1. Call to Order: The meeting was called to order at 2:35 p.m. by President Horace D. Skipper.

2. Approval of Minutes: The Faculty Senate Minutes dated December 14, 1999 were approved as written.

3. “Free Speech”: None

4. Special Order of the Day: A PeopleSoft presentation was provided by Scott Ludlow, Chief Financial Officer; Charles Tegan, University Comptroller; W. C. Hallums, Director of Sponsored Programs, Accounting, and Administration; and Logan Rice, Project Director, CUBS 2000. The history of the system which resulted in the change of the University’s computer system was shared; the importance of the integrity of information was explained; an update of the CUBS program was described; and an opportunity for questions was offered and accepted.

5. Committee Reports
   a. Senate Committees
      1) Welfare Committee – Senator John Leininger, Chair, stated that this Committee will pursue reasons for the difference of holidays between Clemson and the University of South Carolina and the feasibility of exit interviews. Senator Carolyn Brown noted the pursuit of information regarding the inadequacies of coverage for particular health services and concerns regarding new prescription cards will be discussed with those on campus who make these decisions. Senator Brenda Thames stated that the Faculty Senate Retreat was a success and distributed an evaluation summary (Attachment A). Senator Leininger closed by stating that the Welfare Committee will also consider workload interpretations and issues regarding the Academic Calendar.

      2) Scholastic Policies Committee – Chair David Allison stated that there was no report. Next meeting will be on January 17, 2000 at 10:10 a.m.
3) **Finance Committee** – Senator Kinly Sturkie noted that this Committee had not met since the holidays, but will next meet on January 25, 2000. Senator John Bednar will begin chairing this Committee at that time. Senator Sturkie stated that he had met with Charles Tegan to discuss today’s presentation and that the recommendations from the Classified Staff Commission regarding how the Faculty Senate could be of assistance are forthcoming.

4) **Policy Committee** – Jim Acton, Chair, stated that this Committee continues to address the following agenda items: the instructor/lecturer relationship; the incorporation of the Faculty Activity System into the *Faculty Manual*; tenure and promotion documents; and the research professor title. Senator Acton reminded all that the University Committee Structure document was shared with the Senate for information at the December meeting. Next meeting will be January 17, 2000 at 2:30 p.m. in the Library’s Conference Room.

5) **Research Committee** – Vic Shelburne, Chair, stated that this Committee had not met and briefly explained information regarding the definition of Research institutions categories (Attachment B).

b. **University Commissions and Committees** (None)

6. **President’s Report**: President Skipper noted that the Class of ’39 Celebration was a success; congratulated Professor Judy Melton upon receipt of the Class of ’39 Award for Excellence; and stated that the Bell Monument Ceremony was nice. President Skipper announced that the next display at the Martin Inn will contain information regarding patents by Clemson University faculty.

7. **Old Business** (None)

8. **New Business**
   a. Senator Acton noted that the Policy Committee has not voted out of Committee the University Committee Structure document (Attachment C) so it will not come before the Senate at this time for approval. At this time it is still being shared as information, but action must be taken on it in February in order for it to be implemented this year. Comments are to be forwarded to Senator Acton.

   b. A nomination was added to the Grievance Board Ballot and nominations from the floor were sought. There being none, Grievance Board elections were held by secret ballot. Those elected were: Judy Melton (AAH); Mike Vatalaro, (AAH); Webb Smathers (AFLS); Les Carlson (BPA); Eleanor Hare (E&S); and Libby Hoyle (HEHD).

9. **Announcements**: President Skipper reminded members of the Executive/Advisory Committee of the luncheon at 11:30 a.m. on January 21st with President Barker to discuss the research professor title.
10. **Adjournment:** President Skipper adjourned the meeting at 3:27 p.m.

[Signature]

**Elizabeth Dale**

[Signature]

**Cathy Toth Sturkie**

Absent: K. Smith, J. Bednar, C. Voelker, F. Eubanks, S. Edge, A. Ogale (J. Huffman for), S. Saha, R. Singh
What did you learn to improve your communication skills?

