nothing to correct? That what they have been doing is leading toward tenure? And meantime the faculty is anticipating change and will conclude, when it fails to appear, that this person did not heed a warning and, hence, is unworthy of tenure. I have known of cases where a department head did not pass on the faculty's concerns. When tenure was eventually denied, the candidate was shocked, the faculty discovered their warnings were not transmitted, and the head's prestige and reputation suffered.  

"A word of caution here is advisable. With five or six years of contact, people can become very friendly. Sufficiently friendly that hard decisions are almost impossible. Remember you are running a department, not a club. Chumminess is not an area where excellence suffices for tenure. Nice young mathematicians do not invite harsh judgments, but your job, and that of your colleagues, is to promote the well-being of the university. It is not to promote the sociability of the department."  

The temptation to put social concerns ahead of academic needs is real. In an article about a multimillion dollar jury verdict in a tenure denial case involving a chemistry professor, the press reported:  

"David Henderson, then chairman of the chemistry department, said recently that he and his colleagues incorrectly perceived their roles as Ms. Crane's advocates. 'She was a friend,' he explained. 'We'd worked with her for six years... Today. Mr. Henderson describes some of the things that he wrote in the department's letter of appeal as 'hyperbole,' part of a 'calculated strategy' to meet the requirements for appealing a negative tenure decision.'  

Against this backdrop, we offer three general principles to guide the candor of faculty evaluations.  

An institution owes every tenure-track faculty member a clear explanation of the requirements for tenure.  

The institution should give every new faculty member an explanation of the requirements for reappointment and tenure. Members of the search committee might convey some information about standards during the interview process. Whatever the nature of discussions during the search process, after appointment the department or administration should fur-
nish a thorough explanation. Subsequent evaluations then provide an opportunity to review the requirements with the candidate. AAUP recommends that:

Probationary faculty members should be advised, early in their appointment, of the substantive and procedural standards generally accepted in decisions affecting renewal and tenure. Any special standards adopted by their particular departments or schools should also be brought to their attention.¹⁴

It is vital that the institution promptly inform the candidate of any changes in the standards. Interdisciplinary scholars may require special attention. Faculty members who are affiliated with more than one department face a particular risk that the institution will not clearly define the overall standards for evaluation of their performance, or will change these standards frequently over time.

An institution owes every tenure-track faculty member clear advice about his or her progress in meeting tenure requirements.

The institution’s primary goal in the evaluation is to give the candidate a full understanding of his or her progress to date in meeting the requirements. Candor is critical to both the institution and the candidate. The evaluation should be specific and should cover the full review period. Evaluators should avoid broad generalizations such as “Don’s teaching has improved over the past year.” Add specific details, such as “In his introductory readings course, Don succeeded in motivating the students, stimulating class discussion, and preparing them for upper-level work. His new compilation of reading material will have lasting value for our curriculum.”

The evaluation should cover the entire review period, not just the most recent few weeks or months. Normally the department chair shares the written evaluation with the candidate. In a meeting to discuss the evaluation, the department chair should take the opportunity to engage the faculty member in a substantive discussion about work to date and realistic prospects for the future. Use the meeting as an occasion for two-way communication, not just a one-way critique.

Most flawed academic evaluations tend to be excessively positive. A sugar-coated review is easiest for the chair to dispense and for the candidate to swallow. But over the long run, it can prove harmful to everyone.

William Tierney and Estela Mara Bensimon have explained the importance of constructive criticism of tenure-track faculty:

[C]andidates should not be betrayed by the system. If evaluations throughout the first five years have been positive, yet the candidate is denied tenure, then a mistake needs to be rectified. Formal evaluation can be helpful to an individual if it deals with areas for improvement as well as strengths. An organization that does not take evaluation seriously is apt to disable a candidate for tenure because he or she has never received adequate feedback. In effect, the greater blame goes to the organization, but the unsuccessful candidate must pay the penalty.¹⁵

In today’s legal climate, the institution can pay its penalty in the lawsuit that the unsuccessful candidate brings against it.

Evaluators should state their constructive criticism in plain English rather than couching it in the argot of diplomacy. Consider this example. A chair tells a candidate that her most recent published article was “good.” The chair means that, while the article was basically acceptable, it did not meet the department’s high standards of excellence. The candidate, for her part, perceives the comment as praise. A jury later deciding a lawsuit would likely interpret “good” in the same way as the candi-
Annual Faculty Evaluation
Professor Pam Poe

Teaching
The student evaluations place Pam right at the median within the department. She continues to teach the sophomore introductory lecture course every fall. In addition, her development of the new critical methods seminar for department majors has been a big project. She rolled up her sleeves last summer and produced the new course, offered this spring, that has contributed substantially to the quality of our program.

Research
Pam’s research has been showing good progress. We look forward to the publication later this year of the book version of her dissertation by State University Press. In the past year, she has submitted two papers that are under consideration by The International Bulletin of Methodology, one of the leading journals in her field.

Service
Pam’s service record is outstanding. She chaired the committee that conducted the campus-wide study of life and learning issues for female students. She was the primary author of the committee’s report, which made major recommendations for reform in the areas of curriculum, housing, and student activities. On campus, both female and male students eagerly seek her assistance with academic counseling. In the local community, her effective work on the board of the local United Way has brought credit to the college.

Pam is in her fourth year in a tenure-track position. In addition to the across-the-board salary increase, I am pleased to recommend her for an additional 1.5 percent for merit.

Dr. Paul Murky, Department Chair

Sample Evaluations
These are two evaluations of a tenure-track faculty member. Consider their relative candor and usefulness to Professor Poe.

The evaluation should include guidance for the future.
A good evaluation will include some guidance for the candidate’s future efforts. A department chair may encourage a candidate whose teaching is acceptable to devote attention to publishing articles in peer-reviewed journals. The chair might encourage a candidate who has only co-authored publications to write as a

date. The chair’s diplomacy has led to a fundamental miscommunication. Chairs, senior faculty, and academic administrators need to pay increasing attention to the potential “downstream” interpreters of their verbal and written remarks. Today these interpreters may include judges, juries, and investigators from the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.
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Teaching
The student evaluations place Pam right at the median within the department. She continues to teach the sophomore introductory lecture course every fall. In addition, her development of the new critical methods seminar for department majors has been a big project. She rolled up her sleeves last summer and produced the new course, offered this spring, that has contributed substantially to the quality of our program.

Over the next two years, I hope to see Pam devote attention to honing her teaching skills. One area she could usefully address is finding ways to encourage broader student participation in discussions. She is not undertaking any new course preparations in the coming year, which will give her an opportunity to consider new creative approaches to student involvement. I would be glad to consult with her on strategies and, if she wishes, to visit her classes occasionally.

Research
Pam's research has been showing good progress. We look forward to the publication later this year of the book version of her dissertation by State University Press. In the past year, she has submitted two papers that are under consideration by The International Bulletin of Methodology, one of the leading journals in her field.

Pam understands that the college does not place substantial weight on the publication of dissertations or other research projects undertaken elsewhere before a scholar joins our faculty. For a successful tenure candidacy, she will need to show a strong record of publication in peer-reviewed journals. At a minimum, the publication of three substantial articles will be required.

Service
Pam's service record is outstanding. She chaired the committee that conducted the campus-wide study of life and learning issues for female students. She was the primary author of the committee's report, which made major recommendations for reform in the areas of curriculum, housing, and student activities. On campus both female and male students eagerly seek her assistance with academic counseling. In the local community, her effective work on the board of the local United Way has brought credit to the college.

Pam and I have discussed the weight that the college gives to service in evaluating faculty. While important, it stands behind teaching and research in our priorities.

Pam is in her fourth year in a tenure-track position. In addition to the across-the-board salary increase, I am pleased to recommend her for an additional 1.5 percent for merit for her role in the development of the new seminar.

Dr. Charles Candid, Department Chair

sole author. The conscientious chair will anticipate the needs of the candidate and the department and will guide the individual in how best to direct his or her energy.

Future guidance should not, however, take the form of promises. For example, "If you get your book out within the next two years, I'm sure you'll be a shoo-in for tenure." Many things can change over two years. The book, when published, may not be good. The institution may decide it does not have a long-term need for the candidate's specialty. A different department chair may assess the candidate's research productivity differently. So, while future guidance is an important element of an evaluation, the chair should couch it as guidance rather than a guarantee.
An institution is vulnerable to challenge if it gives short shrift to any of the elements of candor. Particularly dangerous is the situation in which the institution has offered a candidate glowing evaluations for five years but then denies tenure on the basis of some inadequacy that no one ever communicated during the entire probationary period.

Every tenured-track faculty member deserves:

✓ A clear explanation of the requirements for reappointment and tenure, including any criteria specific to the department or school.
✓ Periodic evaluations of his or her progress in meeting the requirements.
✓ Candor in all evaluations.
✓ Specific examples that illustrate the quality of his or her performance.
✓ Constructive criticism outlining any potential areas for improvement.
✓ A review covering the entire evaluation period, not just the recent past.
✓ An evaluation in plain English.
✓ Practical guidance for future efforts to meet the requirements, without promises or guarantees that the institution may not be able to honor.
✓ An understanding of how a review (or reviews) during the probationary period differs from a later tenure review.
Chapter 4
Caring for Unsuccessful Candidates

“Almost no one in the history department has talked to me this entire semester. I’m like someone who has been airbrushed out of a Kremlin photograph.”
— Historian denied tenure at Yale University

“It’s like you have leprosy.”
— English professor denied tenure at the University of Michigan

At most institutions, a denial of tenure means that the unsuccessful candidate will remain one final year and then depart. Faculty and administrators should continue to treat a candidate who has been rejected for tenure as a professional colleague. The institution can take many steps to help the individual with what may be a difficult transition. If the institution provides assistance and expressions of concern, it may reduce the anger and desire for revenge that some unsuccessful candidates feel. Caring for unsuccessful candidates is a humane and decent thing to do. It is also a good way to prevent some lawsuits.

Deliver the bad news with compassion.
Consider how your institution notifies candidates that they have been denied tenure. The most impersonal way is a short letter. How would you feel if you received this letter?

Dear Professor Jones,

It is my responsibility to advise you that the governing board voted last week to deny your application for tenure and promotion. You will receive a terminal one-year contract running through next June. Let me offer thanks for your years of service to our college and wish you well in your future professional endeavors.

Sincerely,
President Smith

One immediate question would be why the president did not send the letter more promptly after the board voted. But beyond that relatively minor detail, the letter is highly impersonal. It essentially abandons Professor Jones to face the future alone.

Written notice of the tenure denial is important from a legal standpoint. A better letter would provide an opportunity to meet with the provost or other high-level academic administrator to discuss the decision and any relocation assistance that the institution could provide.

Experience suggests that the provost, or similar official, should meet with each candidate denied tenure as soon as possible after the decision. The meeting can begin the process of repairing damage to the individual’s self-esteem. The provost uses the meeting to say, in effect, “You’re still a good person. You have many fine skills and talents.”
At the present time, unfortunately, you and the institution were not a good long-term match. "The provost should allow the candidate to express feelings about the situation, which can provide the individual with some catharsis. The provost can also begin to outline ways in which the institution may be able to assist with the candidate’s transition.

Encourage colleagues to interact professionally with the unsuccessful candidate after the denial of tenure.

Social isolation can exacerbate the unsuccessful tenure candidate’s sense of failure. Colleagues should take care to interact sensitively and professionally with the individual after a negative decision. Take time for conversation and social interactions. Common courtesies can reduce some of the sting of the outcome.

One unsuccessful candidate described the awkwardness of hosting at her home a gathering for prospective students. She was obliged to “sell” them on the value of an institution that had recently rejected her. Should the gathering have been held elsewhere? The best approach probably would have been for the chair to ask whether she preferred to host what was an annual event one final time or to let the task fall to someone else. Unilaterally shifting the function without consultation probably would have been unwise. Open lines of communication can help the candidate through a difficult period and reduce the prospect of disputes over small or large issues.
Checklist on Caring for Unsuccessful Candidates

The institution can take many steps to help the unsuccessful tenure candidate get back on his or her feet elsewhere. Here are some possibilities:

✓ Networking about available positions at other institutions. Senior faculty in the department can be an enormous help in identifying possibilities at other institutions. They can contact colleagues nearby or in other parts of the country and urge them to consider the candidate for open positions. If the department, however, was strongly opposed to the award of tenure, the networking function might be better performed by a senior academic administrator. If the tenure denial was based on malfeasance, it would be irresponsible for the institution to help the individual relocate to another campus without adequate disclosure of the problem.

✓ Funds for travel and attending conferences. The unsuccessful candidate may find it helpful to have access to funds for attending conferences that have a recruiting component, other travel related to the job search, or maintaining professional contacts. The institution can specifically earmark a reasonable amount for the candidate's use.

✓ Subscriptions to periodicals that have vacancy announcements. A personal subscription may relieve the candidate from the burden of hunting down the department's shared copy of any publications that include position listings.

✓ Photocopying assistance. The search for an academic position requires large amounts of photocopying. The institution can designate someone to assist with this function. If the institution closely monitors photocopying charges, the candidate might be given a special allotment.

✓ Advice about academic job searches. Some candidates may be out of touch with the logistics of finding an academic position. Colleagues or the placement office may be able to offer "how to" advice on current techniques. The candidate might, for example, welcome advice about online information and networking resources and how to prepare a resume for electronic distribution.

✓ Release time, if the candidate desires it. The institution and the candidate may mutually decide that their interests would be best served if the candidate were relieved of certain duties during the terminal contract year. The candidate might, for example, be offered a reduced teaching load. Take care, though, that the decision is mutual. Involuntarily imposing a substantial change in responsibilities on someone denied tenure may create risks. Such action may anger the individual and increase his or her readiness to sue. The faculty handbook may limit the institution's ability to change faculty responsibilities at particular times or in particular ways. If the institution relieves the individual of teaching, the action may violate AAUP's recommended standards on suspension. Mutually agreed-upon release time is, however, acceptable.

✓ Portable research support. Occasionally, institutions have provided financial support to continue the faculty member's research at another institution. Such "portable" support can signal the perceived value of the research and enhance the candidate's attractiveness for another position.

✓ Other support that fits the individual's unique circumstances. Take the time to learn about the candidate's needs and desires for future professional employment. Then consider whether the institution can help satisfy them. Retraining, tuition waivers, the payment of professional society dues, and library access are but a few resources that the institution may be able to deploy. Every situation is different, so examine each with care.

Take care that any oral or written recommendations are consistent with the grounds for the tenure decision. If the candidate files a lawsuit, those recommendations may crop up as evidence.
How can an institution move forward in refining and improving its evaluation process? Collaboration among faculty and academic administrators is a key ingredient. Advice from legal counsel may also be appropriate. We offer institutions the following approaches:

- Conduct workshops for department chairs on the appointment and evaluation of tenure-track faculty. Cover topics such as the importance of following institutional procedures, communicating well with tenure-track faculty, and preparing and retaining appropriate documentation. Possible presenters include experienced chairs and administrators, legal counsel, and outside experts. This report could serve as a basis for discussion.

- For smaller colleges, collaborate with neighboring institutions to develop joint annual or semiannual retreats or workshops for chairs and senior faculty.

- Encourage faculty and chairs to attend external programs on evaluation and tenure practices. Some ongoing workshops are listed in the bibliography. Disciplinary association meetings also sponsor occasional sessions. To compound the benefit of external programs, ask the attendees to share the insights they learn with others back on campus. Institutions often overlook the steps of sharing information and promoting campus dialogue with people who return from external programs.

- Have a small working group analyze situations of tenure denial that have occurred in the recent past and formulate recommendations for improvement. Don’t limit the recommendations just to revising the wording of campus policy. Also address the behavioral issues of how candidly and consistently the evaluators apply tenure standards.

- If lawsuits or other disputes have occurred, learn from those experiences and make appropriate changes. Calculate the intangible and tangible costs of dispute and devote comparable resources to preventing the next problem that might otherwise occur.

- Engage in a dialogue with tenure-track faculty about their perceptions of the tenure process. Ask about their understanding of the tenure standards and procedures, as well as the quality of the ongoing evaluations they are receiving. The information could be solicited informally through conversations or more formally through surveys. Use your findings to identify areas for possible improvement.

Consideration for tenure is a pivotal moment in the life of the candidate and the institution. The good practices detailed here...
are designed to avert problems that can detract from the hard work of evaluating academic achievement. They are also designed to enhance the fairness of the tenure process. A few of the suggestions address institutional policy. Most speak to the words and deeds of the people who implement that policy. We commend these practices to the serious attention of department chairs, other faculty involved in tenure evaluations, and academic administrators.

Chapter 2


Ganguli v. University of Minnesota, 512 N.W. 2d 918 (Minn. App. 1994).
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Chapter 4

Report on the CEDA Workshop on Faculty Evaluation  
San Diego, CA - October 9-10, 2000  
Presenters: Raoul Arreola, Larry Aleamoni

Summary
This workshop consisted primarily of the workshop developers, Arreola and Aleamoni, presenting their recommended faculty evaluation system, the basis for that system, and responding to questions about the system and faculty evaluation in general. The system itself, along with some of the relevant research literature, is covered in great detail in Arreola's book, Developing a Comprehensive Faculty Evaluation System.

Their system consists of 5 primary steps:

1. Faculty and administrators jointly determine the desired faculty roles, e.g., teaching, research, university service, public service, etc. They also determine the components of those roles, e.g., the components of teaching might be instructional delivery, instructional design, content expertise, and course management.

2. At the college and department levels, a range of acceptable weights for each role is developed, e.g., a given department might allow a maximum weight of 85% and a minimum weight of 50% for teaching. At the individual faculty level, the faculty member and department head agree on that faculty member's specific weights (within the allowable department range) - this is much like our Form 1 process.

3. Faculty and administrators determine the appropriate sources of information for the components developed in step 1, e.g., instructional delivery information comes from student evaluation forms, instructional design information comes from student evaluations and peer observations, etc. [Note: A large part of the presentation covered correct and incorrect uses of student evaluation form information.]

4. Faculty and administrators determine weights for each of the sources of information in step 3, e.g. for instructional design, the information from the student evaluations might be weighted 25% and the information from peer observations weighted 75%.

5. For each evaluation cycle, an overall composite rating (based on the evaluation information sources and weights developed above) is calculated for each faculty member. Arreola and Aleamoni also covered in detail how these overall ratings would be used to allocate merit pay. This included using the rating in different models of merit pay - these models varied in their amount of spread between money allocated to low and high-performing faculty members.

Note 1. Note that these weights are actually importance weights, i.e., they are goals, not necessarily distributions of time or effort. It is at steps 1 and 2 that institutional goals would be built into the system.
Positives

1. The presenters/authors have good credentials and experience in this area.

2. The proposed system is consistent with accepted good business practice in that it is based on a priori specification of the tasks expected of employees. Note that in non-academic jobs such a specification is done using a job analysis (often conducted by trained experts from outside the organization). Given the nature of the academic environment, this positive also has some negative aspects (see #5 below).

   “The essence of a workable faculty evaluation system is that the value structure implicit in the system be clearly evident and agreed to by the majority of the faculty being evaluated.”

3. The proposed system is consistent with the current literature on judgment and decision making (JDM). The JDM literature clearly shows that humans are adept at deciding what job dimensions are important, what their relative weights should be in the overall evaluation decision, and judging performance on single dimensions. But humans are relatively poor at combining multiple sources of information across multiple dimensions, especially across tens or hundreds of employees. Performance evaluation of a complex job such as university professor requires combining multiple pieces of data across multiple job dimensions and can lead to several kinds of subtle biases in decisions. Arreola and Aleamoni’s system plays to human strengths by retaining the single-dimension judgment process and then “automating” the information combination process.

4. The system emphasizes good measurement practices and the use of reliable and valid sources of evaluation information. This is especially apparent with regard to student evaluations of teaching. Aleamoni covered in detail the findings of the extensive research literature (some of which was his own work) in this area.