- Need input from all levels in organization.
- Pay more attention to style on E-mail.
- Listening (2)
  - Some good ideas I would like to see implemented.
  - Learned from the keynote address, but not from the workshops.
- Information alone is not communication.
- Informal is better.
- Awareness of different interpretations of communications.
- Need to communicate over different levels of hierarchy.
- Less E-mails; more face to face communication.
- Nothing new - but a reminder of what's important.
- Importance of combining electronic and face to face communication. They complement each other.
- The speech was very good.
- Just a great reinfocer.
- Sharing strategies.
  - Good ideas for improving campus wide communication; better use of technology; breakfast meetings.
  - Make sure everyone in the room is on the same page.
  - Face to face, informal communication is probably the most effective.
- There are different viewpoints/perspectives.
  - Clarify idea or concern; listen to others.
  - Don't just gather facts, find out why.
  - Not only give information, talk about it.
  - Put faculty needs in terms of mission statement.
  - Openness, discuss, listen.
  - Learned more about the faculty's potential contributions to our messages to the legislature.
- Talk openly; we all have some focus and should work together.
- 7 points
  - Reinforced things I forgot.

How can the Faculty Senate be more effective in communicating with Clemson University faculty?

- E-mail from senate as a whole.
- E-mail; representatives send info. to their constituents.
- Create new forums for meeting colleagues.
- More informal meetings.
  - Have open senate/faculty meetings, specifically to solicit input on senate and university matters (i.e. no other business).
  - By providing information in an easy to follow format.
  - Regular updates and requests for input. Faculty senate meetings should be replaced.
- Build trust.
  - Use short E-mail updates.
  - Sponsor meeting to enable communicating w/CU faculty.
  - Open forums, have minutes, etc. easily accessible (now on WEB), take initiative to continue visits of senate officers to department meetings.
  - Take time to reach departments who may not have a senator from the dept.
  - Minutes of meetings in E-mail or voice mail. Maybe I'm not on the list server because I'm administrative.
  - Too new to say.
- See comments from activity.
- More retreats, regular updates.
- Revitalize the responsibilities of lead senators; sponsor workshops like this; continue to solicit input from faculty via phone calls, dept visits, surveys.

(Over)
We need to work together (senate, communications staff) to create an Intranet to provide discussion of issues. Continue practice of president and VP visiting departments; suggest Provost and President do same. Frequent E-mails. Senators hold face to face meetings w/constituents for informal discussions. Have open forum sessions by college. E-mail issues. Face to face meetings w/faculty to "flatten the line." Use CU-wide E-mail for minutes, major issues, agenda. This info. may also be available at the senate’s web page. Meet on campus occasionally; have brunch for faculty and do a little business; senate newsletter via E-mail. Lots of suggestions given - don’t put on the shelf - share with all. Help implement suggestions given in groups; be positive and professional. Do it - truly represent faculty rather than self-reward that time to do that.

Would you be interested in the Faculty Senate sponsoring a retreat again?

No - 1   Yes - 30

Topics you would like to see addressed:
More like this ‘til we get it.
Have deans/VPs/other administrators come and interact; team building exercises w/faculty, staff, administrators.
Faculty rewards in addition to pay, what would faculty see as meaningful recognition of their hard work.
Balance among teaching, research, service; long term goals for the university.
Another one on communication; interdisciplinary collaboration.
How to listen; how to participate in policymaking and legislating.
Faculty-Administration relationships.
More on communication, team building. (2)
Coping with change.
University priorities, i.e. a strategic plan.
Motivating
Building professional relationships, i.e. collaboration or conflict resolution.
Faculty morale.
Spearhead vital issues for dialogue; continue communication.
Communication of shared vision for university.
Involvement of faculty in university affairs/administration, etc.; more discussion of communication.
Communication within departments.
Morale; communication.
Problems specific to the senate itself; internal leadership problems.
After class is out and grades are due! We need to address faculty senate-board communication.
Effective change; communicating/persuading target groups - administration, legislators, parents.
Communication (2) - Encourage civil communication.
Balancing teaching, research, public service (w/administrators and trustees).

COMMENTS:
Thanks for including administrators.
Very useful.
Disappointed at attendance rate of senators.
It is really great that our president and provost spent time with us.
I was very glad to see Stef Rogers and Jim Barker in attendance; it's the right tone to set.
Well done.
Excellent meeting. (2)
Eaglin is powerful; he's on the interpersonal and spiritual level. He's so right on. Thank you for bringing him here again.
The success of this workshop was the selection of the keynote speaker.
Thanks for including communications staff.
Thanks.
Retreat is an excellent idea.
Very good workshop.
As always, not enough time to discuss all the ideas and concerns people have.
Need to focus on "real" issues and discuss means to achieve them.
Delighted to be included and look forward to more and better communication.

Submitted By: Welfare Committee/January 2000
DEFINITION OF CATEGORIES

The 1994 Carnegie Classification includes all colleges and universities in the United States that are degree-granting and accredited by an agency recognized by the U.S. Secretary of Education.

Research Universities I: These institutions offer a full range of baccalaureate programs, are committed to graduate education through the doctorate, and give high priority to research. They award 50 or more doctoral degrees each year. In addition, they receive annually $40 million or more in federal support.

Research Universities II: These institutions offer a full range of baccalaureate programs, are committed to graduate education through the doctorate, and give high priority to research. They award 50 or more doctoral degrees each year. In addition, they receive annually between $15.5 million and $40 million in federal support.

Doctoral Universities I: These institutions offer a full range of baccalaureate programs and are committed to graduate education through the doctorate. They award at least 40 doctoral degrees annually in five or more disciplines.

Doctoral Universities II: These institutions offer a full range of baccalaureate programs and are committed to graduate education through the doctorate. They award annually at least ten doctoral degrees—in three or more disciplines—or 20 or more doctoral degrees in one or more disciplines.

Master's (Comprehensive) Universities and Colleges I: These institutions offer a full range of baccalaureate programs and are committed to graduate education through the master's degree. They award 40 or more master's degrees annually in three or more disciplines.

Notes on Definitions


2. Total federal obligation figures are available from the National Science Foundation's annual report called Federal Support to Universities, Colleges, and Nonprofit Institutions. The years used in averaging total federal obligations are 1989, 1990, and 1991.

3. Distinct disciplines are determined by the U.S. Department of Education's Classification of Instructional Programs 4-digit series.

4. The liberal arts disciplines include English language and literature, foreign languages, letters, liberal and general studies, life sciences, mathematics, philosophy and religion, physical sciences, psychology, social sciences, the visual and performing arts, area and ethnic studies, and multi- and interdisciplinary studies. The occupational and technical disciplines include agriculture, allied health, architecture, business and management, communications, conservation and natural resources, education, engineering, health sciences, home economics, law and legal studies, library and archival sciences, marketing and distribution, military sciences, protective services, public administration and services, and theology.
Federal Obligations to R & D Activities

Schools

(1997) and Top 100 Ranking of ACC

Source: NSF Report 98-331, & 99-331

Duke (18)
UNC (21)
Maryland (46)
Ga. Tech. (64)
Virginia (47)
NC State (74)
Virginia (47)

$Million

Duke (18) 186.9
UNC (21) 165.4
Maryland (46) 90.7
Virginia (47) 90.3
Ga. Tech. (64) 61
NC State (74) 55.2
Wake Forest (78) 52.9
USC (96) 39.2
Clemson 17.9

m
Plans for the 2000 Edition of the Carnegie Classification

Presentation to the Washington Higher Education Secretariat

October 26, 1999

Alexander C. McCormick
Senior Scholar
Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching

Comments to: classification@carnegiefoundation.org

Background

The Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education was developed in 1970 and first appeared as an appendix to the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education's 1971 report New Students and New Places. The Classification was created "to provide more meaningful and homogeneous categories than are found in other existing classifications." When the Classification was published separately in 1973, Commission Chair Clark Kerr described the Commission's intent in the Foreword: "We sought to identify categories of colleges and universities that would be relatively homogeneous with respect to the functions of the institutions as well as with respect to characteristics of students and faculty members" (emphasis added). In both publications it is clear that the Classification was developed to aid research. Indeed, Kerr wrote that "[t]he Commission decided to make the Classification available in published form because we felt that it would be helpful to many individuals and organizations that are engaged in research on higher education" (emphasis added).

In The Rise of American Research Universities (1997), Hugh Davis Graham and Nancy Diamond write that

[The Carnegie system was designed to pull the attention of policy makers away from the nation's research institutions, and to emphasize instead the variety and social importance of the vast majority of institutions that were not research oriented...]. The goal of the Carnegie Commission, headed by Clark Kerr, was to use Carnegie prestige as leverage to change the way in which money was invested in American higher education.

Indeed, the Commission stated in New Students and New Places: "We find no need whatsoever in the foreseeable future for any more research-type universities granting the Ph.D." Among the report's recommendations were "preserving and even increasing the diversity of institutions of higher education by type and by program; resisting homogenization" and "holding steady the number of universities." This is deeply ironic to anyone familiar with how the Classification has been interpreted and how it has affected institutional action over the years.