5. The system avoids a cookie-cutter approach to faculty work goals while providing a structure by which organizational goals are also built into the system.

6. The system protects faculty from capricious administrative decisions.

7. The system protects administrators from charges of capricious decisions.

8. The system makes the personnel decision process fully documented.

9. Mechanically, the system could potentially fit well with our current Form 1-3/FAS system with relatively few modifications.

10. The authors emphasized and addressed the dual (and sometimes contradictory) roles of faculty evaluations: faculty development and personnel decisions. Their system is intended to promote improvements in both and there was considerable discussion of the necessity for a system that addresses both uses.

Negatives

1. The system is moderately complex to communicate and requires a lot of work up-front to implement. The system is not complex to use. [Note: actually it is a variation on a system invented by Ben Franklin that he called “Prudential Algebra”. I’m pretty sure that Arreola and Aleamoni are not aware of this.]

2. The system has a large quantitative component – it does, in fact, “reduce faculty performance to a number”.

3. It has the appearance of being bureaucratic and inflexible. This is not really a legitimate criticism because the inflexibility comes from the fact that all the parties involved must openly agree, in advance, on what constitutes good faculty performance. This also means that the system would be slow to respond to changes – because it is unlikely that the values of faculty and administrators would change quickly or radically once the system has been in place and is accepted.

4. It is open to the charge that faculty will “play to the system”. This is true. Faculty are no different than other employees, they will modify their behavior toward those activities that the evaluation system rewards. However, this is true of any evaluation system – the advantage to this system is that the desired behaviors are made explicit.

5. Making desired faculty performance explicit means that the values (including organizational goals and preferred means to achieve those goals) of all the parties concerned will have to be made explicit. In a university environment this is bound to generate controversy.

6. Many of the specific recommendations will generate controversy, e.g., the suggestion that written comments on student evaluation forms should not go to administrators. In general, the system greatly reduces the roles of deans and provosts in the faculty evaluation process.

Conclusions
The use of such a system (or better, a system modified to fit current Clemson practice and goals) has the potential of improving many aspects of the current faculty performance evaluation system. In the long run, it offers the chance of creating a more accurate, honest, open, and fair system. However, it also offers the possibility of creating such a level of controversy and disagreement that potential benefits of the system are swamped by the costs. My personal recommendation is that Clemson look very closely at implementing such a system; if we decide that such a system is desirable I would also recommend that we consider hiring at least one of the authors as consultants to guide implementation of the system.

-- Fred Switzer
Standards Based Faculty Evaluation Scale

**EX = Exemplary Professional Performance**
This rating is given to those individuals who, during the rating period, consistently exceeded the institution's standards of professional performance. Individuals receiving this rating stand as exemplars of the highest levels of professional academic performance within the institution.

**SP = Standard Professional Performance**
This rating is given to those individuals who, during the rating period, consistently met the institution's standards of professional performance. The individuals receiving this rating constitute those good and valued professionals on whom the continued successful operation of the institution rests.

**IR = Improvement Required (Inconsistent Performance)**
This rating is given to those individuals who, during the rating period, did not consistently meet the institution's standards of professional performance. This rating must be given with specific feedback as to which standards of professional performance were not met as well as suggestions for improvement. Improvement in performance is required within the next rating period.

**UN = Unsatisfactory**
This rating is given to those individuals who, during the rating period, did not meet the institution's standards of professional performance in either one of the two following ways: (1) received an “IR” rating the previous rating period but did not make the improvements required, or (2) consistently violated one or more of the institution's standards of professional performance. This rating represents performance which is not acceptable and/or is inconsistent with the conditions for employment with the institution.

For computational purposes, the following numerical equivalences of this rating scale may be made. However, any forms designed to rate performance must use the alphabetic abbreviations and not the numerical values as response definitions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Numerical Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EX</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Establishing Institutional Standards of Professional Performance. It is necessary for the institution to draw up a specific statement of professional standards. These standards must be institutional in nature, although additional departmental, divisional, or other organizational sub-unit standards may be added for faculty within the sub-unit. The standards may include specific policy statements regarding such issues as office hours, advising responsibilities, absences from class, development of syllabi, service on committees, etc. In unionized institutions the standards of professional performance may already be written as part of the contract. The following are EXAMPLES of the type of statements which may be found in a more complete set of institutional performance standards. These statements are NOT recommendations of standards but simply a broad example of some types of statements.

**A faculty member...**
- must teach a minimum of 15 contact hours per week.
- must be present for all class periods for courses which he or she is teaching; or arrange for either a substitute or some other means for students to make up the work lost during the missed class time.
- must have a syllabus on file in the departmental office for every course he or she is teaching. Each syllabus must be constructed in accordance with departmental guidelines and specifications.
- will be expected advise at least 20 students per semester.
- is required to post and keep regular office hours.
- must have at least one article per year published in a peer-reviewed journal within their field.
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Student Ratings of Teaching: Recommendations for Use

William E. Cashin
Kansas State University

This IDEA Paper compliments IDEA Paper No. 20 (Cashin, 1988) which summarized the research on student ratings of teaching and concluded that student ratings tend to be reliable, valid, relatively unbiased, and useful. If you accept those conclusions, then you will want to use that information in developing or revising your on-campus student rating system, or in selecting one that is commercially available. This paper attempts to derive recommendations based on that literature—a literature which, although sometimes based on empirical studies, is more often based on experience in using student ratings. (In some cases the recommendations may be based primarily on my personal opinion, those cases will be noted.)

The recommendations are divided into five sections: general considerations, the overall system, the student rating form itself, its administration, and its interpretation. In order to keep both the length of the text and the number of references manageable, I will presume that the reader is generally familiar with IDEA Paper No. 20. Therefore, I will usually not detail its conclusions and nor cite all of the references.

General Considerations

RECOMMENDATION 1—Use multiple sources of data about a faculty member's teaching if you are serious about accurately evaluating or improving teaching. The major writers (e.g., Centra, 1979; Miller, 1987; Seldin, 1980) all caution against using any single source of data. In IDEA Paper No. 21 (Cashin, 1989) I proposed an expanded definition of college teaching which argued that using only student rating data ignored several aspects of teaching.

RECOMMENDATION 2—Do use student rating data as one source of data about effective teaching, assuming you accept the conclusions of IDEA Paper No. 20.

RECOMMENDATION 3—Discuss and decide upon the purpose(s) that the student rating data will be used for before any student rating form is chosen or any data are collected. Before an individual (or an institution) develops or selects a student ratings system, one must first decide for what purpose or purposes the data will be used. These three most frequently mentioned purposes are described below:

EVALUATION—the data are used by faculty committees, academic administrators, etc., as part of the data upon which to base personnel decisions: retention, promotion, tenure, or salary increases. Every institution makes personnel decisions so evaluation is necessarily one purpose of any institutional student rating system.

IMPROVEMENT—student rating results are used by the instructor to make changes that he or she thinks will help the students learn more effectively or efficiently. It should be noted that "improvement" (or "development") does not necessarily imply a deficiency. Moving from a B-level to an A-level performance is definitely an improvement, but of an already strong performance. Although the institution's rhetoric often states that improvement is the primary purpose for using student ratings, frequently there is no systematic help provided by the institution for faculty whose student ratings suggest that improvement is needed.

ADVISING—the data are used by students and advisors to help in selecting instructors or courses. My impression is that relatively few institutions actually publish student rating data to help advise students.

All three of these purposes are legitimate uses of the data. However, not all student rating items serve every purpose equally well. Everyone involved—faculty, administrators, and students—should discuss and decide upon how the data will be used, i.e., what information will go to whom, before any ratings are collected. Such open discussion can do much to allay the legitimate concerns of the various parties involved and to enlist their cooperation.

The System

RECOMMENDATION 4—To obtain reliable student rating data, collect data from at least ten raters if this is possible. The average IDEA item reliability with ten raters is around .70. [All of the references to IDEA data are from Cashin & Perrin, 1978 unless otherwise noted.] Similar or higher reliabilities are typically found with other well-designed forms, i.e., forms developed with the assistance of someone knowledgeable about educational measurement. Data based on the ratings of fewer than...
ten rating scales should be interpreted with caution, particularly if you want to generalize about what might be an effective way to teach the same course at a later date. However, combining data from several classes of less than ten students does yield reliable data.

RECOMMENDATION 5 — To obtain representative student rating data, collect data from at least two-thirds of the class. This recommendation is based primarily on experience and common sense. Even using this guideline, one-third of the students would not have been represented in the rating. Some have suggested requiring ratings from three-quarters of the class, but experience with the IDEA system revealed that on average only about 70% of a class turn in ratings.

RECOMMENDATION 6 — To generalize from student rating data to an instructor’s overall teaching effectiveness, sample across both courses and across time. For improvement it is acceptable to look at the data from one course, but for evaluation you need a much broader sample (see Glimm, Kane, & Naccarato, 1976). I suggest two or more different courses from at least three or more different terms.

RECOMMENDATION 7 — For improvement, develop a student rating system that is flexible. Instructional goals vary widely from course to course, and so what is an effective method to teach one goal may not be effective in teaching another. Your student rating system needs to accommodate this diversity. Cafeteria-type systems provide the most flexibility. (See also Recommendation 20.)

RECOMMENDATION 8 — Provide comparative data, preferably for all the items. Student ratings tend to be inflated. The average student rating on a 5-point scale is not 3.0 — as one might think — but usually between 3.5 and 4.0. Also, ratings vary widely from item to item. On the 20 IDEA teaching method items, the lowest mean is 3.3; the highest, 4.3. Without comparative data it is not possible to meaningfully interpret student rating data.

RECOMMENDATION 9 — Discuss and decide what controls for bias will be included in your system. Student ratings are correlated with variables other than the instructor’s teaching effectiveness (recommendations 10–13 will discuss specific). The institution needs to decide what, if anything, will be done about these possible sources of bias.

RECOMMENDATION 10 — Do not give undue weight to: the instructor’s age, sex, teaching experience, personality, or research productivity; the student’s age, sex, level (freshman, etc.), grade-point-average, or personality; or the class size or time of day when it was taught. These show little or no correlation with student ratings. (See IDEA Paper 20 for references.) Regarding class size, although there is a tendency for smaller classes to receive higher ratings, it is a very weak inverse association, average r = —.09 (Feldman, 1984). The average correlation of class size for the 38 IDEA items is somewhat greater — .18 (Cashin & S Livingston, 1977)

EXCEPTION. If the instructor provides evidence in his or her self-report for the influence of these variables, or if you or others have such evidence, that evidence should be taken into consideration.

RECOMMENDATION 11 — Take into consideration the students’ motivation level when interpreting student rating data. Student motivation tends to show higher correlations with other student rating items than with any other variable. Instructors are more likely to receive higher ratings in courses where students have a poor interest in the subject matter. March (1984) for example, notes that higher correlations occur when students have a strong desire to take the course. With the other 37 items, only 4% had a strong desire to take the course.

RECOMMENDATION 12 — Decide how you will treat student ratings from different courses. For example, freshmen, graduate, etc. Higher level courses, especially graduate courses, tend to receive higher ratings (Alien, 1981; Braskamp et al., 1984). However, with the 38 IDEA items course level correlates only .07 on average.

RECOMMENDATION 13 — Decide how you will treat student ratings from different academic fields. There is increasing evidence that different academic fields are rated differently (Braskamp et al., 1984; Cashin, Noma, & Hanna, 1987; Feldman, 1978; Marsh, 1984). What is not clear is why. For example, more quantitative courses— for example, math—tend to receive lower ratings. If you decide that this is because these courses are more difficult to teach, then you should take academic field into consideration when interpreting the data. If you think that certain fields are more poorly taught then you should not.

RECOMMENDATION 14 — For improvement, develop a system that is diagnostic. The more diagnostic the system is, the more useful it will be for improvement. This means that the items included on the form should be descriptive of specific and concrete teaching behaviors. For example, “the instructor provided outlines for each class” is more specific than an item like “the instructor gave detailed presentations.” (See also Recommendation 19.)

RECOMMENDATION 15 — Develop a system that is interpretable. It is very important that the data be understandable to the average faculty member. Using words as well as numbers is one way to achieve this. Including a written explanation along with the results is also desirable—although experience suggests that many faculty will not read it. The ideal solution is to have one or more faculty consultants on your campus who are available both to help faculty understand their ratings and to suggest ways that they might improve their teaching if that is appropriate.

The Form

RECOMMENDATION 16 — For evaluation, use a few global or summary items or scores. This recommendation is more a personal opinion but such summary, or global, student rating items tend to correlate more highly with student learning than do more specific items (Cohen, 1981).

Suggested summary items are:
1) Overall, how effective was the instructor?
2) Overall, how worthwhile was the course?
3) Overall, how much did you learn?

The students’ ratings on these items would be like a final course grade in that the instructor would have some idea of how the students rated him or her, but would not know why. However, such items would serve the purpose of evaluation which is to decide how well the instructor taught (not what he or she might do to improve—which is the focus of development). Using a form with only a few items has some distinct advantages. Such items apply to a wide variety of courses and thus be used as the basis of comparison across the institution, as long as the appropriate comparative data are available. Using such a short form also avoids wasting the students’ time and the institution’s money.
RECOMMENDATION 17—Use the short, evaluation form (or items) in every class every term. Using such a form can flag courses that may be less effectively taught—so that more extensive data can be collected next term—but it avoids using a long diagnostic form in classes which historically have received acceptable ratings.

RECOMMENDATION 18—Use a long, diagnostic form in only one course per term—in the course that the instructor wishes to focus upon for improvement. Most instructors would be doing well to improve one course a term. Using a diagnostic form in only one course a term focuses the instructor’s efforts and avoids gathering data that may not be used.

RECOMMENDATION 19—For improvement, use items that require as little inference as possible on the part of the student rater and as little interpretation as possible on the part of the instructor. This is a corollary of Recommendation 14 that improvement systems need to be diagnostic. Concrete items descriptive of specific behaviors tend to be most helpful to an instructor looking for suggestions about how to improve.

RECOMMENDATION 20—For improvement, do not use a single, standard set of items for every class. Provide a pool of items or some kind of weighting system. This is a corollary of Recommendation 7 on flexibility. The problem with using a form which contains a single set of items is that it assumes that there is a single correct way to teach, and that every instructor in every class should do all of the things listed on the form. Different course objectives—and probably different student learning styles—require different methods. One solution to the flexibility problem is to use a pool of items as the cafeteria systems do. The instructor selects only items that fit his or her course for the students to rate. IDEA uses a weighting system where the instructor, a faculty committee, etc., weight how important a given item—in IDEA’s case general course objectives—is for the given course. Teaching methods are flagged for the instructor’s consideration only if the research shows that the method is relevant to the goals selected for that course.

RECOMMENDATION 21—Use a 5-point to 7-point scale. Scales with less than “5” points do not discriminate as well, but using more than “7” points adds little. There are a number of other technical considerations discussed in the literature, but little consensus on what is best. Interested readers can consult Berk, 1979; or Doyle, 1983.

RECOMMENDATION 22—In the analysis of the results, report computations only to the first decimal place. Although primarily a personal opinion, even reporting data to only the first decimal place yields 41 points on a 5-point scale (1.0 to 5.0). Most student rating data—as most of our classroom exam data—are not that precise, i.e., a 4.0 is rarely different from a 3.9.

RECOMMENDATION 23—Do not overinterpret the data, allow for a margin of error. This is a corollary of Recommendation 22. Depending upon the standard error of measurement of the items, scores within + or - 3 of more may not really be different. Combining the data into a limited number of categories, perhaps ten, rather than using all 41 points, is both more understandable and more realistically reflects the level of accuracy of the data.

RECOMMENDATION 24—Use frequency distributions—what number or percent of the students rated the item “1,” “2,” etc. These are more understandable to most faculty than calculating a standard deviation for each item. Also, the distributions can contain useful information. If all of your ratings are high, keep doing whatever you do. If they are all low, stop. But what if the distribution tends to be flat, the instructor is not sure what to do. One solution is to consider whether any item has the distribution to be flat. The last may mean that what you are doing works for one group of students but not for another. You probably need to do nothing else.
Administration

RECOMMENDATION 27—For evaluation, develop standardized procedures covering all relevant aspects of your student rating system and monitor that the procedures are followed. When the student rating data are going to be used for personnel decisions, it is important that everyone have confidence that everyone’s data were gathered and treated fairly. Recommendations 28–32 deal with some specifics.

RECOMMENDATION 28—For evaluation, administer the ratings about the second to the last week of the term. You want to obtain the ratings near the end of the term so that the students will have an accurate perception of the total course and of what they have learned, but you do not want to give them so close to the end of the term that the students will be distracted by concerns about getting assignments in, or about what will be on the final exam. Avoid administering the ratings on the last day of class or on the day of the final exam. See Lowman, 1984, for a persuasive rationale for administering the student ratings on the last day of class if you use the last class as he suggests.

RECOMMENDATION 29—Develop standardized instructions that include the purpose[s] for which the data will be used, and who will receive what information, and when. Ideally, these instructions will be printed on the top of the student’s form and also read aloud by the proctor.

RECOMMENDATION 30—Instruct the students not to sign their ratings. Studies suggest that requiring signatures will inflate the ratings (Braskamp et al., 1984; Feldman, 1979; Marsh, 1984). Also, tell the students if the instructor will be given their handwritten responses. By doing this, the students can print or leave the open-ended questions blank if they are concerned about confidentiality and possible retaliation from the instructor. Some instructors have the open-ended questions printed on a separate sheet of paper which they let the students take home so they can type their comments if they wish. It also allows the students to give more thought to their responses. If we want the students to cooperate by giving us their honest feedback, we must do everything we can to insure confidentiality.

RECOMMENDATION 31—The instructor may hand out the rating forms and read the standardized instructions, but the instructor should leave the room until the students have completed the ratings and they are collected. When the instructor remains in the room, the ratings tend to be higher (Feldman, 1979; Marsh, 1984).

RECOMMENDATION 32—The ratings should be collected by a neutral party and the data taken to a predetermined location—often to where they are to be scored—and they should not be available to the instructor until the grades are turned in. This is the conventional wisdom with which I strongly agree. Following these procedures does much to assure people’s confidence in the fairness of the system.

Interpretation

RECOMMENDATION 33—Develop a written explanation of how the analyses of the student ratings are to be interpreted. For data from individual classes that will be interpreted in isolation—particularly if being used for evaluation—include the caveats about having at least ten raters and about having data from at least two-thirds of the class. Remind readers that if they want to generalize to the instructor’s overall teaching effectiveness, they should have ratings from two or more courses from three or more terms. Above all, remember that student ratings are only one source of data.
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We Need Objective, Rigorous Peer Review of Teaching

By DANIEL BERNSTEIN and RICHARD EDWARDS

Remember formula funding? General-education reform? Total quality management? The history of higher education, like other fields, is littered with such managerial panaceas and educational cure-alls whose popularity has come and gone.

Those of us who were faculty members in the Massachusetts public system in the 1970's recall "Kelly points," so named for the powerful state senator James A. Kelly, who worried that faculty members were not working hard enough. You earned three points for teaching an undergraduate class, four and a half for a graduate class, additional amounts for advising or other duties. Your total Kelly points for the year had to at least equal some set number -- 22 sticks in the mind. Fortunately, the whole system sank from sight when, for crimes unrelated to Kelly points, the senator was accused of extortion, convicted, and sent to jail.

In recent years, peer review of teaching has gained currency on some campuses as a way to evaluate professors' pedagogical skills. Yet is it just another fad, destined to hold our attention for a while and then fade away? We have experimented with peer-review projects for almost two decades, and we don't think so. But if educators are going to sustain the progress made, we will need to move toward a more rigorous and objective form of review.