Although the Carnegie Classification is not intended to confer status or to rank institutions, it is widely interpreted in those ways. It has also been adopted for a range of uses beyond research, some of which have important consequences for institutions. Both of these factors have led institutional leaders to have ambitions with respect to the Classification and in some cases to adopt "moving up the Carnegie Classification" as an explicit institutional goal. In these ways, what was intended as a relatively objective research tool has become an influential-if un-tended-policy lever. The Classification itself is driving change in institutions and by extension, the system that it aims to describe objectively. This not only compromises the Classification's utility for research purposes, it also raises serious questions about its impact on institutional flexibility, change, and innovation. It is in this context that the Carnegie Foundation approaches the question of whether and how to revise the Carnegie Classification.

Plans for Upcoming Editions

The Carnegie Classification was last revised in 1994, based primarily on data from 1989-92. It is now seriously out of date. Mindful of the need to update the Classification and also of the need for a fundamental rethinking of the present system, the Carnegie Foundation has announced a short-term plan to issue a revised edition in 2000, and a longer-term plan to undertake a comprehensive revision of the classification system for release in 2005, to coincide with the Foundation's centennial.
The 2000 edition will resemble past editions in many respects, and is intended primarily to update the Classification with more current data. It is nevertheless a transitional version. For 2005, we plan to restructure the present classification system with a series of classifications. A multi-classification framework will remind users that institutions can be compared and grouped in a variety of ways, and that no single taxonomy is adequate or appropriate for all purposes. Users will then have to think carefully about the dimensions of variation that are most relevant to the particular question at hand. Another potential benefit of this approach is that it would more

differentiate classification from ranking.

The 2000 Edition

In view of the Carnegie Classification's importance to the higher education community, and the potential impact that even relatively minor changes may have, the Carnegie Foundation is sharing its preliminary plans to invite feedback and commentary. While this is not a referendum on the proposed changes, we want to give the community an opportunity to contribute to our deliberations. This is the first time that the Foundation has undertaken such a broadly consultative process before reissuing the Classification. Appended to this document are pages detailing the 1994 Classification categories and definitions and the changes that we plan for the 2000 edition.

Each edition of the Classification since 1976 has involved changes in category definitions. For example, through 1976 the definition for Research Universities I and II limited each of those categories to about 50 institutions (they totaled 92 institutions in 1973 and 98 in 1976). In 1987 this limitation was eliminated, and by 1994 there were 88 Research Universities I and 37 Research Universities II. Thus, while the labels remained constant, the underlying definitions have been subject to change.

Doctorate-granting Institutions

In past editions of the Classification, doctorate-granting institutions (Research Universities I and II and Doctoral Universities I and II) have been more finely differentiated than any other type of institution. Although they represent about 7 percent of the Classification's universe of institutions, they account for about 20 percent of its categories (4 out of 19 in 1994). Level of federal funding has been used to define and differentiate Research Universities I and II. The Carnegie Foundation plans to reduce the number of categories of doctorate-granting institutions and to discontinue use of federal funding as a measure of research activity.

Although the Carnegie Classification is not intended to confer status or influence institutions' access to resources, we recognize that it has both effects, and that they are most evident among doctorate-granting universities. Thus the research- and policy-related difficulties associated with the Classification are most pronounced among these institutions. A number of sources have persuasively argued that the extent and manner of differentiating these institutions is problematic given its impact on institutions. For example:

- It seems to imply that faculty at Doctoral Universities do not conduct research.
- The use of federal funding to assess research activity favors certain types of institutions, such as those with medical schools.
- The drive to "move up" the Classification can affect resource allocation and hiring, possibly at the expense of other components of institutional mission that are less finely measured or absent from the Classification's definitions.

Past editions of the Classification have used data from the National Science Foundation (NSF) on federal agencies' obligations to colleges and universities as a way to assess the level of research activity on a given campus. While these data have the virtues of independence and objectivity, using them as the sole measure of research activity has its drawbacks:

- Not all federal obligations are related to research.
- Not all federal agencies are included in the NSF survey.
- These data are blind to the pass-through of funds from one institution to another.
- Not all university research is federally funded.

Each of these drawbacks can prevent us from assessing an institution's true level of research activity.

Finally, there are technical reasons why the familiar categories cannot be reproduced. Whereas the NSF previously reported both science and engineering (S&E) and non-S&E obligations, it now reports only S&E obligations. Because previous editions of the Classification used the total figure from the NSF data (that is, the sum of S&E and non-S&E obligations), it is not possible to reproduce the previous criteria using current data. Continued use of the NSF data would require an adjustment to compensate for this change, and the new categories constructed with these data would not be strictly comparable with the previous ones.

After careful consideration, we have concluded that the difficulties set forth above outweigh the benefits associated with continued use of the NSF data to identify and differentiate the Research Universities categories. The 2000 edition of the Classification will include two categories, to be labeled Doctoral/Research Universities I and Doctoral/Research Universities II. The two categories will be differentiated according to doctorate production and field coverage. We have chosen new labels to avoid possible confusion with the previous ones.

Our ambitions for the 2005 edition include the development of more precise ways to measure the full range of indicators of research activity, as well as indicators for teaching and service activity.
To: Faculty Senate President Horace D. Skipper  
From: Policy Committee Chair James C. Acton  
Re: Final Overhaul of University Committee Structure

For two years the subject of a streamlined University committee structure has been the subject of attention by the Academic Council, the full Senate for information, then to an ad hoc committee to iron out the details, and now to the Policy Committee for further refinement before submission to the full Senate for final approval.

As a point of departure it may prove helpful to have a list of those committees which would be discontinued under this proposal. They are (page numbers refer to August 1999 version of the Faculty Manual):

aa. External Educational Programs Committee, pp. 45-46  
bb. Academic Ceremony Committee, pp. 46-47  
cc. Facilities Planning Committee, pp. 49-50  
dd. Committee on Access and Accommodations for Individuals with Disabilities, p. 50  
ee. Group Insurance Committee, p. 51  
ff. Strategic Planning Committee, p. 51  
gg. Alumni Distinguished Professors Committee, p. 52  
hh. Faculty Development Committee, p. 53  
ii. Faculty Salaries & Fringe Benefits Committee, p. 53  
jj. Financial Aid Committee, p. 54  
kk. Safety and Fire Prevention Committee, p. 56

Part VI. of the August 1999 Faculty Manual deals with "Faculty Participation in University Governance" (pages 43-66). After a "General Statement" (pages 43-44), there is a description of the charge and membership of the Academic Council (page 44).

Currently, the committee composition is outlined as follows: first, the ten committees reporting to the Academic Council (pages 44-47). Next there is a section dealing with each of the ten bodies reporting to the President (pages 47-52), the eleven reporting to the Provost (pages 52-55), the five reporting to the Chief Research Officer (pages 55-56), the nine reporting to the Vice President for Student Affairs (pages 56-58), and the three reporting to the Chief Financial Officer (pages 58-59).
Under the following proposal there would only be two Councils reporting to the Academic Council, - a Council on Undergraduate Studies with seven subcommittees and a Council on Graduate Studies with five subcommittees. In the revised structure there would be only six bodies reporting to the President, now only four for the Provost, and one Research Council with five subcommittees reporting to the Chief Research Officer. The committee structure for the Vice President for Student Affairs would be changed with the deletion of one committee and revision of another. The committees reporting to the Chief Financial Officer would remain the same.

Editorial comments appear in brackets {} so that the section of the Manual can be easily located, implementation details described, and the impact of committee deletions/combinations understood. New language is underscored.

*******************************************************

1. Academic Council. (page 44) {The charge and membership of the Academic Council is unchanged; however, the structure of reporting would be changed with only two Councils and their appropriate subcommittee chairs reporting to the Academic Council. See below.)

2. Council on Undergraduate Studies {NEW}

This Council will consist of all the faculty members, students, and administrators from each subcommittee listed below. The Senior Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Studies will be a non-voting member serving as chairperson. The Senior Vice Provost will convene the Council each fall. All terms begin August 15 of the academic year. In the instance of a resignation from a subcommittee, the dean of that college appoints a replacement who serves until the next election for seating on August 15.

Jurisdiction: The Council on Undergraduate Studies will recommend to the Academic Council all policy matters which originate with it, from the colleges, the Faculty Senate, the Student Senate, or from the various committees that report to it.