Peer review of teaching first appeared in the 1980's, in response to widespread public criticism that research universities didn't care enough about teaching undergraduates. Several universities began to pay more attention to the quality of teaching and to explore how to improve it. For example, the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education made four grants to our institution, the University of Nebraska, to promote the concept of professors' evaluating their colleagues' teaching effectiveness.

The goal of peer review has been to provide the same level of
support, consultation, and evaluation for teaching that universities now provide for research. Yet in its embryonic form, peer review typically consisted of a faculty member making a single visit to a colleague’s classroom. Often the reviewer would then write a cursory letter to the department chair or for a tenure file, but he or she rarely interacted in any substantive way with the teacher under review.

In 1994, the American Association for Higher Education took the peer-review idea a significant step further. It organized a national consortium of 12 universities, including Nebraska, to develop a model of peer teaching interactions. The A.A.H.E. vision of peer review required a much deeper intellectual engagement — one that combined inquiry into the substance of the course work with a careful investigation of what the students actually learned.

The various institutions that have participated in the A.A.H.E. consortium have explored a variety of methods for professors to judge one another’s teaching. The best model — developed by Russell Edgerton and Pat Hutchings, then the president and a senior staff member of the A.A.H.E., and Lee Shulman, then an adviser to the A.A.H.E. — focuses on student understanding as an index of successful teaching.

In the application of that model, professors describe the intellectual goals for a course, and then provide sample assignments, examples of actual student performance, and students’ grade distributions on the assigned work. Based on their own teaching experience, peers from the same discipline comment on the appropriateness of those assignments, as well as on the level and quality of student work. A number of institutions now also encourage professors to assemble portfolios containing reflective analysis of how well students achieved the goals of the courses.

The process is always voluntary for the person being reviewed. The teacher and peer, or peers, first exchange in writing their assessments of the substantive accomplishments of both the teacher and his or her students. Several times during the year, they meet and discuss candidly the teacher’s successes and areas for improvement. Often the teacher changes assignments, course procedures, or how he or she assesses student learning as a result of those conversations.

Based on our experience at our university, and through workshops that we’ve conducted for faculty members at other institutions, we know that such an interactive model improves
teaching. Faculty members become better teachers and more enthusiastic about sharing their knowledge of how to teach effectively.

Still, despite being highly visible in the academic world for five years, in-depth peer review of teaching has not made great inroads into the routine of academic life. Why?

Some faculty members believe that the process takes inordinate amounts of time. Given the constantly escalating demands of academic life, faculty members will primarily devote time to activities that their colleagues and leaders value. Especially in research universities, where teaching itself is often undervalued and anonymous student evaluations continue to be the main tool for assessing teaching performance, many professors are skeptical that such efforts will be noticed or rewarded. Thus, although the evidence clearly shows that peer collaboration on teaching is beneficial, such collaboration is difficult to sustain.

Our extensive involvement with peer evaluation of teaching has led us to identify the most promising way to overcome such obstacles and give peer review the legitimacy it deserves: We must go beyond individual campus efforts and share expertise among different institutions. Universities should create among themselves a network of faculty members who can exchange teaching evaluations. Those external reviews would be similar to the external reviewing process that nearly all institutions use to evaluate a professor's research publications. Our best understanding of critical ideas, intellectual standards, and research practices emerges from the commentaries we provide each other when we review work submitted for publication and financial support. Why not create a similar support system for teaching?

Multi-campus conversations on peer review could significantly increase our understanding of what constitutes excellent teaching and how to measure it — and also shape what Lee Shulman, now president of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, and others are calling a "scholarship of teaching." That approach could also solve the key problem with the current system: Those who evaluate the portfolios are usually disciplinary colleagues from the faculty members' own departments, who primarily advise them on their teaching effectiveness rather than formally evaluate them, and who are not typically perceived as disinterested. External peer reviews could provide independent arm's-length evaluations.

Yet is it possible to create a network of faculty members at
different institutions who can exchange informed and competent reviews of teaching — and without imposing excessive demands on the reviewers' own time. At our institution, we have embarked on a pilot project to try to build just such a network with the University of Michigan and Indiana, Kansas State, and Texas A&M Universities — and with the support of the Pew Charitable Trusts.

During the past academic year, faculty members at the participating institutions have met on their own campuses to discuss what constitutes excellent teaching. Representatives from all of the institutions recently convened to share the results of those conversations and to identify common elements and best practices — to try to determine how to represent, evaluate, and honor intellectual work in teaching.

For example, professors from Nebraska, as well as members of the Carnegie Academy for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning — an initiative of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching that focuses on the concept of teaching as scholarly work — showed examples of their course portfolios, and we discussed how faculty members from other institutions could meaningfully review such materials. Do the portfolios provide the right evidence of excellent teaching? What questions should the outside reviewers be asking?

We concluded that faculty members need two clearly distinct types of peer reviews: one that can help improve their teaching, and another that can be used in formal evaluations. We also agreed that we should distinguish between a "course portfolio" and a "teaching portfolio." The former should be the product of a focused inquiry into the learning by students in a particular course, while the latter should provide a broader range of information, self-description, and evidence, and include several examples of course portfolios.

All five campuses are continuing to generate portfolio materials through faculty consultation and collaboration, and faculty members from these institutions will provide one another objective written reviews of those materials throughout the next few years. We will share the results at a national conference in the spring of 2003, so that more universities can participate in the discussion and see how faculty members react to the experience.

Our vision is that, one day, many research universities will be connected through peer review of teaching just as they collaborate today in assessing research quality. If we wish to
attain the same quality in teaching that we offer in research, we will need to develop a broad community of faculty members who can recognize, evaluate, and replicate excellence in teaching within the context of their individual fields of study. A system of peer exchange and review of course portfolios, focused on student learning, offers the best opportunity to create that community.

Daniel Bernstein is a professor of psychology and Richard Edwards is senior vice chancellor for academic affairs at the University of Nebraska at Lincoln. Bernstein is also a Carnegie Scholar in the Carnegie Academy for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning.
Student Ratings of Teaching: The Research Revisited

William E. Cashin
Kansas State University

Negative attitudes toward student ratings are especially resistant to change, and it seems that faculty and administrators support their belief in student-rating myths with personal and anecdotal evidence, which [for them] outweighs empirically based research evidence. (Cohen, 1990, p. 124-125)

There are now more than 1,500 references dealing with research on student evaluations of teaching. IDEA Paper No. 20, Student Ratings of Teaching: A Summary of the Research (Cashin, 1988) attempted to briefly summarize the research from 1971 to 1988. This paper is an update of that paper and repeats much of its content. No major study published since then has substantively changed that paper's conclusions, but several studies or reviews of the literature provide modifications or further support for its conclusions.

This paper will attempt to summarize the conclusions of the major reviews of the student rating literature from Costin, Greenough, and Menges (1971) to the present. That literature is extensive and complex. Obviously, a paper this brief can offer only broad, general conclusions and very limited citations. Interested readers are encouraged to consult the various reviews and their individual references for details. For readers with less time, both Braskamp and Ory (1994) and Centra (1993) have chapters summarizing the student rating research; see also Davis (1993) and McKeachie (1994).

The ERIC descriptor for student ratings is "student evaluation of teacher performance". I suggest that the term "student ratings" is preferable to "student evaluations." "Evaluation" has a definitive and terminal connotation; it suggests that we have an answer. "Rating" implies that we have data which need to be interpreted. Using the term "rating" rather than "evaluation" helps to distinguish between the people who provide the information (sources of data) and the people who interpret it in combination with other sources of data (evaluators).

Viewing student ratings as data rather than as evaluations may also help to put them in proper perspective. Writers on faculty evaluation are almost universal in recommending the use of multiple sources of data. No single source of data—including student rating data—provides sufficient information to make a valid judgment about overall teaching effectiveness. Further, there are important aspects of teaching that students are not competent to rate (see IDEA Paper No. 21, Defining and Evaluating College Teaching; Cashin, 1989, for details.)

Multidimensionality

There have been a number of factor analytic studies (see Abrami & d'Apollonia, 1990; Feldman, 1976b; Kulik & McKeachie, 1975; and Marsh & Dunkin, 1992, for details) that conclude that student rating forms are multidimensional, i.e., that they measure several different aspects of teaching. Put another way, no single student rating item, nor set of related items, will be useful for all purposes.

Both Centra (1993) and Braskamp and Ory (1994) identify six factors commonly found in student rating forms:

1. Course organization and planning
2. Clarity, communication skills
3. Teacher student interaction, rapport
4. Course difficulty, workload
5. Grading and examinations
6. Student self-rated learning

Marsh's (1984) SEEQ (Students' Evaluations of Educational Quality) form has nine dimensions: learning/value, enthusiasm, organization, group interaction, individual rapport, breadth of coverage, exams/grades, assignments, and workload. Other student rating forms have items measuring some or all of the above dimensions. In several of his reviews of the literature, Feldman (1976b, 1983, 1984, 1987, and 1988) categorized student ratings items—and gave examples—into as many as 22 different logical dimensions. In a more recent review, Feldman (1989b) identified 25 dimensions. When interpreting student rating data, we must distinguish among the various items and their dimensions to insure that all of the appropriate
dimensions are rated. Averaging dissimilar items is not appropriate.

Although there is general agreement that student ratings are multidimensional, and that various dimensions should be used when their purpose is to improve teaching, there is disagreement about how many, or which, dimensions should be used for personnel decisions. In several articles, Abrami (e.g., 1989a; and Abrami & d'Apollonia, 1991) suggested that one or a few global or summary type items might provide sufficient student rating data for personnel decisions. Centra (1993) and Braskamp and Ory (1994) make a similar recommendation. Cashin and Downey (1992) tested this using the IDEA Overall Evaluation measure as the criterion of teaching effectiveness. Each of three global items—individually—accounted for at least 50% of the variance in the criterion measure: overall instructor effectiveness, 54%; overall course worth, 60%; overall amount learned, 69%. However—contrary to their hypothesis—controlling for the students’ motivation to take the course, the size of the class, or the difficulty of the subject matter, did not add significantly to the amount of variance explained.

Marsh (1994) had some reservations about the way the IDEA Overall Evaluation measure was calculated and he generated four variations that he considered improvements. However, Cashin, Downey, and Sixbury (1994)—using each of Marsh’s four variations as the criterion measure—obtained the same results as the original study: each of the global items accounted for at least 50% of the variance in each of Marsh’s criterion measures, and the control items added little.

Reliability

In the educational measurement literature, reliability covers consistency, stability, and generalizability of items. For student rating items, reliability refers most often to consistency or interrater agreement (i.e., within a given class do the students tend to give similar ratings on a given item). Reliability varies depending upon the number of raters, i.e., the more raters, the more reliable. For example, with the IDEA system (Sixbury & Cashin, 1995a), the median reliabilities (intraclass correlations) for the 38 items are:

- for 10 raters, .69
- for 15 raters, .83
- for 20 raters, .83
- for 30 raters, .88
- for 40 raters, .91

Similar or higher reliabilities are typically found with other well-designed forms, i.e., forms developed with the assistance of someone knowledgeable about educational measurement. As a rule of thumb, I recommend that items with fewer than ten raters (reliabilities below .70), be interpreted with particular caution.

Stability is concerned with agreement between raters over time. In general, ratings of the same instructor tend to be similar over time (Braskamp & Ory, 1994; Centra, 1993). For example, a longitudinal study (Overall & Marsh, 1980) compared end-of-course ratings with ratings by the same students years later (at least one year after graduation). The average correlation was .83.

Generalizability is concerned with how confident we can be that our data accurately reflect the instructor’s general teaching effectiveness, not just how effective he or she was in that particular course that term. A study conducted by Marsh (1982) illustrates the question. He studied data from 1,364 courses, dividing them into four categories: the same instructor teaching the same course but in different terms, the same instructor teaching a different course, different instructors teaching the same course, and different instructors teaching different courses. This permitted him to study the differential effects of the instructor and of the course. He then correlated student ratings in the four different categories, separating items related to the instructor (e.g., enthusiasm, organization, discussion) from background items (e.g., student’s reason for taking the course, workload). The average correlations are shown below; the correlations in parentheses are for the background items.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Same Course</th>
<th>Different Course</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Same Instructor</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(.69)</td>
<td>(.34)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different Instructor</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(.49)</td>
<td>(.21)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The instructor-related correlations were higher for the same instructor, even when teaching a different course. The correlations for the background items (in parentheses)—more tied to the course than the instructor—were higher for the same course. Marsh concluded that the instructor, not the course, is the primary determinant of the student rating items. Marsh’s results are comparable to other generalizability studies (Gillmore, Kane, & Naccarato, 1978; and Hogan, 1973).

When making personnel decisions, we want to use the data to make judgments about the instructor’s general teaching effectiveness. When considering student ratings (remembering that we need other kinds of information beyond student ratings), the following seem to be reasonable rules of thumb. If the instructor teaches only one course (e.g., part-time instructors), consistent ratings from two different terms may be sufficient. For most instructors, however, use ratings from a variety of courses, for two or more courses from every term for at least two years, totaling at least five courses. If there are fewer than fifteen raters in any of the classes, data from additional classes are recommended.

Validity

In educational measurement, the basic question concerning validity is: does the test measure what it is supposed to measure? For student ratings this translates into: to what extent do student rating items measure some aspect of teaching effectiveness? Unfortunately there is no agreed upon definition of
“effective teaching” nor any single, all-embracing criterion. The best that one can do is to try various approaches, collecting data that either support or contest the conclusion that student ratings reflect effective teaching.

Approach One—Student Learning

Theoretically, the best criterion of effective teaching is student learning. Other things being equal, the students of more effective teachers should learn more. A number of studies have attempted to study this hypothesis by comparing multiple-section courses. In the typical study, different instructors teach different sections of the same course, using the same syllabus and textbook, and most importantly using the same external final exam, i.e., an exam developed by someone other than the instructors. Cohen (1981) and Feldman (1989b) reviewed these studies. Using the students’ grades on the external exam as the measure of student learning, they examined correlations between the exam grade and various student rating items. The average correlations are given below (1981–Cohen; 1989–Feldman):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student ratings of</th>
<th>1981</th>
<th>1989</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>achievement or learning</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>overall course</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>overall instructor</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teacher skill dimension</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–course preparation</td>
<td></td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–clarity of objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teacher structure dimension</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–understandableness</td>
<td></td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–knowledge of subject</td>
<td></td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teacher rapport dimension</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–availability</td>
<td></td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–respect for students</td>
<td></td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teacher interaction dimension</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–encouraging discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note on Interpreting Validity Correlations: Earlier I suggested as a rule of thumb that reliability correlations of at least .70 (at least 10 raters) were desirable. However, in the social sciences validity correlations above .70 are unusual, especially if studying complex phenomena, such as student learning. As a rule of thumb, I suggest that student rating validity correlations between .00 and .29, even when statistically significant, are not practically useful. Correlations between .30 and .49 are practically useful. Correlations between .50 and .70 are very useful but are not common when studying complex phenomena.

Using the above rule of thumb, the average correlations reported by Cohen (1981) and Feldman (1989b) are generally useful. These relationships tend to support the validity of student ratings because the classes in which the students gave the instructor higher ratings tended to be the classes where the students learned more, i.e., scored higher on the external exam. On the other hand, the correlations are far from perfect, in part because many of the variables that relate to students’ learning will be related to student characteristics (e.g., motivation or ability), not to instructor characteristics.

Approach Two—Instructor’s Self Ratings

Researchers have sought for a criterion of effective teaching that would be acceptable to faculty. One possibility is the self ratings of the instructor. In a review of the literature, Feldman (1989a) cites 19 studies which correlated instructor’s self ratings with student ratings. The average correlation was .29. However, in one study (Marsh, Overall, & Kesler, 1979) instructors were asked to rate two different courses in order to see if the course the instructor rated higher was also rated higher by the students. The median correlation—based on six factor scores between the instructor’s self ratings and the students’ ratings—was .49. In a later report (Marsh & Dunkin, 1992) using nine factor scores, the median was .45. Such studies provide further support for the validity of the students’ ratings.

Approach Three—The Ratings of Others

If one is willing to grant that the ratings of administrators, colleagues, alumni, and others have some validity—and, excepting alumni, that these ratings are independent of feedback from students—then student ratings share that validity.

Administrator’s Ratings—Student ratings correlate with administrator’s ratings, ranging from .47 to .62 (Kulik & McKeachie, 1975), but Feldman (1989a), using global items, found a lower average correlation of .39.

Colleague’s Ratings—Student ratings correlate with colleague’s ratings, .48 to .69 (Kulik & McKeachie, 1975); Feldman (1989a) found an average of .55. Marsh and Dunkin (1992) question the usefulness of colleague’s ratings based on classroom visitation because such ratings tend to be unreliable.

Some faculty question whether the students have an appropriate conception of what effective teaching is. In a review of 31 studies, Feldman (1988) found that the students’ view of effective teaching was very similar to the faculty’s view (average correlation equaled .71). There were some differences in emphasis between the two groups. Students tended to place more weight on the instructor being interesting, having good speaking skills, and being available to help; students also focused more on the outcomes of instruction, e.g., what they learned. Faculty placed relatively more weight on intellectual challenge, motivating students, setting high standards, and fostering student self-initiated learning.

Alumni Ratings—Student ratings correlate with alumni ratings, .40 to .75 (Overall & Marsh, 1980; Braskamp & Ory, 1994). Feldman (1989a) found an average correlation of .69. This belies the conventional wisdom that the students will come to appreciate our teaching after they get into the real world as working adults.
An even narrower definition when using ratings for personnel decisions or the instructor's improvement. I suggested restricting bias to variables not a function of the instructor's teaching effectiveness. Thus, student motivation or class size might impact teaching effectiveness, but instructors should not be faulted if they were less effective teaching large classes of unmotivated students than their colleagues who were teaching small classes of motivated students. In this case, student motivation and class size, although related to teaching effectiveness, were not a function of the instructor's characteristics, but of student and course characteristics. Thus, they should be considered sources of bias, and should be controlled for by using appropriate comparative data. Feldman (1995, April) observed—accurately in my judgment—that such a definition of bias, while possibly acceptable, was not the usual definition and it served to confuse the literature. Marsh and Dunkin (1992)—considering that prior student interest in the subject matter is not a bias because it does impact teaching and learning—raise the question of "fairness," in comparing instructors teaching classes of interested students versus instructors teaching classes of uninterested students.

In the interest of clarity, rather than using "bias" in the restricted sense I did in the original paper, I will identify variables (when correlated with student ratings) that require control, especially when making personnel decisions.

**Variables Not Requires Control**

Despite widespread faculty concern, the research has uncovered relatively few variables that correlate with student ratings but are not related to instructional effectiveness. Generally the following variables tend to show little or no relationship to student ratings:

1. **Instructor variables not related to student ratings:**
   - Age and teaching experience—in general age, and also years of teaching experience, are not correlated with student ratings. However, where small differences have been found, they tend to be negative, i.e., older faculty receive lower ratings (Feldman, 1983). Marsh and Hocievar (1991) point out that most of the studies have been cross-sectional, studying different cohorts of faculty to represent different age groups. In a longitudinal study they analyzed student ratings of the same instructors for as long as 13 years. They found no systematic changes over the years.
   - Gender of the Instructor—in a review of 14 laboratory or experimental studies, e.g., where students rated descriptions of fictitious teachers, Feldman (1992) found no differences in global ratings in the majority of studies, but in a few studies the male teachers received higher ratings. In a second review of 28 studies of actual ratings of real teachers reporting global ratings, he (Feldman, 1993) found a very slight average difference in favor of women teachers ($r = .02$). However, a few studies raised the question of whether women faculty had to do more of what was being rated (e.g., being available to students) to obtain the same ratings as men. In a few other studies there was a gender of student/gender of instructor interaction, i.e., female students rated female teachers higher, and men students rated male instructors higher.
   - Race—Centra (1993) points out that there have been hardly any studies of the race of the instructor. He speculates that students of the same race as the instructor might rate the instructor higher. In a doctoral dissertation using IDEA, Li (1993) found no difference in the global ratings of Asian students compared to American students of their (presumably Caucasian) instructors.
   - Personality—few personality traits tend to correlate with student ratings (Braskamp & Ory, 1994; Centra, 1993). In studies measuring personality using instructor's self report (e.g., personality inventories, self-description questionnaires), Feldman (1986) found only two (out of fourteen) traits that had average correlation with a global item that approached practical significant correlations. These traits were positive self esteem ($r = .30$), and energy and enthusiasm ($r =$
Note: I suggest that these two traits enhance the instructor's teaching effectiveness and so should not be controlled. Murray, Rushton, and Pauw (1990) found significantly different patterns of personality traits of psychology instructors teaching six different types of courses, e.g., introductory, graduate. They concluded that instructors tend to be differentially suited to different types of courses.

5) research productivity—has little correlation with student ratings (Centra, 1993). In his review of the literature, Feldman (1987) found the average correlation between research productivity and overall teaching effectiveness items to be .12. This very low correlation suggests that research productivity is indicative neither of good teaching nor bad teaching.

B. Student variables not related to student ratings:
1) age of the student—(Centra, 1993).
2) gender of the student—(Feldman, 1977, 1993), but sometimes there is a gender of student/gender of instructor interaction (see above under instructor variables).
3) level of the student—e.g., freshman (McKeachie, 1979).
5) student's personality—(Abrami, Perry, & Leventhal, 1982).

C. Course variables not related to student ratings:
1) class size—although there is a tendency for smaller classes to receive higher ratings, it is a very weak inverse association, i.e., smaller classes receive higher ratings, average r = -.09 (Feldman, 1984). The average correlation of class size for the 38 IDEA items is -.14 (Sibury & Cashin, 1995a).
2) time of day when the course is taught—(Aleamoni, 1981; Feldman, 1978).

D. Administrative variables not related to student ratings:
1) time during the term when ratings are collected; any time during the second half seems to yield similar ratings—(Feldman, 1979).

Variables Possibly Requiring Control

The research cited above suggests that many variables suspected of biasing student ratings are not correlated with them to any practically significant degree. For the following variables, however, the research suggests that there are correlations—relationships—with student ratings that may require control.

A. Instructor variables related to student ratings:
1) faculty rank—regular faculty tend to receive higher ratings than graduate teaching assistants (Braskamp & Ory, 1994). This variable does NOT require control because regular faculty as a group tend to be more effective teachers than GTAs as a group.
2) expressiveness—the Dr. Fox effect (Naftulin, Ware, & Donnelly, 1973)—where a professional actor delivering little content received high ratings—suggests that student ratings may be more influenced by an instructor's style of presentation than by the substance of the content. The literature is complex (see Abrami, Leventhal, & Perry, 1982), but Marsh and Ware (1992) suggest that, especially in studies involving an incentive and a test, manipulations of instructor expressiveness primarily influence items related to instructor enthusiasm, and manipulation of content coverage primarily influences items related to instructor knowledge and student exam performance. Nevertheless, making the class interesting as well as informative helps students learn content. Expressiveness tends to enhance learning and does NOT require control.

B. Student variables related to student ratings:
1) student motivation— instructors are more likely to receive higher ratings in classes where students had a prior interest in the subject matter (Marsh & Dunkin, 1992), or were taking the course as an elective (Aleamoni, 1981; Braskamp & Ory, 1994; Centra, 1993; Feldman, 1978). The average correlation of the IDEA (Sibury & Cashin, 1995a) motivation item, "I had a strong desire to take this course," with the other 37 items is .40. Marsh and Dunkin (1992) conclude that reason for taking the course (which overlaps with student motivation), also is related to student ratings. Higher ratings were received from students who took a course for general interest, or as a major elective; lower ratings were received when the course is being taken as a major requirement or a general education requirement. This variable REQUIRES CONTROL.

2) expected grades—there tend to be positive, but low correlations (.10 to .30) between student ratings and expected grades (Braskamp & Ory, 1994; Feldman, 1976a; Howard & Maxwell, 1980 and 1982; Marsh & Dunkin, 1992). Three possible hypotheses have been proposed for these correlations. One is the validity hypothesis—the students who learned more earn higher grades and give higher ratings (therefore, student ratings are valid). Another explanation is grading leniency— instructors giving higher grades than the students deserve receive higher ratings than they deserve. A third is based on student characteristics—some student characteristics, e.g., high motivation, lead to greater learning and, therefore, to higher grades and higher ratings. In two studies by Howard and Maxwell (1980 & 1982), which used IDEA data, they concluded that most of the correlation between expected grade and a global instructor item was accounted for by student (self-reported) learning—the validity hypothesis—and desire to take the course—a student characteristic. To control for the possibility of grade leniency, my recommendation is to have peers (faculty knowledgeable in the subject matter) review the course material, particularly exams, computer scored test results, graded samples of essays, projects, etc.; and judge whether grades are inflated.

C. Course variables related to student ratings:
1) level of the course—higher level courses, especially graduate courses, tend to receive higher ratings (Aleamoni, 1981; Braskamp & Ory, 1994; Feldman, 1978). However, the differences tend to be small. Regarding possible control, check to see if your
Conclusion

D. Administrative variables related to student ratings

1. No student rating feedback = 0
2. Only student rating feedback = 75th percentile
3. Student rating feedback = 74th percentile
4. Student rating feedback = 75th percentile
5. Student rating feedback = 74th percentile
6. Student rating feedback = 75th percentile

End of Term

During term

50th percentile = 75th percentile
60th percentile = 74th percentile
70th percentile = 73rd percentile
80th percentile = 72nd percentile
90th percentile = 71st percentile
100th percentile = 70th percentile
This paper has summarized the general conclusions from the research on student ratings. Whether those conclusions hold true for any given campus is an empirical question. If an institution has reason to believe that they do not apply, it should gather local data to answer the question. However, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, I suggest that the general conclusions serve as a guide.
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OBJECTIVES FOR PARTICIPANTS

By the end of this workshop, you will be able to interpret student evaluation results, both your own and those of your colleagues', in a fair and statistically informed way.

You will also be able to mentally correct for known biases in student evaluation data.

Finally, you will learn a simple, department-based system for appraising teaching effectiveness by scholarly standards that integrates student and collegial evaluations.
ASSESSING TEACHING:

Making Sense out of Student Evaluations

Facilitated by:

Linda B. Nilson, Ph.D.
Director, Office of Teaching Effectiveness and Innovation
445 Brackett Hall * Clemson University
(864) 656-4542
nilson@clemson.edu * www.clemson.edu/OTEI
### Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Conceptual structure: Are ratings conceptually unidimensional or multidimensional?</th>
<th>Convergent validity: How well are ratings measures correlated with other indicators of effective teaching?</th>
<th>Discriminant validity: Are ratings influenced by variables unrelated to effective teaching?</th>
<th>Consequential validity: Are ratings results used in a fashion that is beneficial to the educational system?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greenwald &amp; Biddle</td>
<td>Like effective teaching, ratings are conceptually and empirically multidimensional. Their validity and particularly their usefulness as feedback are undermined by ignoring this multidimensionality.</td>
<td>Different dimensions of student ratings are consistently related to effective teaching criteria with which they are most logically related, thus supporting their construct validity.</td>
<td>Ratings are relatively unaffected by potential biases. Bias (misinterpretations typically fail to control valid effects on teaching) may be on teaching (e.g., class size, enthusiasm) that ratings accurately reflect.</td>
<td>Multidimensional ratings, augmented by consultation, improve teaching effectiveness, their most important purpose. Their use in personnel decisions, however, should be more informed and systematic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apolloni</td>
<td>Although teaching is multidimensional, ratings contain a large global factor, which consists of several highly correlated lower-order factors. Global student ratings or a weighted average of specific ratings are moderately correlated with teacher-produced student learning.</td>
<td>Global student ratings or a weighted average of specific ratings are moderately correlated with teacher-produced student learning.</td>
<td>Global student ratings or a weighted average of specific ratings are moderately correlated with teacher-produced student learning.</td>
<td>Global student ratings or a weighted average of specific ratings are moderately correlated with teacher-produced student learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiliens</td>
<td>Because student ratings are dominated by a global evaluative factor, many ratings items detect only this global evaluation rather than their intended distinctive content.</td>
<td>Ratings measure global student ratings or a weighted average of specific ratings are moderately correlated with teacher-produced student learning.</td>
<td>Ratings measure global student ratings or a weighted average of specific ratings are moderately correlated with teacher-produced student learning.</td>
<td>Ratings measure global student ratings or a weighted average of specific ratings are moderately correlated with teacher-produced student learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kooper &amp; Waite</td>
<td>There is a g factor in ratings, but there are also discriminable lower-order factors. Student ratings provide valid, albeit imperfect, measures of teaching effectiveness.</td>
<td>Student ratings provide valid, albeit imperfect, measures of teaching effectiveness.</td>
<td>Student ratings provide valid, albeit imperfect, measures of teaching effectiveness.</td>
<td>Student ratings provide valid, albeit imperfect, measures of teaching effectiveness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knapp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The quest for high ratings subtly induces lenient grading, which can both (a) reduce academic content of courses and (b) feed grade inflation. Ratings contribute to judgments of teaching effectiveness, but their use could be improved.
Dear Center

Are student ratings related to student learning?

Yes, according to a review of more than 30 studies conducted by Kenneth Feldman. Feldman expanded on the research originally conducted by Cohen, but Feldman looked at 31 different dimensions of instruction rather than using a single rating of overall effectiveness. Feldman, as did Cohen, used studies which measured students’ learning by their scores on an external exam—an exam developed by people other than the instructors. The weighted average correlations between the 26 instructional dimensions—where data were available—and student achievement ranged from .57 to .11, and all but three were statistically significant. The correlations for the 31 Instructional Dimensions are given below.

No. 5. Teacher’s Preparation; Organization of the Course = .57
No. 6. Clarity and Understandability = .56
No. 23. Instructor Pursued and/or Met Course Objectives = .49
No. 12. Perceived Outcome or Impact of Instruction = .46
No. 30. Overall Rating of Teacher as an Item of a Multi-Item Indicator = .39
No. 1. Teacher’s Stimulation of Interest in the Course and its Subject Matter = .38
No. 20. Teacher Motivates Students to Do their Best; High Standard of Performance Required = .36
No. 16. Teacher’s Encouragement of Questions and Discussion, and Openness to Opinions of Others = .36
No. 19. Teacher’s Availability and Helpfulness = .34
No. 7. Teacher’s Elocutionary Skills = .35
No. 9. Clarity and Course Objectives and Requirements = .35
No. 3. Teacher’s Knowledge of Subject = .34
No. 8. Teacher’s Sensitivity to, and Concern with, Class Level and Progress = .30
No. 2. Teacher’s Enthusiasm (for Subject or for Teaching) = .27

No. 13. Instructor’s Praise, Importance of Evaluation of Students; Quality of Examinations = .23
No. 25. Classroom Management = .26
No. 17. Intellectual Challenge and Encouragement of Independent Thought (by the Teacher and the Course) = .25
No. 14. Personality Characteristics (“Personality” of the Teacher = .24
No. 15. Nature, Quality, and Frequency of Feedback from the Teacher to Students = .23
No. 12. Teacher’s Concern and Respect for Students; Friendliness of the Teacher = .23
No. 26. Pleasantsness of Classroom Atmosphere = .23
No. 10. Nature and Value of the Course Material (including Its Usefulness and Relevance) = .17
No. 23. Difficulty of the Course (and Workload)—Description = .09—not significant
No. 24. Difficulty of the Course (and Workload)—Evaluation = .07—not significant
No. 11. Nature and Usefulness of Supplementary Materials and Teaching Aids = -.11—not significant
No. 4. Teacher’s Intellectual Expansiveness (and Intelligence) = No weighted average given
No. 21. Teacher’s Encouragement of Self-Initiated Learning = No weighted average given
No. 22. Teacher’s Productivity in Research and Related Activities = No entries
No. 27. Individualization of Teaching = No weighted average given
No. 29. Overall Rating of Lectures as an Item of a Multi-Item Indicator = No weighted average given
No. 31. Overall Rating of Course as an Item of a Multi-Item Indicator = No entries.

CORRELATES OF HIGH STUDENT RATINGS OF TEACHING OVERALL

- Enthusiasm/expressiveness
- Greater content/amount learned
- Higher challenge/difficulty (to a point)
- Clarity (explanations, examples)
- Organization/structure
- Rapport/participation/interaction
POSITIVE "BIASES" ON EVALUATIONS

Humanities, social sciences
vs. science, math, engineering,
and technical courses

Greater perceived importance/
impact of evaluations

Higher student motivation
- prior interest
- interactivity
- course level
- in major or an elective; not a
  required GenEd course

Higher expected grades
(maybe)
MYTHICAL BIASES

These variables have non-significant and/or inconsistent effects on ratings.

**Instructor:**
- gender
- age/years of experience
- personality type (as tested)
- research productivity

**Student:**
- gender
- age
- level/year
- GPA
- personality type (as tested)

**Course/class:**
- size (slightly curvilinear)
- time of day
- time in semester
COMMON ERRORS MADE IN INTERPRETING STUDENT EVALUATION RESULTS

Creating a "summary index" by adding up the means across items (e.g., #1-#9), especially when done across classes without weighing for class size

Comparing such "summary indices" across different evaluation forms with different items

Ranking faculty by the overall-item means (#10) -- or the means of any other item(s). Compare means only against a "pre-set rating of acceptability."
Expecting ratings to normally distributed; (bell curve); they are *positively skewed*.

Using 1 evaluation form to assess the “composite effectiveness” of 2 different instructors in a team-taught course

Putting stock in small-class results ($\leq 10$)

Confusing mean and median

Using standard deviation as a confidence interval. S.D. = dispersion, lack of consensus

Not mentally correcting for known biases -- course level & how much required
ASSESSING TEACHING:

Integrating Collegial and Student Evaluations within Standards of Scholarship

Facilitated by:

Linda B. Nilson, Ph.D.
Director, Office of Teaching Effectiveness and Innovation
445 Brackett Hall * Clemson University
(864) 656-4542
nilson@clemson.edu * www.clemson.edu/OTEI
OBJECTIVES FOR PARTICIPANTS

By the end of this workshop, you will have collectively developed a workable and theoretically informed framework for assessing the teaching of your colleagues, suitable for promotion and tenure decisions.

The framework will be grounded in established standards for evaluating scholarship and will integrate both student evaluations and peer review.
1) To what extent do you consider teaching in tenure and promotion decisions now?

2) How do you assess teaching now?

3) What problems have you encountered or what concerns do you have about assessing teaching?
Report Says Standards Used to Evaluate Research Should Also Be Used for Teaching and Service

Carnegie Foundation issues follow-up to influential study "Scholarship Reconsidered"

BY DENISE K. MAGNER

EVALUATING THE FACULTY

A Carnegie survey of 4-year colleges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE SCALES</th>
<th>Ranked</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-evaluation</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer review</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of research impact</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of the impact of scholarship</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The report finds that 74% of the respondents said they were satisfied with the quality of research conducted by their faculty. Only 16% said they were not satisfied. In terms of teaching, 10% said they were not satisfied. In terms of service, 10% said they were not satisfied.

"We are convinced that it is indeed possible to find standards that can be applied to each kind of scholarly work," said Dr. Glaisick, a senior associate at the Carnegie foundation.

"It is in the interest of those who wish to make the most of their university years to ensure that faculty members are working on campus committees, but what is called the "application of knowledge," in which scholarly efforts are focused on helping the local community, the state, or the nation on important issues of the day.

Some institutions have made more than talk about the foundation's ideas. Dr. Glaisick said he had anecdotal evidence that some colleges had changed their promotion and tenure policies in an effort to reward the multiple roles of faculty members. But he said: "We're going to have to look back 10 years from now to see if this movement really takes hold.

Last fall, Kent State University adopted a new policy on faculty promotion, using some of the language from "Scholarship Reconsidered," that expanded how it defines "scholarship," said Myron S. Freny, the provost. "Not all people contribute to the productiviy of a department in the same way," he said. Some professors are doing critical research, he said, while others are making important contributions to the curriculum.

"We want to value those varied contributions as long as faculty are sustainably engaged."

This doesn't mean that Kent State is ready to start handing out tenure to people whose research record is weak but who are excellent teachers. Faculty leaders and administrators are now working on a new tenure policy. Applying the foundation's ideas to a tenure code has been "a little more challenging," Dr. Freny said. "The language of the policy will emphasize an expanded view of scholarship, but other factors have to be taken into account. A faculty member has to connect with the profession in appropriate ways, and the years one to seven of a career may be the most vulnerable."

"A MOVEMENT AFOOT"

Kent State officials believe they are breaking new ground. The Carnegie foundation was itself interested in how many institutions were actually changing the way faculty roles are defined and faculty work was rewarded. As part of the report, it conducted a national survey in 1990 of 1,380 four-year colleges and universities and heard back from 485 chief academic officers, for a response rate of 36 percent.

The results are published for the first time in "Scholarship Reconsidered." The survey found that a movement to examine faculty roles and rewards was indeed under way. More than 80 percent of the respondents said they were looking into the topic or planned to do so. At least three-quarters said they had already made changes to reward good teaching, such as giving awards for teaching excellence or offering sabbaticals for professors to improve their teaching.

However, only 50 percent said they were going to reward good teaching, and only 28 percent had established centers for improving teaching on campus.

While 69 percent of the institutions said...
they had developed new methods of evaluating teaching, less progress was reported on other types of work by faculty members. Only 38 per cent of the respondents said they had devised new ways of evaluating applied scholarship or student advising.

The main criticism of the 1990 report was that it offered some fine ideas but little guidance about how to evaluate teaching and service in as rigorous a way as is used for research. The same charge is likely to be leveled at "Scholarship Assessed," which includes some practical suggestions but is mainly philosophical in tone.

"It's more important to paint these general directions and let individual institutions fill in the blanks for themselves," said Mr. Maeroff, director of the Hechinger Institute for Education and the Media at Teachers College of Columbia University.

He said the report was not intended as an attack on traditional research, but as a way for "teaching, application, and integration of knowledge to get their proper due without diminishing research."

The Carnegie foundation now plans to survey institutions to determine which ones are making use of the two reports. It hopes to bring officials from those campuses together for a conference in 1998.

Copies of "Scholarship Assessed" are available for $15.95 each from Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers, 350 Sansome Street, Fifth Floor, San Francisco 94104; by calling (800) 378-2537; or by sending a fax to (800) 663-2665.
STANDARDS FOR ASSESSING TEACHING AS SCHOLARSHIP

1. Clear, appropriate goals/objectives (student learning objectives/outcomes)

2. Adequate preparation, background

3. Appropriate teaching methods to meet the goals/objectives

4. Significant results, value (student learning, motivation, interest)

5. Clear, effective communication for the (student) audience

6. Reflective evaluation
EFFICIENT ASSESSMENT

Document for QUALITY

Provide detailed evidence of "the best I can do" by the six standards.

List for QUANTITY

List basic information on other courses, professional development activities, student advising/mentoring, teaching-related committee work, etc.
TO ASSESS

1. Clear, appropriate goals/objectives

COLLEAGUES:

Specific learning objectives for course (syllabus)

Graded exams and papers (match with objectives)

STUDENTS (EVALUATIONS):

"Learning objectives were well defined."

"Exams and papers served the stated objectives."

"Class periods were organized around clear objectives."

TO ASSESS

90
2. Adequate preparation, background

COLLEAGUES:

Quality of syllabus (complete, well organized)

Quality and currency of course topics, readings, and other materials

STUDENTS (EVALUATIONS):

"Instructor was well prepared for classes."

"Instructor knew the material."

"Instructor was helpful outside of class."