The subcommittees that report to it are:

a. Academic Advising Committee (NEW) is to examine undergraduate advising, to provide the Provost with periodic updates, and to make recommendations pertaining to advising. Membership consists of the following: (Voting) Two faculty members elected from each college for a two-year term on a staggered basis, two at-large appointments made by the Provost, and two undergraduate students appointed by the President of the Student Senate. As an ex officio, non-voting, liaison member is the Director of Undergraduate Academic Services. The chair is elected by the membership.
b. Undergraduate Curriculum Committee is comprised of the Senior Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Studies or some other member of the Provost's staff who serves as non-voting chairperson. Each college has two voting members, one of whom is chair of the collegiate curriculum committee, and the collegiate committee elects the second. The committee's jurisdiction is set forth in the Faculty Constitution (p. 66). The term of office is for three years in rotation. Non-voting members in addition to the chair include one elected Library faculty, one undergraduate student appointed by the Student Body President, the Registrar, the Calhoun Honors College Director, and other members of the Senior Vice Provost's staff as needed.

c. Admissions Committee (pp. 44-45, formerly combined with Continuing Enrollment) formulates and recommends undergraduate admissions policies to the Council on Undergraduate Studies. It also serves as the appeals committee for undergraduate admissions.

Membership consists of five faculty members serving three-year terms elected one from each college, the Chair of the Faculty Senate Scholastic Policies Committee (or designee), and the chair of the Student Senate Academic Affairs Committee. Non-voting members are the Director of Undergraduate Admissions (Chair), the Director of Undergraduate Academic Services, and the Director of Housing.

d. Continuing Enrollment Committee (pp. 44-45, formerly combined with Admissions) formulates and recommends undergraduate continuing enrollment appeals policies to the Council on Undergraduate Studies. It is responsible for recommending policies relating to advising and retention. It also serves as the appeals committee for undergraduate continuing enrollment appeals.

Membership consists of five faculty serving three-year terms elected one from each college, the Chair of the Faculty Senate Scholastic Policies Committee or designee, the student chair of the Minority Council, and an undergraduate student appointed by the Student Body President. The non-voting Director of Undergraduate Academic Services is the chair.

e. Calhoun Honors College Committee (p. 46) formulates and recommends policies and procedures for Calhoun Honors College to the Council on Undergraduate Studies. The faculty members on the committee serve as the curriculum committee for the Honors Program.

Membership consists of five faculty members serving three-year terms elected one from each college, one member elected from the Library, the chair of the Faculty Senate Scholastic Policies Committee (or designee), an honors student appointed by the Honors College Director, and an undergraduate student member of the Student Senate Academic Affairs Committee appointed by the Student Senate President. Non-voting members are the Director of Calhoun Honors College (Chair) and one representative from the Office of Admissions and Registration.
f. Scholarships and Awards Committee (p. 46) formulates and recommends policies relating to scholarships and awards to the Council on Undergraduate Studies. It reviews the selection of recipients for University and collegiate undergraduate scholarships and awards, and it hears appeals on scholarships and grants-in-aid.

Membership consists of six faculty members serving three-year terms elected one from each college and the Library; the Chair of the Faculty Senate Scholastic Policies Committee (or designee); and one undergraduate student appointed by the Student Body President. Non-voting: the Director of Financial Aid (Chair), the Director of Calhoun Honors College, the Dean of Student Life, the Director of Admissions, and the Registrar.

g. Academic Integrity Committee. (p. 54, formerly Undergraduate Academic Grievances Committee) hears appeals concerning undergraduate student academic dishonesty and academic grievances brought by undergraduate students against faculty or administrators. In all unresolved cases the committee makes its recommendation through the Provost to the President. The procedures and penalties are set forth in the current Undergraduate Announcements.

Membership of the committee consists of ten tenured faculty members, two from each college as elected by their respective collegiate faculties. College faculty members will be elected for a staggered term basis, serving for a period of two years after initiation of staggered terms. They are joined by ten undergraduate students (two from each college). The Director of Undergraduate Academic Services is the administrative coordinator. The terms of appointment begin with each Fall registration.

3. Council on Graduate Studies (NEW)

This Council will consist of all the faculty members, students, and administrators from each subcommittee listed below. The Dean of the Graduate School will be a non-voting member. The Graduate Dean will convene the Council each Fall; the Council will elect its chair from amongst the entire membership. In the instance of a resignation, the dean of the college appoints a replacement who serves until the next election for seating on August 15.

Jurisdiction: The Council provides oversight for policy and procedural implementation relating to graduate education by: receiving, stimulating, and originating proposals for the development of graduate education; reviewing, considering, and disseminating recommendations from its constituent committees; and approving and forwarding to the Academic Council those recommendations requiring specific action.