TO ASSESS

91
3. Appropriate methods to meet goals

COLLEAGUES:

Match between objectives and
a) reading assignments (syllabus)
b) writing assignments (syllabus and assignment directions)
c) in-class activities (syllabus and handouts)

STUDENTS (EVALUATIONS):

“Doing the homework assignments better prepared you for exams and papers.”

“In-class activities helped you acquire the skills and knowledge on which you were tested and graded.”

“How difficult were the course requirements?”

“How fair was the grading?”
TO ASSESS

4. Significant results, value

STUDENTS (LEARNING):

Results on standardized tests

Pretest-posttest comparisons (first-day diagnostic test/essay and comparable final exam/paper)

STUDENTS (EVALUATIONS):

"Instructor motivated you to learn."

"Instructor stimulated your interest in the material."

"How intellectually challenging was the course?"

"How much did you learn?"

"Would you recommend this course to a friend?"
5. Clear, effective communication for audience

STUDENTS (EVALUATIONS)

“Syllabus was easy to read and understand.”

“Directions for assignments and tests were clear and complete.”

“Course was clearly and logically organized.”

“Instructor’s explanations were clear and helpful.”

“Instructor communicated effectively.”

“Instructor provided the background for understanding the readings.”
6. Reflective evaluation

INSTRUCTOR'S WRITTEN SELF-ASSESSMENT:

What did I do in advance to improve my teaching of this course?

What went well in the course?

What merits change?

How do I plan to improve my teaching further? (e.g., faculty development activities)
Each issue of the Open Forum shall include the following notification as a heading below the masthead: "Any member of the Clemson University Faculty, Staff, Administration (on-campus and of-campus) may submit items for publication in the Open Forum. Views presented are not necessarily those of the Faculty Senate or of the editor(s) of the Open Forum."
MEMORANDUM

TO: Alan Grubb, President
FROM: Alan Schaffer, Editor

RE: Composition of university honors committee

At its July meeting, the Policy Committee unanimously accepted the following revision in the composition of the university’s honors committee:

“Membership consists of five faculty members, one from each college elected for a three-year term. Colleges shall elect from their ranks faculty with experience and interest in the Honors College as indicated by such activities as teaching honors courses, directing honors theses and research projects, and serving on honors committees at the department and college level. Other voting members are: one member of the Faculty Senate elected for a one-year term; two faculty members, each serving two-year terms and appointed by the Director of the Honors College from the combined constituencies of the Dixon Senior Fellows, Calhoun Honors seminar instructors, and Bradbury Award recipients; one student member of the Dixon Fellows Program elected by the other fellows; one student member of the Calhoun Society elected by the members of the Society; one honors student appointed by the Director of the Honors College. All student members shall serve one-year terms. Non-voting members are the Director, Associate Director, and Assistant Director of the Honors College, and one representative from the Office of Undergraduate Admissions.”

If accepted by the Senate and approved by the Provost, this would replace the section on the composition of the honors committee in Section VI, page 36 of the Faculty Manual.

I would appreciate it if you would place this on the agenda for the August meeting of the Faculty Senate.

cc: John Huffman
    Steve Wainscott
    Cathy Sturkie
MEMORANDUM

TO: Alan Grubb, President
FROM: Alan Schaffer, Editor

RE: Time limit for submission of documents in a grievance

At its July meeting, the Policy Committee unanimously approved the following addition to the section on Grievances in the Faculty Manual:

"All written evidence submitted by all parties to the grievance hearing must be received by the chair of the hearing panel not less than 7 days prior to the date set for the hearing; any material received after that date may be allowed or excluded by the hearing panel at its discretion."

If accepted by the Senate and approved by the Provost, this change will be inserted into the Faculty Manual section on grievances, specifically into the second paragraph on page 30 after the words "...original is not readily available."

I would appreciate it if you would put this on the agenda for the August meeting of the Faculty Senate.

cc: John Huffman
    Cathy Sturkie
RESOLUTION ON SEARCHES AND SEARCH COMMITTEES

FS01-8-1 P

Whereas, There have been a number of recent incidents in which search committees for academic administrators and/or faculty members have not been selected in accordance with the Faculty Manual; and

Whereas, Searches carried out by these improperly constituted committees have not been carried out in accordance with the provisions in the Faculty Manual; and

Whereas, The role of the faculty in the selection of these committees and the resulting appointments have been improperly abridged; and

Whereas, Such continued and egregious violations of the Faculty Manual contribute significantly to an unnecessarily adversarial relationship between the faculty and the University's academic administration;

Therefore be it:

Resolved, That it is the position of the Faculty Senate that any Academic Administrator who is appointed as the result of an improper search shall be considered to be in a de facto interim position, and that a proper search must be carried out subsequently, and

Further resolved, That the Faculty Senate respectfully requests that the Interim Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs emphasize to the Deans in the most forceful manner possible that the procedures contained in the Faculty Manual must be followed and that she will not permit the appointment of any academic administrator or faculty member selected by other procedures.

This resolution was passed by the Faculty Senate on August 21, 2001.
THE SEPTEMBER 11, 2001

FACULTY SENATE MEETING

WAS CANCELED

DUE TO THE WORLD TOWER TRAGEDY
Call to Order: The Faculty Senate Meeting was called to order at 2:36 p.m. by President Alan Grubb.

Approval of Minutes: The Faculty Senate Minutes and the Academic Convocation Minutes both dated August 21, 2001 were approved as written.

“Free Speech”: President Grubb reminded Senators

Special Order of the Day – Christian E. G. Przirembel, Vice President for Research, summarized his approach to this newly-acquired position. The underlying axiom how Dr. Przirembel views his position is that the University is a community of scholarship and that his focus will be to champion the University research and scholarship areas. A main objective of his since 1981 has been to grow national recognition of whatever he is doing at the time and now that will be to move Clemson University forward in national recognition into the Top 20. The guiding principle of Dr. Przirembel will be the pursuit of excellence with a passion to optimize faculty time and to uphold the ethics and honesty of the system. Dr. Przirembel plans to meet with the faculty of each college to understand the current faculty strengths and look at where potential faculty strengths are to match potential strengths with emerging areas of funding. Measures for national recognition will be identified by department chairs and faculty as will barriers and possible solutions. Other issues to be addressed are compliance and technology export control (because it is not well defined) and research misconduct. Questions and answers were then exchanged.

Committee Reports
a. Senate Committees
   1) Research Committee – Senator Dan Warner, Chair, noted that this Committee was working on two items: updating the Faculty Manual to reflect the new Research structure and revising the Policy on Research Ethics.

   2) Welfare Committee – Chair Connie Lee provided an update on the issues this Committee is pursuing. Regarding the issue of sick leave for nine month employees, Jim Daniels informed her that President Barker must approve requests for changes that go to the legislature. The committee will prepare a letter to President Barker. Information is being gathered from chambers of commerce and University groups on the issue of spousal/partner employment. Dr. Lee met with the Provost who wants the Committee to devise a Clemson friendly and specific program. The salary
issue is on hold. Regarding the opportunity for nine-month faculty to be paid over twelve months, Dr. Lee referred to the Reports dated September 5 and 10, 2001 (Attachment A).

3) **Finance Committee** – No report.

4) **Policy Committee** – Senator John Huffman, Chair, stated that the Committee met on September 18. Dr. Huffman explained the history of the issue probationary period extension for parenting (Attachment B), noting that it had been discussed in both the Policy Committee and the Women’s Commission with differences of opinion. Senators are to respond to Dr. Huffman by October 23rd with their thoughts. Methods of appointment of Senior Lecturers and the TERI issue will be discussed at the next meeting. A proposed ethics policy from the College of Architecture, Arts, & Humanities will be addressed by the Policy Committee after it has been reviewed by the deans.

5) **Scholastic Policies** – Senator Jim Zimmerman, Chair, noted that the Committee had met twice since the last Faculty Senate meeting and submitted and briefly explained the Committee Reports dated September 18, 2001 and October 2, 2001 (Attachment C).

b. **University Commissions and Committees**

1) Senator Brenda Vander Mey informed the Senate that an analysis performed by the Women’s Commission of policies and procedures related to several different issues will be shared with the Welfare Committee.

2) **University Assessment Committee** – Senator Zimmerman announced that a draft report should be available from this Committee next week on the share drive.

c. **Board of Trustees Committee Meetings** – President Grubb thanked those Senate liaisons who were able to attend various committee meetings and encouraged all Senators to try to attend them whenever possible in the future. These meetings are open and those who attend will learn a lot about how the Board operates and will find them beneficial.

6. **Old Business:** None

7. **President’s Remarks:**

a. President Grubb noted that he believes the Faculty Senate Retreat was successful even though we could only hold half of the event due to the tragedy on September 11, 2001. Our intention is to reschedule the portions of the Retreat that had to be canceled prior to Faculty Senate meetings.
b. President Grubb called attention to Part I, Section C. of the *Faculty Manual* which contains proper procedures for allegations of *Faculty Manual* violations. President Grubb further noted that as Senators work with deans and department chairs, to remember that the *Faculty Manual* must always be followed.

c. President Grubb attended the Student Senate Retreat. A discussion of plus/minus grading was held and President Grubb stated that something good will come out of it with all groups participating in discussions and working on this issue.

d. Senators Rudy Abramovitch and Mark Snyder were thanked by President Grubb for their work in editing and distributing the recent *Open Forum*. Professor John Meriwether was thanked for expressing his views in this Senate publication. The *Open Forum* is a good way to work out problems and bring attention to possible solutions. This form of communication is very positive and constructive for the University.

e. President Grubb attended the Graduate Summit which was very successful. Interesting statistics about the growth of the program were shared.

f. The work of the Provost Search Committee is progressing. Over fifty applications have been received. The deadline to invite candidates to campus in January will be met.

 g. President Grubb announced that the Budget Accountability Committee has been reconstituted. Hal Harris will chair and other Faculty Senate representatives are Doug Rippy and Brenda Vander Mey. President Grubb noted that the salary report should be available soon and that this year we will more than likely have two reports. Provost Helms then took the floor to share the Criteria, Guidelines and Process for Performance-Based Salary Increases and requested the advice of the Faculty Senate. During discussion, it was suggested that the administrators’ pool of monies be kept in the Provost’s Office for her distribution determination and that the guidelines should most certainly be shared with all faculty. The Provost asked for a show of hands to move forward with this performance-based salary increase. The Faculty Senate responded positively.

8. New Business:

a. Senator Zimmerman moved to accept adoption of “Major Changes to Undeclared” (Attachment D). Vote was taken and permission to change majors to “Undeclared” and be advised by Academic Support Center passed.

a. Senator Huffman submitted, explained, and moved acceptance of the *Faculty Manual* change, Academic Integrity Committee. There was no discussion. Vote to accept *Manual* change was taken and passed unanimously (Attachment E).
c. Senator Huffman submitted, explained, and moved acceptance of the *Faculty Manual* change, Appointment of Academic Administrators in Conformity with *Faculty Manual*. There was no discussion. Vote to accept *Manual* change was taken and passed unanimously (Attachment F).

d. Senator Huffman moved, submitted, and explained the *Faculty Manual* addition regarding the Administrative Council. There was no discussion. Vote to approve addition was taken and passed unanimously (Attachment G).

e. Senator Lee asked the Faculty Senate if the Welfare Committee should continue to pursue the issue of nine-month faculty getting paid over twelve months. After much discussion, Senator Lee withdrew the question and stated that she will talk again with Ron Herrin of Human Resources about his offer to work with faculty. The issue of whether or not to pursue will be undertaken at next month’s Senate meeting.

9. Announcements:

a. President Grubb reminded the Senators that the Class of ’39 Award for Excellence nominations are due to the Faculty Senate Office no later than October 23, 2001.

b. President Grubb reminded all to be sure to visit the Martin Inn to see the First Sun Connector Display honoring faculty; Senator Wayne Chapman, in particular.

10. Adjournment: President Grubb adjourned the meeting at 5:08 p.m.

Kelly Smith, Faculty Senate Secretary

Cathy Toth Sturkie, Administrative Assistant

Absent: Miller, Guffey, Placone, Malloy, B. Lee
Faculty Senate Welfare Committee Report

Date: 9/5/2001
To: Connie Lee
From: Pamela Dunston
RE: 12-Month Pay for 9-Month Employees

I met with Ron Herrin in June 2001 to discuss issues related to full-time Clemson faculty members having the option of being paid on a 12-month basis rather than the 9-month, academic-year system currently being used. According to Mr. Herrin, the Office of Payroll and Benefits is willing to consider the possibility of full-time faculty being paid over a 12-month period. However, Mr. Herrin requested that the Faculty Senate poll current, full-time faculty members to determine the level of interest. At least 10% of the faculty (400 people minimum) must be interested in the 12-month pay option before Payroll and Benefits can warrant expenditure of the time and money needed to make changes to the current pay roll system. According to Mr. Herrin, changes to the current pay system would require several months lead time before a new system could be fully functional. If faculty members are allowed to elect a 9- or 12-month pay system, each and every employee's payroll record would have to be set up by hand due to variations in individual deductions, credit union accounts, and automatically deducted loan and bill payments.

Another factor that faculty members must consider, according to Mr. Herrin, is income tax deductions. Currently, tax deductions are based on a faculty member's gross salary paid across a 9-month period. The same gross salary paid over a 12-month period could result in less income tax being withheld from each paycheck. When faculty members file tax returns at the end of the year, those paid on a 12-month system could end up owing federal income tax due to under-withholding of income tax during the year. That is, under a 12-month pay system the amount of tax withheld from each paycheck could be reduced while the individual's tax liability remains unchanged. As a result, individuals may under-pay federal income taxes throughout the year and would have to make up the difference when filing their returns.

Mr. Herrin suggests that rather than changing the payroll system, individual faculty members should consult with him or another Employee Benefits counselor to arrange a payroll deduction plan that would allow the employee to have "summer" money set aside each month in a credit union savings account.

PJD
I have new information that needs to be added to the report on Tuesday. My husband, Bill, works for the IRS and he has investigated the issue of employees electing 9-month or 12-month pay periods.

According to Income Tax law, 9-month employees cannot elect when to receive their pay. Employees do not have this right, according to the IRS, due to income tax withholding issues. If a 9-month employee decided to receive pay over a 12-month period, in effect, they would be deferring income (and income tax) to another tax year. IRS does not allow deferment of taxes from one year to another.

The employer may choose, for business reasons, to pay 9-month employees over a 12-month period but that decision rest with the employer. This issue is laid out in the tax laws pertaining to employers' withholding of employees' income taxes. I have a few IRS statements concerning this issue that I can share with other members of the Welfare Committee and/or Faculty Senate if you would like. At any rate, the decision to change over to a 12-month pay period could be mutually agreed upon between the University and faculty but would have to adhere to tax law.

Upon request, we can ask that an official IRS position statement of the law be written for us. To pursue the possibility of 9-month employees receiving pay over a 12-month period, I will need to talk with University accountants to determine whether two pay systems are possible. From a business sense, I cannot imagine the University benefiting from a two-pay system model that would accommodate the needs of a few employees.

I recommend the Welfare Committee poll the faculty to determine the level of interest in a 12-month pay system before we pursue this issue further.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Alan Grubb
FROM: Alan Schaffer

RE: Probationary period extension for parenting

At its August meeting the Policy Committee approved a change in the probationary period prior to tenure consideration. The additional language reads as follows:

“Probationary faculty who give birth or father or adopt a child under the age of six during their probationary period shall, at their request, receive a one-year extension of the tenure decision date. Requests for such extension must come within two months of the event via the department chair and must be approved by both the college dean and the Provost. Normally, a maximum of two such extensions may be granted.”

The Committee asked that you send this on to the Senate’s Welfare Committee for consideration prior to bringing it before a meeting of the Faculty Senate.

cc: John Huffman
Cathy Sturkie
Minutes
Scholastic Policies Committee
September 18, 2001

Present: Frances Chamberlain, Camille Cooper, Mickey Hall, Gary Kirby, Ed Moise, Kelly Smith, Ryan Solomon, and Jim Zimmerman

Report from September 14 meeting of the Council on Undergraduate Studies

The Recommendations on Advising Policy that was approved by the Faculty Senate at the April 10, 2001 meeting was with the change of one “will” to “shall” in the wording of Goal II. 4.

A proposal from last year’s Student Government regarding Academic Integrity was sent to a committee formed by Dr. Carter and was also sent to the Scholastic Policies Committee for discussion. At least initially, Jim Zimmerman will represent the Committee. The first meeting will be September 21.

The Senate’s proposal on the introduction of +/- grading was sent to committee with essentially no discussion. The committee will be faculty members Jim Zimmerman, Patty Conner-Green, and Fran McGuire; student members Ryan Solomon and Julie Clark; and Registrar Stan Smith. The first scheduled meeting will be October 5.

Other Business

There was continued discussion concerning the +/- proposal. This issue will be addressed by Student Senate. For information, Jim Zimmerman indicated that, in addition to Iowa, already identified by Registrar Smith, Stanford, Rice, Cornell, Columbia, the University of Oregon, and New Haven University use the A+ = 4.3 system. Additional schools will be added to this list as located. Ryan Solomon indicated that the proposal was to be discussed in the Student Senate. Committee members indicated a strong desire that there be a clear decision on the matter and that if approved, the procedures for implementation begin by the end of this academic year.

Jim Zimmerman reported on a meeting with Joy Smith, Student Affairs, about University excused absences. He was assured that any notices from her office are only to confirm that the activity is recognized by the University. The faculty member is free to excuse the student or not.

There was discussion concerning students who have GPRs less than 2.0 and who would like to transfer out of their current major. The following resolution was passed.

******************************
Some students choose majors for which they are academically unsuited and consequently earn GPRs less than 2.0. Many of these students would like to transfer from their declared majors, but cannot because of their low GPRs. This situation leaves them with departmental advisors who are no longer appropriate.

These students should be allowed to change majors to "Undeclared" and to be advised by the newly created Academic Support Center.

********************

The next meeting will be at 3:30, October 2, in the Jordan Room.

Jim Zimmerman
Minutes
Scholastic Policies Committee Meeting
October 2, 2001

Present were: Frances Chamberlain, Camille Cooper, Gary Kirby, Ed Moise, Ryan Solomon, Brenda Vander Mey and Jim Zimmerman

Camille Cooper gave a report on the Educational Policy Committee Meeting of the Board of Trustees held September 20. Beginning in Fall 2002, laptop computers will now be mandatory for freshmen and sophomores in the College of Engineering and Science and for freshmen in the College of Business and Behavioral Science. The other three colleges will be included at a later date.

Jim Zimmerman reported on a subcommittee meeting of the Council on Undergraduate Studies concerning Academic Integrity Violations. A policy was adopted by the subcommittee for consideration by the Undergraduate Council that reads “If a student is charged with academic dishonesty, he or she may not withdraw from the course unless he or she is exonerated of the charge.” Jim Zimmerman reported that a suggestion from a member of the Advisory/Executive committee was made that would add the phrase, “without the faculty member’s permission.”

Committee members had been provided an email from Joy Smith concerning wording of footnotes on notices from Student Affairs concerning students going to meetings. Ms. Smith proposed wording to indicate students had been invited to... rather than will be attending.... The committee indicated their approval of the change. Jim Zimmerman will discuss this again with Ms. Smith.

The first meeting of the subcommittee of the Council on Undergraduate Studies concerning +/- grading will be held October 5. Stan Smith indicated earlier in the week the need to include someone from the Graduate School and a graduate student representative.

The entire committee membership present indicated a strong desire for the University to purchase a site license that would allow faculty to check student work for plagiarism.

A suggestion of developing a policy regarding pledging and GPR was decided to be outside the scope of this committee.

The next meeting is scheduled for October 23 at 3:30 in the Jordan Room.
MAJOR CHANGES TO UNDECLARED

Some students choose majors for which they are academically unsuited and consequently earn GPRs less than 2.0. Many of these students would like to transfer from their declared majors, but cannot because of their low GPRs. This situation leaves them with departmental advisors who are no longer appropriate.

These students should be allowed to change majors to “Undeclared” and to be advised by the newly created Academic Support Center.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Alan Grubb, President
FROM: Alan Schaffer, Editorial Consultant

RE: Academic Integrity Committee

At its August meeting the Senate's policy committee approved a change in the Faculty Manual description of the Academic Integrity Committee. The following language is meant to replace the language on page VI-3 of the Manual to bring it into conformity with what is now in the Undergraduate Announcements:

g. **Academic Integrity Committee** hears cases concerning possible academic dishonesty by undergraduate students. The committee’s procedures and the penalties it may impose are set forth in the current Undergraduate Announcements.

The committee is composed of two tenured faculty elected from each college for a two year term, and ten undergraduate students, two from each college, nominated by the student body president and appointed by the Provost for two year terms. Terms for both faculty and students begin with fall semester late registration.

h. **Academic Grievance Committee** hears cases concerning possible discrimination in academics brought by an undergraduate student against a member of the faculty or a staff member of the university. The committee is also empowered to hear cases concerning grievances of a personal or professional nature involving an individual undergraduate student and a faculty member. A full description of the committee and its procedures are in the current Undergraduate Announcements.

The committee is composed of three faculty from each college appointed by the respective collegiate dean, twelve undergraduates nominated by the student body president, approved by the student senate, and appointed by the Provost, and the dean of student life or his/her designee. Faculty serve three year terms; students serve one year terms, all commencing with fall semester late registration. The senior vice-provost for undergraduate studies appoints the chair from among those faculty members who have previously served.

I would appreciate it if you would bring this up at the next meeting of the Faculty Senate.

cc: John Huffman
    Cathy Sturkie
MEMORANDUM

TO: John Huffman
FROM: Alan Schaffer

RE: Appointment of academic administrators in conformity with *Faculty Manual*

The appropriate place to put some kind of statement is on page II-6, section K, Selection of the President and Other Academic Administrators. The language would go at the end of the paragraph beginning with the words, “The selection and appointment of all academic administrators . . . . “ The full paragraph would read (new material in bold):

“The selection and appointment of all academic administrators shall be in conformity with applicable university affirmative action policies and procedures. In particular, in the selection of each search and screening committee, black and female representatives shall be included whenever feasible. In all appointments subject to the approval of the Provost, the dean, committee chair, or other individual making the recommendation must certify in writing that the procedures used in establishing the search committee and conducting the search itself were in conformity with the procedures outlined in the *Faculty Manual.*”

We need to suggest to the Provost that the certification called for needs to be on one of the existing forms, but I don’t think that needs to be in the *Manual.*

cc: A. Grubb
    C. Sturkie
20 September 2001

MEMORANDUM

TO: Alan Grubb, President, Faculty Senate
FROM: Alan Schaffer, Editorial Consultant
RE: Addition to Faculty Manual

This item comes to us from the self-study Committee on Organization and Administration through Debbie Jackson. Since it is not from a Senate committee I think the proper procedure is for you to introduce it under "new business." If accepted by the Senate and approved by the Provost it would become the first item in Section 6 under Councils, Commissions, and Committees reporting to the President. This is not a new addition to our administrative structure; this council has been in existence for a long time but has never been listed in the Faculty Manual.

"Administrative Council. The President, as chief executive officer of the university, is charged with administering the university in accordance with policies adopted by the Board of Trustees and with primary responsibility for leadership and planning. In order to carry out the charges of office effectively and efficiently, the President may convene administrative leaders, including, but not limited to, those administrators who report directly to the President.

The administrative council meetings primarily serve as staff meetings between the President and those individuals reporting to him or her. The administrative council assists the President in planning for the University; reports information and action items to the President; provides advice or counsel to the President about activities in each area of the university; and demonstrates leadership in developing, implementing, and/or evaluating university policies.

I would appreciate it if you would add this item to the agenda for the next Senate meeting.

cc: Debbie Jackson, assistant to the President
Cathy Sturkie
1. Call to Order: The Faculty Senate Meeting was called to order at 2:39 p.m. by President Alan Grubb.

2. Approval of Minutes: The Faculty Senate Minutes dated October 9, 2001 were approved as written.

3. Class of '39 Award for Excellence:
   a. President Grubb appointed Senator Frances Chamberlain to assist with the Class of '39 ballot count.
   b. The election of the 2001 Class of '39 Award for Excellence recipient was held by secret ballot.

4. "Free Speech": None

5. Special Order of the Day: Cathy Sams, Chief Public Affairs Officer, described the criteria and selection process by U. S. News and World Report for inclusion within their Top 20 Public Universities. Ms. Sams also shared information and criteria to be undertaken by Clemson University in order to achieve this status by 2010. Questions and answers were then exchanged.

6. Committee Reports
   a. Senate Committees
      1) Research Committee – Senator Dan Warner, Chair, reported that this Committee met on October 23rd. Committee members revised the new research administrative structure and required changes to the Faculty Manual (Part VI, F). This Committee also looked over the Research Ethics Policy and will bring proposed changes to the full Senate at a later date.

      2) Welfare Committee – Chair Connie Lee submitted the Welfare Committee Report dated October 30, 2001 (Attachment A) and provided an update noting that she and President Grubb will meet with the President of the Clemson Chamber of Commerce on November 21st. The Welfare Committee will next meet on December 7th.

      3) Finance Committee – No report.
4) **Policy Committee** – Senator John Huffman, Chair, stated that this Committee met on October 23 and will meet again on November 20, 2002 at 3:30 p.m. in the Second Floor Conference Room of the Library. At the October meeting, the Committee discussed workload reporting (Committee is satisfied that it is not really a problem) and passed *Faculty Manual* changes that will be brought forward to the Senate under New Business. At its next meeting the Committee will discuss what documents go upward in the Post Tenure Review process. The Policy Committee received an allegation of a *Faculty Manual* violation (procedures to address violations are contained within the *Manual*). The Vice President/President Elect of the Faculty Senate, the Chair of the Faculty Senate Policy Committee, and the Faculty Manual Editorial Consultant met with the dean of the college to discuss the matter. It was pointed out to the dean that procedures to follow are in place and are to be followed until changed officially. Suggestions were offered to the dean from the Faculty Senate representatives. John Huffman, as Chair of the Policy Committee, met later with the Interim Provost and a resolution to this matter was obtained. Senator Huffman stated that the Faculty Senate representatives did the best they could not to harm any individuals and not cause any dissent between the Faculty Senate and the administration. The Provost noted that the Faculty Senate did the right thing to make sure faculty are protected and that she would not want any instance such as this to harm the faculty. Much discussion followed.

5) **Scholastic Policies** – Senator Jim Zimmerman, Chair, submitted and explained the Committee Report dated October 23, 2001 (Attachment B).

b. **University Commissions and Committees**

1) Senator Brenda Vander Mey informed the Senate that the Budget Accountability Committee will meet on November 14th at 10:00 a.m., Barre Hall; Hal Harris, Chair.

2) Senator Vander Mey reminded the Senate of the Peer Institution Study: Workplace Climate Policies & Resources conducted by the President’s Commission on the Status of Women at Clemson University (Attachment C).

7. **Old Business:**

a. Following a description of the history of the issue of nine-month faculty being paid over twelve months and much discussion, Senators C. Lee and Pamela Dunston sought a response to the question of whether or not to pursue this issue. Vote was taken and failed. This issue will not be pursued further.

8. **President’s Remarks:** President Grubb

a. Stated that the function of the Faculty Senate is not one of policing University policies and administration but rather to uphold the existing policies contained within the *Faculty Manual*.
b. noted that he learned at the President's Cabinet that based on a national assessment student drinking at Clemson University is alarming.

c. received a communication from the Provost requesting that items be put under New Business at today's meeting. President Grubb will forward to the appropriate committees to address as quickly as possible.

d. stated that he met with the Grievance Board to begin organizing a grievance workshop to learn how to deal with all the issues involved in the grievance process. Presenters and those invited to attend are actively involved at various levels of the Grievance process. This workshop is scheduled for February 7th and further information is forthcoming.

e. reminded senators to forward names of nominees for the Grievance Board and those for Grievance Counselors for slate consideration by the Advisory Committee and final election by the Faculty Senate.

f. noted that he and Kinly Sturkie will attend a meeting this Friday in Columbia with the members of the Council of Faculty Senate Presidents/Chairs of public institutions in South Carolina in an effort to exchange information on budget matters and other relative issues and noted that he hopes something positive will result from these meetings.

9. New Business:
   a. Senator Huffman submitted, explained, and moved acceptance of the Faculty Manual change, Senior Lecturer Rank. There was no discussion. Vote to accept Manual change was taken and passed unanimously (Attachment D).

   b. Senator Huffman submitted, explained, and moved acceptance of the Faculty Manual change, Post-Tenure Review Clarification. There was no discussion. Vote to accept Manual change was taken and passed unanimously (Attachment E).

   c. Senator Huffman submitted, explained, and moved acceptance of the Faculty Manual change, Change in Probationary Period for New Faculty. There was no discussion. Vote to accept Manual change was taken and passed unanimously (Attachment F).

   d. Senator Huffman submitted, explained, and moved acceptance of the Faculty Manual change, Probationary Period Extension for Parenting. Following much discussion which included friendly amendments that were either accepted or not, Call to Question was stated. Vote to Call was taken and passed. Vote on amended Faculty Manual change was taken and passed (Attachment G).
10. Announcements:
   a. Announcement to all that the correct telephone number for Alan Schaffer, Faculty Manual Editorial Consultant, is 864-650-8453.
   
   b. Reminder to all to be sure to visit the Martin Inn to see the First Sun Connector Display honoring the Award recipients of the Class of '39 Award for Excellence.
   
   c. The Celebration of the Class of '39 will be from 6-8:00 p.m. on Monday, January 7, 2002 at the Madren Center.
   
   d. The Bell Tower Ceremony honoring Jerry Waldvogel as the 2001 recipient of the Class of '39 Award for Excellence will be held at 10:00 a.m. on Tuesday, January 8, 2002 at the Bell Tower.
   
   e. Interim Provost Dori Helms referenced an item regarding the compensation of department chairs and asked for the endorsement of the Faculty Senate. This issue is one of several that President Grubb will forward to appropriate committees to address (mentioned in President's Remarks above).

11. Adjournment: President Grubb adjourned the meeting at 4:40 p.m.

Kelly Smith, Faculty Senate Secretary

Cathy Tóth Sturkie, Administrative Assistant

Absent: Bertrand, Grimes, Miller, Hall, Placone, Rippy, Malloy, Brannan, Ogale
MEMORANDUM

Date: October 30, 2001

To: Faculty Senate Executive/Advisory Committee

From: Welfare Committee (WC)

Subject: Four current issues in progress:

1. **Sick Leave for 9 Month Faculty Employees**
   As advised by the Department of Human Resources in Columbia, a letter was sent on August 31, 2001 to Ms. Donna Traywick, Director of the HR. The letter asked her about what political or legislatorial steps the Welfare Committee should follow to change this current state policy of not providing the sick leave benefit. Still waiting for her response.
   As per Jim Daniels’ advice, the WC sent a letter to President Barker on 10/26 for his approval to pursue this issue at the legislatorial level.

2. **Spousal/Partner Employment**
   As per Provost Helms’ advice, a letter was sent to the people at the Chamber of Commerce in Clemson, Seneca, Anderson and Greenville, including the Alumni Center at Clemson University.

   Senator Backman and I are in the process of making calls to universities in the US to gather information on their current programs in accommodating this issue for their faculty and staff.

   Upon sufficient information from other Universities programs, the WC will begin to draft a program that would be Clemson University specific and friendly.

   The Women’s Commission is willing to help the WC with drafting a program.

3. **Salary Inversion among Faculty Members**
   The WC has put this issue on hold until the performance raises are in place.

4. **Getting Paid on a 12 Month Basis**
   Mr. Ron Herrin at the Office of Human Resources has been contacted to assist individual faculty members with financial alternatives. He will publicize the service.

   The Faculty Senate will finalize this issue to determine whether or not the WC should continue to pursue further.

......Next Meeting-November 2 at 11:00 in Edwards, Conference Room 538....

Cwl/Faculty Senate Welfare Committee Written Report/10/30/2001
Minutes, Scholastic Policies Meeting, October 23, 2001

Present were: Frances Chamberlain, Julie Clark, Camille Cooper, Gary Kirby, Ed Moise, David Orr, Ryan Solomon, Brenda Vander Mey, and Jim Zimmerman

Jim Zimmerman reported that the Council on Undergraduate Studies Committee that has been formed concerning plus/minus grading has met again. Student Senate will be holding an open forum Tuesday, November 13, at 6 p.m. in McKissick Auditorium to present information about the proposed system(s). Prior to that, an article describing the two systems being discussed (A+ = 4.3 or A+ = 4.0), the advantages/disadvantages of a plus/minus system, and announcing the forum, will appear in the November 2 Tiger. A similar article will appear in the Observer. Student Senate is currently finding faculty members that graduated from institutions with a plus/minus system to be on the panel. The forum will be open to all.

Jim Zimmerman announced that it is time to speak to Dr. Reel's office about the wording used concerning the administration of student evaluations of teaching. It is also time to make sure the Assessment Office has completed their selection of courses to be part of the test of electronic evaluation.

David Orr brought the committee up-to-date on the philosophy and need behind the Student Senate's Grade Redemption resolution. The resolution is being reworded. Discussion followed.

Student Senate resolutions from last year concerning posting of course syllabi electronically and on academic advising were also discussed. Both of these resolutions are currently undergoing revisions at Student Senate.

The next scheduled meeting is Tuesday, November 20, at 3:30 in the Jordan Room.

James Zimmerman
Peer Institution Study: Workplace Climate Policies & Resources

Overview of Project

Focus:

- Clemson University as a workplace.

Catalysts:

- Results from the Campus Wide Sexual Harassment Survey:
  - Some respondents criticized Clemson’s Sexual Harassment Policy as inadequate, a “joke,” as “not worth the paper it is written on;”
  - Some respondents conveyed descriptions of experiences that probably constitute Chilly Climate behavior, but Clemson does not have a policy on Chilly Climate;
  - The need for training about sexual harassment seemed apparent, but information about existing policies and resources in a comparative frame was absent.

- General sense of curiosity about Clemson in comparison to peers:
  - As a workplace, how is Clemson’s climate in comparison to peers?
  - Does Clemson have the policies and resources that make for a workplace culture that embraces pluralism and promotes non-discrimination?
  - Overall, what is Clemson’s “temperature?”

- Perception of need for an expedient study that would serve multiple users:
  - Many questions of concern to the Women’s Commission are shared by other groups, committees & commissions;
  - Some questions of side interest – but interest nonetheless – to the Women’s Commission are central questions for other groups, committees or commissions;
  - Once data of this sort are being collected, it seems most expedient to cover as many related questions as possible, thus providing Clemson with at least a rudimentary checkmark study, rather than a narrowly focused one.
Steps taken:

- Began with questions of interest to the Women’s Commission;
- Sought input from representatives from the President’s Commission on Black Faculty & Staff, Women’s Studies, and Classified Staff Senate at earlier stages;
- Drafted the initial list of questions/variables and had various individuals make comments and additions;
- Started collecting information;
- Listened to concerns at Faculty Senate meeting, Spring, 2001, and added some variables;
- Sent out fuller list to representatives from: Faculty Senate; Classified Staff Senate; President’s Commission on the Status of Black Faculty & Staff; Extension Senate; Community & Cultural Diversity Committee; President’s Faculty Advisory Committee; Office of Access & Equity; Office of Human Resources; Members of the Black Studies Advisory Board, Women’s Studies Faculty;
- Student researcher discussed the study with local chapter of the NAACP;
- Finalized variables/questions list;
- Continued data collection and entry.

Strategy:

- Institutions included in the study will be all institutions ranking above or even with Clemson University in the 2000 U.S. News & World Report rankings of public institutions, plus peers not ranked above Clemson University;
- Information will be pulled from web pages posted by each university;
- Initial findings will be sent out to a group of individuals at Clemson University to crosscheck for accuracy;
- A designated (by the institution) individual at each institution will be contacted by telephone, informed of the study, and asked to check the results found on his/her institution for accuracy.
- The telephone call will be followed up with a fax of a letter of information and the sheets containing the findings for that institution. These materials also will be sent via regular mail. If needed, e-mail correspondence with this individual also will be used.
(Check up charts have been made to document whom to contact, when they were contacted, how, etc.);
• Two follow up reminders will be provided each institution if needed.

Status as of mid-November, 2001:

• Information for all institutions has been collected;
  • These institutions are being contacted to verify data entered;
  • Data entry is completed for about one-third of the institutions;
  • Most other institutions are partially completed in terms of data entry.

Timeline to Date:

• Complete all data verification before the Christmas/New Year’s break;
• Draft report to circulate in early January;
• Final report due in early February;
• Public presentations to begin mid- to late-February.

For questions about the study or copies of the final report, contact:

Dr. Brenda J. Vander Mey, Professor and Chair,
Subcommittee on Sexual Harassment & Discrimination
President’s Commission on the Status of Women
Sociology; Brackett 132; Box 341356
Clemson University
Clemson, SC, USA 29634-1356
Tel: 864.656.3821
Fax: 864.656.1252
E-mail: vanmev@clemson.edu

For information about Clemson’s President’s Commission on the Status of Women, go to:

http://virtual.clemson.edu/groups/womenscommission/
Or call: 864.656.1532; Fax: 864.656.6448.
Chair: Dr. Judy Melton. E-mail: jmlton@clemson.edu
List of variables/questions asked...

- School used in comparison study.
- Does the college or university have a written policy on chilly climate?
- Does the university have 'chilly climate' mentioned in a policy?
- Does the university have a written policy on campus climate/conditions/environment (not specifically chilly)?
- Does the university have 'hostile environment' mentioned in a policy?
- Does the university have a written policy on sexual harassment?
  - Does the sexual harassment policy include a definition of sexual harassment?
  - Does the sexual harassment policy give resolution procedures?
  - Does the resolution process offer an informal resolution option?
  - Does the university keep the initial discussion with an official on harassment confidential?
- Does the university have a written policy on racial discrimination/non-discrimination?
- Does the university have a written policy on affirmative action?
- Does the university have a written policy on workplace/campus violence?
- Does the university have a written policy on sexual orientation/lifestyle?
- Does the university offer leadership training (specific to equal opportunity)?
- Does the university have a Women's Center?
- Does the university have a sexual harassment counselor(s)?
- Does the university have a Women's Office?
- Does the university have a hotline to handle rape/sexual assault?
- Does the university have an office for Equal Opportunity?
- Does the university have a Multicultural Office/Center for Multicultural Affairs?
- Does the university have an office of minority student affairs?
- Does the university have an Affirmative Action office?
- Does the university have an office of Access and Equity?
- Does the university have a Women's advocacy group for employees?
  - What is the name of the Women's advocacy group?
- Does the university offer a major in Women's/Gender Studies?
  - If the university offers a major, what is the label?
- Does the university offer a minor in Women's/Gender studies?
  - If the university offers a minor, what is the label?
- Does the University offer a Women's Studies Certificate?
- Does the University have a Center/Institute for Women's Studies?
  - If so, provide the name.
  - *(Note: This is different from a Women's Center, which usually is medical in nature.)*
- Does the University offer a minor in Black/African American studies?
- Does the University offer a major in Black/African American studies?
- Does the university offer a graduate program (MA, MS, or Ph.D.) in Black/African American Studies?
- Is the University a member of the [Black Studies Association]?
- Is the University an institutional member of the NAACP?
- Does the University have a Center/Institute for Black/African American Studies?
  - If so, provide name of this Center/Institute.
- Has a study on the status of minorities been conducted?
  - If so, what is the name of this study?
- Does the University offer cultural diversity/awareness training?
- Does the University have a tenure review delay policy?
  - Does this delay include medical disability?
  - Does this delay include personal illness?
  - Does this delay include childbirth?
  - Does this delay include adoption of a child?
  - Other types of delays included in the policy (list).
- Is the University a member of the NWSA? (National Women's Studies Association)
- Does the University offer a women's society/organization geared towards science and engineering?
  - If so, what is the name of the society/organization?
- Does the university have an ombudsman/mediator for faculty only?
- Does the university have an ombudsman for staff only?
• Does the university have the same ombudsman for BOTH faculty and staff?
• Is there a study done regarding the chilly climate at this institution?
  • What is the name of the study done regarding the chilly climate?
• Does the university have a spousal hire policy that tries to hire/find jobs for spouses?