The subcommittees will consist of the following:
a. Graduate Curriculum Committee. (p. 65) This committee shall be composed of the Dean of the Graduate School as non-voting Chairperson, plus two representatives of the graduate curriculum committees of the several colleges, one of whom will be the chair of the college committee and the other elected by the college committee. Should a college have a single curriculum committee, the college committee will elect two representatives to the University Graduate Curriculum Committee. (from the Faculty Constitution, p. 65)

b. Graduate Admissions and Continuing Enrollment Appeals Committee. (p.45) This committee deals primarily with graduate admissions and continuing enrollment appeals. Its recommendations on policy and reports on general statistics are submitted to the Academic Council.

Membership consists of the following: (Voting) One faculty representative from each college elected by the collegiate faculty for three-year terms. (Non-Voting) Associate Dean of the Graduate School (Chair).

c. Graduate Fellowship and Awards Committee. (p. 47) This committee formulates and recommends policies and procedures relating to graduate fellowships and awards. It oversees selection of the recipients for University-wide fellowships and the campus competition from departmental nominations for Outstanding Graduate Teaching Assistants as well as future award recognitions for graduate students.

Membership consists of one faculty representative from each college elected by the collegiate faculty for three-year terms. The Director of Financial Aid or designee shall be a non-voting member of this committee. An assistant or associate dean of the Graduate School will serve in a non-voting capacity as chair of the committee.

d. Graduate Advisory Committee. (p. 54) This committee independently studies and reviews policy on non-curricular graduate student academic matters and on those issues affecting the general welfare of graduate students.

Membership consists of the following: one faculty member from each college elected by the collegiate faculty for three-year terms and two graduate students appointed by the President of Graduate Student Government. The non-voting chair is the Dean of the Graduate School.

e. Graduate Student Academic Grievances Committee. (pp. 54-55) This committee hears all grievances involving the following: (a) grievances of a personal nature involving an individual student and a faculty member; (b) the claim by a student that the final grade in a course was inequitably awarded; (c) cases where the grievance involves graduate student employment; and (d) graduate student academic dishonesty. In cases involving academic dishonesty, the Policy on Academic Misconduct shall be applied. (Page 35 of GRADUATE SCHOOL ANNOUNCEMENTS) In all unresolved cases, the committee makes its recommendations to the President through the Provost. All proceedings of the committee are confidential. Details as to definitions and procedures may be found in Graduate School Announcements.
Membership of this committee consists of the following: 
five faculty members involved in graduate education (one 
from each college elected by the collegiate faculty for 
three-year terms) and two graduate students appointed by the 
President of Graduate Student Government; also one repre-
sentative of the Graduate School serving in a non-voting, 
advisory role. Each year the chair is elected from among 
the continuing faculty members. The terms of appointment 
begin with each Fall registration.

D. Councils, Commissions, and Committees Reporting to 
the President {pp. 47-52}

1. Athletic Council. {pages 47-49, NO CHANGE}

2. President's Commission on the Status of Women {page 
49, NO CHANGE}

3. Honorary Degree and Naming Committee. {pages 51 and 
49 respectively, combines two former committees}

This committee consists of the Vice President for 
Academic Affairs and Provost, who serves as chair; the Pres-
ident of the Faculty Senate, who serves as secretary; the 
most recent past president of the Faculty Senate currently 
in the employ of Clemson University; the most senior (in 
years of service) Alumni Distinguished Professor; and the 
most senior (in years of service) holder of an Endowed 
Chair/Titled Professorship. When functioning to select 
candidates for an honorary degree, the Chair of the Insti-
tutional Advancement Committee of the Board of Trustees and 
the Chair of the Board of Trustees will be added.

When the committee functions to name candidates for an 
honorary degree, it evaluates a candidate's credentials and 
submits a recommendation for the awarding of an honorary 
degree to the President of the University. The President 
will forward a recommendation to the Board of Trustees for 
approval. When serving as a naming committee, this body 
recommends appropriate names for University lands and fa-
cilities to the University President for approval by the 
Board of Trustees.

4. The President's Cabinet. {p. 51, NO CHANGE}

5. Classified Staff Commission. {pp. 51-52, NO CHANGE}

6. President's Commission on the Status of Black 
Faculty and Staff. {p. 52, NO CHANGE}

E. Committees Reporting to the Vice President for 
Academic Affairs and Provost {pp. 52-55}
1. Computer Advisory Committee. (p. 52) This committee reviews and advises on policies for the Division of Computing and Information Technology. Voting membership consists of one faculty member serving a three-year term elected from each of the colleges and the Library; a representative from the Faculty Senate elected annually; and a graduate student appointed by the President of Graduate Student Government. Non-voting membership includes the Vice Provost for Computing and Information Technology (chair) and a staff member from each of the following offices: Student Affairs, Development, and Finance.