SCHOOLS USED IN THE STUDY:

1-University of California, Berkeley
1-University of Virginia
3-University of California, Los Angeles
3-University of Michigan, Ann Arbor
3-University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill
6-College of William and Mary
7-University of California, San Diego
8-Georgia Tech*
8-University of Wisconsin, Madison
10-University of California, Davis*
10-University of California, Irvine
10-University of Illinois, Urbana/Champaign
13-Penn. State University, University Park
14-University of California, Santa Barbara
14-University of Washington
16-University of Texas, Austin
17-Texas A & M University, College Station*
18-University of Florida
18-University of Minnesota, Twin Cities
20-Ohio State University, Columbus
20-Purdue University, West Lafayette*
20-University of Georgia
20-University of Iowa
24-Rutgers, New Brunswick
24-University of Maryland, College Park
26-Colorado School of Mines
26-Indiana University, Bloomington
26-Miami University, Oxford (OH)
26-University of California, Santa Cruz
26-University of Colorado, Boulder
26-University of Delaware
26-Virginia Tech*
33-Michigan State University*
33-North Carolina State University, Raleigh*
33-SUNY, Binghamton
33-University of California, Riverside
33-University of Missouri, Columbia
38-Clemson University
38-Iowa State University*
38-University of Connecticut
38-University of Pittsburgh

* Indicates Peer Institution; All others are above or even with Clemson in U.S. News and World Report ranking, as of Fall, 2000.

PEER INSTITUTIONS NOT RANKED ABOVE CLEMSON UNIVERSITY:

Auburn
Mississippi State
University of Nebraska, Lincoln

For questions about the study or copies of the final report, contact:

Dr. Brenda J. Vander Mey, Professor
Chair, Subcommittee on Sexual Harassment & Discrimination
President’s Commission on the Status of Women
Sociology; Brackett 132; Box 341356
Clemson University
Clemson, SC, USA 29634-1356
Tel: 864.656.3821
Fax: 864.656.1252
E-mail: vanmev@clemson.edu

For information about Clemson’s President’s Commission on the Status of Women, go to: http://virtual.clemson.edu/groups/womenscommission/
Or call: 864.656.1532; Fax: 864.656.6448. Chair: Dr. Judy Melton.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Alan Grubb, President
    Faculty Senate
FROM: Alan Schaffer, Editor
RE: Senior lecturer rank

At its October meeting the Policy Committee approved the following language concerning the new rank of senior lecturer:

"After six years of satisfactory performance, a lecturer may be reclassified as a senior lecturer. A department chair, on the recommendation of the department's advisory committee, may recommend an individual to the college dean who makes the appointment. Senior lecturers may be offered contracts ranging from one to three years with the requirement of one year's notice prior to termination."

If approved by the Senate this will be forwarded to the Provost for approval. If approved by the Provost it must be approved by the Board of Trustees since this establishes a new special faculty rank.

cc: John Huffman
    Cathy Sturkie
MEMORANDUM

TO: Alan Grubb, President
    Faculty Senate
FROM: Alan Schaffer, Editor
RE: Post-tenure review clarification

At its October meeting the Policy Committee approved a change in the Faculty Manual write-up on post-tenure review, part iv, page 6. The first item under Procedure now reads in part:

"All tenured faculty will be peer reviewed every six years. The year or years in which a faculty member is on sabbatical, unpaid leave, and/or extended sick leave shall not be counted in the review period."

The Policy Committee recommends that the language be changed to read:

"All tenured faculty will be peer reviewed every six years. The year or years in which a faculty member is on approved leave shall not be counted in the review period."

Would you please put this on the agenda for Senate consideration at the November meeting.

cc: John Huffman
    Cathy Sturkie
MEMORANDUM

TO:        Alan Grubb, President,
            Faculty Senate
FROM:      Alan Schaffer, Editor

RE:        Change in probationary period for new faculty

At its August meeting the Senate approved an addition to the *Faculty Manual*
dealing with the probationary period for untenured faculty. This was sent to the Provost
for her approval and she returned it suggesting it be changed to take into consideration
both 9 month and 12 month faculty. If approved by the Senate the addition will now
read (the Provost’s suggestions are in bold):

"The probationary period for all faculty begins in August of the
calendar year in which the individual is officially added to the
faculty roster. However, 9 *month* faculty officially joining the
university after October 1st of a calendar year shall have their
probationary period begin with the following August. Twelve
*month* faculty officially joining the university after January 1st
of a calendar year shall have their probationary period begin on
July 1st of that calendar year."

Would you please put this on the agenda for consideration by the senators at their
November meeting. If approved by the Senate and Provost this language will be added to
the section of the *Faculty Manual* dealing with tenure policies, part iv, section G.

cc:        John Huffman
            Cathy Sturkie
PROBATIONARY PERIOD EXTENSION FOR PARENTING

Probationary faculty who give birth, or father, or adopt a child under the age of six, during their probationary period may at their request, receive a one-year extension of the tenure decision. Request for such an extension must come within two months of the birth or adoption via the department chair, and both the college dean and the Provost must be informed. Normally, a maximum of two such extensions may be granted.
MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
DECEMBER 11, 2001

1. Call to Order: The Faculty Senate Meeting was called to order at 2:37 p.m. by President Alan Grubb.

2. Approval of Minutes: The Faculty Senate Minutes dated November 13, 2001 were approved as written.

3. "Free Speech": None

4. Special Resolution – President Grubb introduced Joel Brawley and then submitted for acceptance by acclamation the Resolution to Honor Professor Joel Brawley as the 2001 South Carolina Governor’s Professor the Year (Attachment A) (FS01-12-1 P).

5. Special Orders of the Day: Whitney Romanowski and Margarita Sanchez, representatives of the Graduate Student Government, informed the Senate of events to be held during One World Week, April 15-18, 2002 (Attachment B).

Bonnie Holaday, Dean of the Graduate School, explained the results of the Graduate Student Satisfaction Survey which contained the top twenty items that graduate students believe most important and also the level of student satisfaction (Attachment C). Dean Holaday then shared information regarding the Graduate Program Review, a pilot program with faculty involvement that is a peer review program looking at the quality of the academic programs offered by Clemson University. A summary will be shared with the Graduate Council and the Provost. The Provost will then meet with department chairs and deans to discuss improvements. An update on the Professional Development Program was then provided by Dean Holaday. Monies will be available to offer this program to prepare future faculty. Dean Holaday then asked for comments regarding how to proceed with departmental numbers of PhD graduates. She asked what our doctoral programs should look like and what kind of changes should be made by the Graduate Council regarding dissertations, admission. President Grubb noted that the Faculty Senate can most definitely be of assistance with this request. Direct comments are to be sent to Senator Dan Warner who will share them with President Grubb who will then forward them to the Graduate Council. President Grubb also encouraged senators to look at the report of the Graduate Summit on the web.

6. 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 explained the Welfare Report dated November 27, 2001 (Attachment D). Senator Lee informed the Senate that President Grubb asked the Committee to draft a paragraph for Ron Herrin to endorse to all faculty offering assistance to withdraw monies from individual accounts throughout the summer months. New issues Committee is addressing include: mandatory deposits (Clemson University requires mandatory deposits of paychecks of all new hires and it is being done to save money and security reasons); insurance coverage for preventive insurance (Attachment E); and no Fike fee for faculty (Committee is working on this issue). Next meeting will be on January 11, 2002 at 3:30 p.m. Mr. Lawrence Nichols, the new Human Resources Director, met with the Welfare Committee. In addition to discussing the subject of mandatory deposits, Mr. Nichols responded to question regarding the screening of applications. For faculty searches, procedures are in *Faculty Manual*; however, for staff it is different. Human Resources screens all applications but they pay more attention to the cover letters. Mr. Nichols suggested that if cover letter does not mention every single point in job description, it will be rejected. The Faculty Senate will continue to look into this issue and will also forward this information to the Classified Staff Senate with the suggestion that it pursue the possibility of adding such statement to job advertisements.

3) **Finance Committee** – No report.

4) **Policy Committee** – Senator John Huffman, Chair, stated that this Committee met on November 20, 2001. Committee discussed Post Tenure Review items regarding the role of chairs and deans in evaluations and put this issue on hold. Committee also discussed a revision in review of academic administrators which will come up under New Business. A *Faculty Manual* change was forwarded regarding the rights and privileges of retired faculty which was opposed by the Committee. The Committee believes that since the current language in the *Manual* is new and has not been tested, that it should remain as is. The Policy Committee also met last week, chaired by Eleanor Hare. The discussion on Post Tenure Review continued and will be brought to the Senate at the next meeting. A draft resolution on financial reports for holders of endowed chairs will be submitted to the Senate also. A discussion on the performance-based salary increases was held and since the discussion, a list of those receiving raises has been distributed (without noting achievements of individual faculty members). Senator Huffman noted that he just received requests to pursue from the Provost regarding various decisions on items the Policy Committee and Senate had passed. The Senate’s attention was called to an article in this week’s Chronicle of Higher Education regarding faculty rights.

5) **Scholastic Policies** – Senator Jim Zimmerman, Chair, submitted and briefly explained the Committee’s Report dated November 29, 2001 (Attachment F). Senator Zimmerman then displayed and explained four different plus/minus schemes and asked for the Sense of the Senate regarding should the Faculty Senate continue to pursue strongly for the plus/minus grading system (knowing that grading is a faculty issue but
that the Student Government will be against it). Sense of the Senate was taken and vote
determined that the Faculty Senate will continue to strongly pursue. Senator Zimmerman
then asked the Senate for a sense of which scheme was preferred. Sense of the Senate
was taken and Scheme B was voted as the preferred scheme.

b. University Commissions and Committees
   a. Senator Brenda Vander Mey noted the memo from Hal
   Harris, Chair of this Committee, of the initial meeting (Attachment G); that the Loose
   Group Report (recommending an encompassing salary study and a need for a philosophy
   of compensation) is in the Faculty Senate archives; and that efforts are underway by a
   group of faculty to bring Jane Goodall to campus.

7. Old Business: None

8. President's Remarks: President Grubb
   a. Stated that the Provost Search is ongoing and on track; that airport
   interview tapes are being viewed at the present time; and that candidates will be invited
to campus in January.

   b. Informed the Senate that the Salary Reports will, hopefully, be made
   available shortly.

   c. Reminded Senators to forward nominations for both the Grievance Board
      and Grievance Counselors.

9. New Business:
   a. Senator Huffman submitted, explained, and moved acceptance of the
   Faculty Manual change, Revision of Procedures in Review of Academic Administrators.
   There was no discussion. Vote to accept Manual change was taken and passed
   unanimously (Attachment H).

   b. President Grubb noted that there have been a lot of questions about the
criteria for the recently-distributed performance-based salary increases process and the
way that the criteria were administered in different departments and colleges. Dr. Patricia T. Smart stated on behalf of the Provost that she (the Provost) will work together
with the Faculty Senate put together a survey to all faculty to provide information and
concerns to improve this process for next year's distribution. President Grubb plans to
discuss this with the Provost.

   c. Senate Alternate Nancy Porter questioned the issue of institutes on
campus. She believes that they continue to be approved and asked what guidelines are in
place for them, in general, and in particular, the guidelines tying them to departments.
d. Senator Mickey Hall noted that the Provost addressed colleges during which she said she was in favor of reducing the number of institutions, but an announcement was made recently about an institution that no one knew anything about. President Grubb will discuss this with the Provost.

10. Announcements:
   a. The Celebration of the Class of '39 will be from 6-8:00 p.m. on Monday, January 7, 2002 at the Madren Center.

   b. The Bell Tower Ceremony honoring Jerry Waldvogel as the 2001 recipient of the Class of '39 Award for Excellence will be held at 10:00 a.m. on Tuesday, January 8, 2002 at the Bell Tower.

   c. The Westin Poinsett is very interested in establishing a relationship with the faculty of Clemson University and is beginning with an invitation to faculty senators to New Year’s festivities at a discount (Attachment I).

11. Adjournment: President Grubb adjourned the meeting at 4:18 p.m.

   [Signature]

   Kelly Smith, Faculty Senate Secretary

   [Signature]

   Cathy Toth Sturkie, Administrative Assistant

Absent: Bertrand, Grimes, Miller, Burns (Madden for), Heusinkveld, Moise, Abramovitch, Malloy, Brannan, Ogale
RESOLUTION TO HONOR
PROFESSOR JOEL BRAWLEY AS THE 2001 SOUTH CAROLINA
GOVERNOR’S PROFESSOR OF THE YEAR

FS01-12-1 P

Whereas, Professor Joel Brawley has consistently exemplified the qualities of consummate teacher, mentor, and researcher in a career that has spanned forty years; and

Whereas, Professor Brawley has demonstrated unceasing commitment and devotion to Clemson University, its alumni, colleagues, and the citizens of South Carolina; and

Whereas, Professor Brawley’s recent selection as the 2001 South Carolina Governor’s Professor of the Year brings honor to Clemson University and to its faculty as a whole;

Therefore be it:

Resolved, That the Clemson University Faculty Senate celebrates Professor Brawley’s honor and the work that it so appropriately recognizes.

This resolution was passed unanimously by the Faculty Senate on December 11, 2001
PQ

"One World Week" Committees

"Field of Flags" Committee

April 15-18, 2002

The "Field of Flags" is a passive program where participation will include observation of a space on campus where rows of colored irrigation flags will spread across a field. The flags are each meant to statistically represent victims of hate behavior, each color symbolic of a different form of oppression. This event is meant to strike reflection and conversation upon viewing the hundreds of flags. Volunteers of the "Field of Flags" Committee will participate in collecting statistics, setting up the field, and will be stationed at the field in conjunction with the Information Booth where interactive reflection with passers-by may be warranted.

The Information Booth will be a central location disseminating information such as brochures, flyers and announcing "One World Week" events and purpose. Also, several displays will also be available such as collection of newspaper clippings and pictures demonstrating oppression in proximity to Clemson. The Clemson University Pledge against hate will be located at the Information Booth and accessible for passers-by and "One World Week" participants to sign. Volunteers will be needed to collect possible information for dissemination, plan possible interactive activities at the booth, set-up and staff the information booth throughout the week.

"Tunnel of Oppression" Committee

April 15 & 16, 2002

The "Tunnel of Oppression" leads participants through several simulations of oppression. Volunteers will serve as facilitators during each "journey" through the tunnel, and will facilitate discussion at the conclusion. Participants will have the opportunity to express their reactions on the "Wall of Change" and counselors will be available to talk with anyone. This program is made possible by the South Carolina Leadership in Public Service Mini-Grant.

Public Relations Committee

April 15-18, 2002

"Movie Night Committee"

April 16, 2002

To illustrate the power of one individual, "Pay It Forward" will be shown in McKissick Theater. This marks a transition in "One World Week" from focusing on the problem to focusing on the solution.

"If someone did you a favor, something big, and instead of paying it back, you paid it forward to three people...And the next day, they each paid it forward to three more...And the day after that...Another three...And everyone in turn paid it forward..."

"One World Week" needs your help to be successful.

Please respond to the following questions:

1. Would you, individually, like to participate in the following way:

   - Q Serve on a committee:
     - "Journey to a Hate Free Millennium" Committee
       April 17, 2002

     - "Tunnel of Oppression" Committee
       April 15 & 16, 2002

     - "Field of Flags" Committee
       April 16-18, 2002

     - "Movie Night Committee"

   - Q Be a facilitator

   - Q Donate supplies

   - Q Be on the set-up/clean-up crew

   - Q Provide advertising support

   - Q Provide financial support

2. If you advise, or are involved with, a student organization:

   - Q Be interested in attending a viewing of "Journey to a Hate Free Millennium"?

   - Q Co-sponsor an event (circle one):
     - provide labor
     - financial support

3. Would your department/business like to:

   - Q Co-sponsor an event (circle one):
     - provide labor
     - financial support

Please remove this page and return to the address on back.

"One World Week" will address the specific social issues that are facing the world today and will serve as a catalyst for discussion and reflection. The "Field of Flags" will be a central location and will include a display of flags in memory of lives lost to hate.

Please respond to the following questions:

1. Would you, individually, like to participate in the following way:

   - Q Serve on a committee:
     - "Journey to a Hate Free Millennium" Committee
       April 17, 2002

     - "Tunnel of Oppression" Committee
       April 15 & 16, 2002

     - "Field of Flags" Committee
       April 16-18, 2002

     - "Movie Night Committee"

   - Q Be a facilitator

   - Q Donate supplies

   - Q Be on the set-up/clean-up crew

   - Q Provide advertising support

   - Q Provide financial support

2. If you advise, or are involved with, a student organization:

   - Q Be interested in attending a viewing of "Journey to a Hate Free Millennium"?

   - Q Co-sponsor an event (circle one):
     - provide labor
     - financial support

3. Would your department/business like to:

   - Q Co-sponsor an event (circle one):
     - provide labor
     - financial support

"One World Week" will address the specific social issues that are facing the world today and will serve as a catalyst for discussion and reflection. The "Field of Flags" will be a central location and will include a display of flags in memory of lives lost to hate.
One World Week Goals & Objectives

1. Expose the Clemson community to issues that will enable them to work collaboratively in diverse environments.

2. Provide opportunity for growth and active thinking processes reflective of a more complex, less automatic mode of thought.

3. Assist in the healing of those who have been victims or have known victims of oppression.

4. Provide opportunities to reflect on real life incidences of oppression.

5. Motivate the Clemson community to be more committed to action by signing a pledge board.

Pledge: I pledge from this day forward to do my best to interrupt prejudice and to stop those who, because of hate, would hurt, harass or violate the civil rights of anyone. I will try at all times to be aware of my biases against people who are different from myself and I will ask questions to learn about these differences. I firmly believe that one person can make a difference and by signing this pledge, I recognize respect for individual dignity.

**adapted from the Anti-Defamation League's A World of Difference Institute Pledge

Because We Share One World...

...Hate Hurts
...Different Doesn't Mean Defective
...Silence is Acceptance
...Practice Compassion

Event Schedule

"Field of Flags", Information Booth & Pledge Board
April 15-18, 2002

"Tunnel of Oppression"
April 15 & 16, 2002

"Pay It Forward"
April 16, 2002

"Journey to a Hate-Free Millennium"
April 17, 2002

Judy Shepard & Candlelight Vigil
April 18, 2002
How Satisfied Are Our Students Compared to Other Four-Year Public Institutions?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Your Campus</th>
<th>Comparison Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Advising</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Climate</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Life</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Support Services</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern for the Individual</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment and Financial Aid</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration Effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety and Security</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Excellence</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Centeredness</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean scores range from 0 to 7, with 0 being very dissatisfied and 7 being very satisfied.
## Institutional Summary

### Scales: In Order of Importance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group 1 - Group 2</th>
<th>Performance Gap</th>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>Performance Gap</th>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>0.16</strong></td>
<td>0.67/1.24</td>
<td>4.83/1.32</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>0.95/1.09</td>
<td>5.96/1.66</td>
<td>6.41/1.73</td>
<td>6.31/1.62</td>
<td>5.47/1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>0.29</strong></td>
<td>0.90/1.68</td>
<td>5.96/1.66</td>
<td>6.41/1.73</td>
<td>6.31/1.62</td>
<td>5.47/1.44</td>
<td>6.31/1.62</td>
<td>5.47/1.44</td>
<td>6.31/1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>0.13</strong></td>
<td>1.03/1.25</td>
<td>6.41/1.73</td>
<td>6.31/1.62</td>
<td>5.47/1.44</td>
<td>6.31/1.62</td>
<td>5.47/1.44</td>
<td>6.31/1.62</td>
<td>5.47/1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>0.21</strong></td>
<td>0.90/1.68</td>
<td>5.96/1.66</td>
<td>6.41/1.73</td>
<td>6.31/1.62</td>
<td>5.47/1.44</td>
<td>6.31/1.62</td>
<td>5.47/1.44</td>
<td>6.31/1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>0.34</strong></td>
<td>0.90/1.68</td>
<td>5.96/1.66</td>
<td>6.41/1.73</td>
<td>6.31/1.62</td>
<td>5.47/1.44</td>
<td>6.31/1.62</td>
<td>5.47/1.44</td>
<td>6.31/1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>0.14</strong></td>
<td>1.03/1.25</td>
<td>6.41/1.73</td>
<td>6.31/1.62</td>
<td>5.47/1.44</td>
<td>6.31/1.62</td>
<td>5.47/1.44</td>
<td>6.31/1.62</td>
<td>5.47/1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>0.13</strong></td>
<td>1.03/1.25</td>
<td>6.41/1.73</td>
<td>6.31/1.62</td>
<td>5.47/1.44</td>
<td>6.31/1.62</td>
<td>5.47/1.44</td>
<td>6.31/1.62</td>
<td>5.47/1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>0.16</strong></td>
<td>0.67/1.24</td>
<td>4.83/1.32</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>0.95/1.09</td>
<td>5.96/1.66</td>
<td>6.41/1.73</td>
<td>6.31/1.62</td>
<td>5.47/1.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Performance Gap

- **Respectiveness to Diverse Populations**
- **Campus Life**
- **Recruitment and Financial Aid**
- **Service Excellence**
- **Campus Support Services**
- **Retention and Graduation Rates**
- **Student Centeredness**
- **Campus Climate**
- **Concern for the Individual**
- **Safety and Security**
- **Institutional Effectiveness**
- **Academic Advising**

### Note:

- **Difference statistically significant at the .05 level**
- **Difference statistically significant at the .01 level**
- **Difference statistically significant at the .001 level**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
<th>SD Performance Gap</th>
<th>Group 1 - Group 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. The content of the courses within my major is valuable.</td>
<td>6.79</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The quality of instruction I receive in most of my classes is excellent.</td>
<td>6.77</td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. My academic advisor is knowledgeable about requirements in my major.</td>
<td>6.66</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I am able to experience intellectual growth here.</td>
<td>6.56</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Nearly all of the faculty are knowledgeable in their field.</td>
<td>5.87</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. My academic advisor is concerned about my success as an individual.</td>
<td>5.76</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. There is a commitment to academic excellence on this campus.</td>
<td>5.61</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. The instruction in my major field is excellent.</td>
<td>5.54</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. My academic advisor is approachable.</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. The content of the courses within my major is valuable.</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Difference statistically significant at the 0.01 level**
- **Difference statistically significant at the 0.05 level**
- **Difference statistically significant at the 0.10 level**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group 1 - Group 2</th>
<th>Performance Gap</th>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
<th>Group 1 - Group 2</th>
<th>Performance Gap</th>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>** 0.21**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.44 / 1.42</td>
<td>5.33 / 1.42</td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.44 / 1.34</td>
<td>5.07 / 1.34</td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.32 / 1.27</td>
<td>1.12 / 1.27</td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.26 / 1.21</td>
<td>1.00 / 1.21</td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>** 0.45**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.61 / 1.56</td>
<td>1.70 / 1.56</td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.42 / 1.34</td>
<td>1.40 / 1.34</td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>** 0.24**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.31 / 1.24</td>
<td>1.40 / 1.24</td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.60 / 1.54</td>
<td>1.65 / 1.54</td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.14 / 1.04</td>
<td>1.10 / 1.04</td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>** 0.50**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.60 / 1.54</td>
<td>1.65 / 1.54</td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.44 / 1.34</td>
<td>1.40 / 1.34</td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.26 / 1.21</td>
<td>1.00 / 1.21</td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>** 0.45**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.61 / 1.56</td>
<td>1.70 / 1.56</td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.42 / 1.34</td>
<td>1.40 / 1.34</td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>** 0.24**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.31 / 1.24</td>
<td>1.40 / 1.24</td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.60 / 1.54</td>
<td>1.65 / 1.54</td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.14 / 1.04</td>
<td>1.10 / 1.04</td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Difference statistically significant at the 0.001 level
** Difference statistically significant at the 0.01 level
*** Difference statistically significant at the 0.05 level
### Scales Importance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Spring 1999</th>
<th>Spring 2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Advising</td>
<td>6.51</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Effectiveness</td>
<td>6.47</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety and Security</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>5.96</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern for the Individual</td>
<td>6.21</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Climate</td>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>6.31</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Centeredness</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td>6.80</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration Effectiveness</td>
<td>6.02</td>
<td>6.03</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Support Services</td>
<td>6.01</td>
<td>6.03</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>6.32</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Excellence</td>
<td>5.96</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment and Financial Aid</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>6.31</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Life</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern for the Individual</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>6.31</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety and Security</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Effectiveness</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Advising</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment and Financial Aid</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Life</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>6.31</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern for the Individual</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety and Security</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Effectiveness</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Advising</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment and Financial Aid</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Institutional Summary

#### Spring 2001
- Custom Report
  - Group 1 - Group 2
  - Performance Gap
  - Mean Difference

#### Spring 1999
- Custom Report
  - Group 1 - Group 2
  - Performance Gap
  - Mean Difference

---

*Difference statistically significant at the .01 level
**Difference statistically significant at the .001 level
+ Difference statistically significant at the .05 level
* Difference statistically significant at the .10 level
+ Difference statistically significant at the .25 level

---

Custom Report - Clemson University - Graduate School - Year to Year Report - 7/2001
### Demographic Information

#### Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>43.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>56.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>791</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 and under</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 to 24</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>36.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 34</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>49.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 44</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>10.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 and over</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>791</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Ethnicity/Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity/Race</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaskan Native</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Pacific Islander</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>21.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian/White</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>62.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other race</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race - Prefer not to respond</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>789</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Current Enrollment Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Day</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>80.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evening</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>19.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekend</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>791</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Current Class Load

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Load</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>81.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>18.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>786</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Class Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special student</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate/Professional</td>
<td>789</td>
<td>99.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other class level</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>797</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Current GPA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GPA Range</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No credits earned</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.99 or below</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0 - 2.49</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 - 2.99</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>27.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0 - 3.49</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>64.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5 or above</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>796</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Educational Goal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Associate degree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's degree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's degree</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>60.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate or professional degree</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>37.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certification (initial/renewal)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-improvement/pleasure</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job-related training</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other educational goal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>796</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Employment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-time off campus</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>15.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time off campus</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>6.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time on campus</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>22.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time on campus</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>40.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not employed</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>14.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>788</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Demographic Information

#### Current Residence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residence</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residence hall</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraternity / Sorority</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own house</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>19.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent room or apt off campus</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>65.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent's home</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other residence</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>794</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Residence Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In-state</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>50.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-state</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>19.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International (not U.S. citizen)</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>29.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>795</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Disabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disability</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes - Disability</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No - Disability</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>97.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>793</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Institution Was My

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st choice</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>65.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd choice</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>24.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd choice or lower</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>9.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>788</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Institution Question

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Campus Item - Answer 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Item - Answer 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Item - Answer 3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Item - Answer 4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Item - Answer 5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Item - Answer 6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Selection of Program/Major

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program/Major</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0015</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0103</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0104</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0105</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0106</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0108</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0110</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0111</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0113</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0115</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0122</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0125</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0148</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0150</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0156</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0163</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0166</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0180</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0183</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0205</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0206</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0210</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0213</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0240</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0303</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0306</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>6.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0307</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0309</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0310</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0315</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0318</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0327</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0365</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0378</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0380</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0402</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0405</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0410</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0415</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0420</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0423</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0425</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0435</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0440</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0445</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0450</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0455</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0502</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0505</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0508</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0509</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.77%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Copyright 2001, Noel-Levitz Centers, Inc.
### Demographic Information

#### Selection of Program/Major

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0511</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0514</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0520</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0531</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0535</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0545</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0605</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0607</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0620</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0635</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0638</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0663</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0670</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0675</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0702</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0710</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0725</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0804</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0806</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0811</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0816</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0820</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0822</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0825</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0832</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0851</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0865</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0871</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0899</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0920</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0930</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0960</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>796</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No response: 21
MEMORANDUM

Date: November 27, 2001
To: Faculty Senate Executive/Advisory Committee
From: Welfare Committee (WC)
Subject: Monthly Written Report

1. Sick Leave for 9 Month Faculty Employees:

A follow up letter was sent to President Barker on 11/26. The initial letter was sent on 10/25, but have heard nothing from him. President Barker’s endorsement is required to pursue this issue at the legislatorial level.

2. Spousal/Partner Employment:

The WC heard from Clemson, Seneca, and Greenville Chambers of Commerce. President Grubb, Senator Backman and I are due to have a meeting with Mr. Nail, Director of Clemson Chamber of Commerce, on 11/29 at noon.

Ms. Michelle Brinn from the Greenville Chamber of Commerce has been contacted by e-mail and is willing to work with the Faculty Senate on this issue. A meeting with Ms. Brinn will be set up in a few days.

Mr. Garman, Director of Anderson Chamber of Commerce contacted me, and a meeting with him will be set up in a few days as well.

Upon sufficient information from the Directors from the various Chambers of Commerce, the WC will begin to draft a program that would be Clemson University specific and friendly. The Women’s Commission is willing to help the WC with drafting a program.

Senator Backman and I have made several calls to universities in the US to gather information on their current programs in accommodating this issue for their faculty and staff. However, no particular school has been known to have a program or an office just for this issue in place. As it appears, each department delegates a person(s) to accommodate the spouse as a situation arises. No established office or program has been learned thru the phone calls.

3. Salary Inversion among Faculty Members:

The WC has put this issue on hold until the performance raises are in place.
4. **Getting Paid on a 12 Month Basis:**

At its November 13th meeting, the Faculty Senate voted not to continue pursuing this option.

**New Issue:**

Mr. Lawrence Nichols, Chief of Human Resource Office, will be at the December WC meeting to talk about the issue of Payroll/Direct Deposit for Clemson University Faculty and staff.

---

*The Next Welfare Committee meeting is scheduled on December 7 at 11:00 in Room 538 Edwards Hall*
Connie,

This is in response to the Welfare Committee assignment. This is what I have found out this afternoon:

The State Health Plan that Clemson University has for its employees is a statewide program that is managed by the South Carolina State Budget and Control Board. It is a self-supporting system. That is, 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 state-wide basis. *If items are added* it will require an increase from premiums collected from Clemson University and the employee.

Pay Roll and Benefits will help us interpret the benefits but neither they nor Clemson University have the authority to make any changes to current programs offered. They have all of the options listed on their web page [http://virtual.clemson.edu/groups/HUMANRES/pb.htm](http://virtual.clemson.edu/groups/HUMANRES/pb.htm).

Each fall all employees receive a booklet "The Insurance Advantage" ([http://virtual.clemson.edu/groups/HUMANRES/pb.htm](http://virtual.clemson.edu/groups/HUMANRES/pb.htm)). This booklet explains all insurance options and changes for the up coming year. Page 7 & 8 does a comparison of the health benefits offered for 2002. Page 16 lists the important open enrollment reminders. The MoneyPlus program comes closest to providing for checkups from non-taxable salary. The MoneyPlus program is available for employees that have been on the job for at least a year. It is a tax-exempt program. Money is payroll deducted for medical bills and checkups, placed into an account to be paid out on receipt of medical bills submitted. The submission form can be downloaded from [http://virtual.clemson.edu/groups/HUMANRES/pb.htm](http://virtual.clemson.edu/groups/HUMANRES/pb.htm).

Each January all employees receive a booklet "Insurance Benefits Guide". This booklet is about the size of the Clemson University phone book. It explains in detail what can and can not be claimed. Page 25 describes the Early Detection Benefits which covers mammograms and Pap tests. Page 27 covers The Well Child Care Benefits. Page 33-35 lists expenses not covered. Routine physical exams and checkups are on this list of 33 items *not* covered by the State Health Plan.

Any concerns and questions not answered with these two publications and Pay Roll and Benefits should be sent to Rob Tester, Customer Services, The Office of Insurance Services, PO Box 11661, Columbia, SC 29621-1661, (www.ois.state.sc.us), 1-803-734-0678.

Looks like a dead end to me. Any suggestions??

Harold Hupp AVSc Department Box 340361 Clemson University Clemson, SC 29634-0361
Minutes of the Scholastic Policies Committee
November 29, 2001

Present were: Camille Cooper, Ed Moise and Jim Zimmerman

Jim Zimmerman brought the Committee up-to-date on the +/- proposal. On November 13, Student Government sponsored a forum. A PowerPoint presentation of the background was given followed by a four-member panel (two Clemson faculty with +/- experience elsewhere, one current Furman student where +/- is used, and one current student who attended UNC where a +/- system is used). Afterwards there was a question/answer period. Students filled out a questionnaire when leaving. The results of that questionnaire showed 52 against and 23 for the +/- system.

On November 16, the committee appointed by the Council on Undergraduate Studies to study the +/- issue met. It was decided to make a presentation at the December 14 meeting presenting the results we have obtained so far. Before that meeting, all members of the CUS will receive an updated copy of the earlier PowerPoint. Immediately after the December 14 meeting, the committee will meet to write their recommendations for presentation at the January meeting.
November 19, 2001

MEMORANDUM

TO: Alan Grubb
FROM: Hal Harris
SUBJECT: Initial Meeting, Budget Accountability Committee

The Committee met on November 14. We are pleased to report that David Fleming announced that the salary report was scheduled for Committee Overview in early December, and for presentation to the Faculty Senate at your January 2002 meeting. The report will include both raises occurring this year as you suggested.

While our understanding is that the Committee’s major function is presentation and analysis of the annual salary report, we strongly believe that this is just a starting point. There are a number of critical current issues on which the Committee believes it can provide some insight for the Senate. First, there is a similar “road map” raise scheduled for Classified Employees in March. We suggest that you work with Jerry Beckley and the Classified Staff Senate to assure that this is included in a subsequent report. The Classified Staff Senate is also extremely concerned that we obtain information on the salaries and raises for the lowest-paid, yet vital, members of the Clemson family — those who make less than $30,000. The Committee agrees that such data would be very useful.

Finally, and most important, we suggest that it is now time to undertake a university-wide comprehensive salary study. As you recall, there was organizational pressure for such a study last year from the so-called “Salary Loose Group.” This group represented ten or more representative groups, commissions, and University departments. The study was deferred until key officials attended a training session on compensation, and until a new Human Resources Director came on board.

We urge you to join with Jerry Beckley and urge President Barker to initiate such a study now. In anticipating a move in that direction, our Committee at its next meeting will begin discussing the development of a philosophy of compensation for the university. Leading the discussion will be Thornton Kirby, Lawrence Nichols, Scott Ludlow and Byron Wiley.

Please give me a call if you have questions or suggestions.

jkd

cc: Budget Accountability Committee
MEMORANDUM

TO: Alan Grubb, President
FROM: Alan Schaffer, Editor
RE: Revision of procedures in review of academic administrators

At its November meeting the policy committee approved the attached revision of that section of the Faculty Manual calling for the review of academic administrators (part ii, pages 7-8). The changes made here are (1) the use of the term “staff” to make it clear that staff are to be included in these evaluations, (2) a different method of choosing faculty to serve on committees evaluating academic administrators other than department chairs, and (3) different language in the provision calling for the Provost and President to communicate their evaluations.

The new language or provisions are in bold; deletions are put in brackets and [underscored].

This item should be put on the agenda for the next meeting of the Senate.

cc: John Huffman
    Cathy Sturkie

28 Nov 2001
Review of Academic Administrators

In the normal performance of their duties, administrators are subject to evaluations. Such evaluations shall employ the standard Clemson University form for the evaluation of administrators (see Appendices F and G) submitted to the chair of the evaluation committee and will involve the faculty and staff most affected by a particular administrator as well as that administrator’s supervisor. In all instances of an administrator’s review, a comment period of 15 days shall be provided. The affected faculty or constituent group is defined as follows: (a) all tenured and tenure-track members of a department, (b) all regular faculty of the appropriate college for academic deans, and (c) all staff affected by that administrator.

Each administrator evaluation committee shall consist of [3-5] 5 members. For a department chair, three members of the committee shall be selected by vote of the regular faculty in the department. For deans and other administrators, each academic unit within the college will nominate one individual chosen by election within the unit. Three committee members shall be selected from this slate of nominees by vote of the regular faculty in the college [from a slate of nominees or volunteers generated by faculty/staff from the administrator’s constituent group by the Faculty Senate Advisory Committee before the close of the Fall semester]. The department chair and other administrators shall [have the option to] choose an additional member of the committee from the constituent group. In addition, the immediate supervisor shall [also have the option to] choose an additional member of the committee from the constituent group. This committee procedure shall not preclude any faculty or staff member in the constituent group from providing [his/her] advice directly to the [evaluating officer] immediate supervisor. In all instances the administrator evaluation committee will provide a written summary of faculty and staff opinion as solicited by the approved Clemson University form. As part of the review process department chairs and collegiate deans will supply the reviewing committee with the following materials: a plan for professional growth, a vision statement for the unit’s future, a summary of activities and accomplishments including research, teaching, and public service since the last review, and a roster of six references outside the unit upon whom the committee could call for professional perspective.

Before the end of the department chair’s second year in office and every fourth year thereafter, the appropriate dean shall conduct a formal review of that chair’s performance. This review shall include receipt of the written summary from the administrator’s evaluation committee; it may include interviews and/or other forms of consultation by the dean with each tenured and tenure-track faculty member of the department as well as staff. At the discretion of the dean, the affected department’s advisory committee may be enlisted to assist in conducting the formal review. When the review process has been completed, the dean shall make a report to the Provost. Subsequently, a brief summary of the decision will be communicated to the department chair involved and to the evaluation committee.
Likewise, the Provost shall formally review the performance of deans before the end of the dean’s third year in office and every fifth year thereafter, consulting especially with department chairs and directors as well as with faculty and staff through the administrator evaluation system. The Provost will meet with the evaluation committee and afterwards will report his/her conclusion to the dean [report his/her conclusion to the dean and the evaluation committee]. The Provost’s conclusion will be communicated to the college at the next meeting of the college faculty. Likewise, the President of the university shall review the performance of the Provost before the end of the Provost’s fifth year in office and every fifth year thereafter, consulting especially with the academic deans and with representative department chairs, faculty, and staff. The President’s conclusion will be communicated to the university community at the next meeting of the university faculty.

The final paragraph is unchanged.
New Year's Eve Celebration
At
The Westin Poinsett

New Year's Festivities Package includes:

Cocktails and Hors D'oeuvres on Mezzanine
Four Course Dinner in The Poinsett Ballroom
Dancing in the Classic Gold Ballroom
featuring The Frank Love Orchestra
Party Favors and Midnight Toast
Coffee, Liqueurs, and Full Bar

Also Includes:

Deluxe overnight accommodations featuring
King size Heavenly Bed
Welcome Amenity in Room
New Year's Day Brunch

$299.00*

*$354.00 Per couple includes tax and gratuities
Full non-refundable payments required at time of booking

Identify yourself with Clemson University
and receive a Free Gift

For Reservations, Please Call 864-421-9700
Vulcan

Harold wooden

Fred