2. Libraries Advisory Committee. (p. 53) This committee reviews and advises on policies for the University Libraries. Membership consists of the Dean of Libraries (chair, non-voting); one faculty representative serving a three-year term elected from each college and the Library; a representative of the Faculty Senate elected annually; an undergraduate student appointed by the President of the Student Senate; and a graduate student appointed by the President of Graduate Student Government.

3. University Assessment Committee. (p. 53, no change EXCEPT to drop "Institutional" twice in paragraph two so it reads "...different areas of Administration and Advancement appointed by the Vice President for Administration and Advancement" and then ADD immediately thereafter "one representative appointed by the Dean of Undergraduate Studies,...." (This addition was approved by then Provost Charles Jennett on February 22, 1995, but it never made its way into the document.)

4. Innovation Fund Awards Committee. (p. 54, no change EXCEPT that "Chair of the Strategic Planning Committee" drops off the membership since that committee has been disbanded.)

F. Committees Reporting to the Chief Research Officer
(pp. 55-56, formerly reporting to the Vice President for Public Service and Agriculture)

1. Research Council. (p. 47, formerly the University Graduate Council) The Research Council provides the needed advisement and representation on issues impacting the University's research efforts. The Research Council will provide the Chief Research Officer direct faculty input on future policy and procedural matters to enhance the quality of scholarly endeavors and the growth of research programs under his/her direction. The Research Council will be expected to transcend unit and college lines, to promote shared values, and to present a cohesive point of view to the Chief Research Officer.
The Council membership will consist of the following: one faculty member elected from each collegiate faculty and the Library for a three-year term; one faculty member appointed from each college by the Chief Research Officer in consultation with the collegiate dean; the current Chair of the Faculty Senate Research Committee (or designee); and the chairs of each of the subcommittees.

The Chief Research Officer shall convene the membership for the purpose of electing a Chair. The Council will meet at least three times each academic year. A special meeting can be called by the Chair, by the Chief Research Officer, or by request of a third of the Council members in order to manage the Council’s business.

This Council is assisted by the following subcommittees whose chair reports through it:

a. Animal Research Committee. (p. 55, no changes EXCEPT that "Committee appointments are made for three-year terms by the Chief Research Officer" - not the VP for Public Service and Agr. or for indefinite terms.)

b. Institutional Biosafety Committee. (p. 55) This committee consists of the Associate Vice President for Research Compliance; two faculty members from disciplines relevant to recombinant DNA technology; two faculty members from disciplines relevant to chemical hazards and biohazards; two residents of the local community, not employees of the University; and one nonacademic laboratory technician. All members and chair are appointed by the Chief Research Officer to serve three-year terms." (The remainder of the paragraph is unchanged.)

c. Human Subjects Committee. (p. 55, formerly called the Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects; no changes EXCEPT that "All members are appointed by the Chief Research Officer to serve three-year terms.")

d. Intellectual Property Committee. (pp. 55-56) This committee consists of a chair appointed by the Chief Research Officer; the Senior Contract Advisor; the General Counsel (secretary); a representative from Administration and Advancement; an associate dean from each college; one graduate student representing the Graduate Student Association, for a one-year term; one undergraduate student nominated by the Dean of Student Affairs for a one-year term; a faculty representative elected from each college; and the person from Cooper Library identified as Patent Coordinator serving in an ex officio, non-voting capacity. (DELETED is the sentence that "All appointments are made by the Chief Research Officer, upon recommendation from the academic deans, where appropriate.) This committee recommends intellectual property policy to the Chief Research Officer; approves or disapproves patent and other intellectual property proposals submitted in accordance with patent policies of the University; and makes recommendations to the Chief Research Officer.
e. **Research Grants Committee.** (p. 56, formerly University Research Grant Committee) CHANGE to the opening sentence: "This committee consists of two faculty representatives elected for three-year terms by the faculty of each college plus one member elected for a three-year term from the Library. (The rest remains the same.)

G. **Organizations Reporting to the Vice President for Student Affairs** (pp. 56-58)

1. **Safety and Fire Prevention Committee (p. 56).** The recommendation from Student Affairs is to **DISCONTINUE.**

7. **University Union Advisory Council** (formerly University Union Board, pp. 57-58).

The purpose of the Union Advisory Council is to broaden student and University community representation and input on all matters relating to all aspects of the Union's operations, programs, and services. It is through this broadened representation and sharing of ideas the Union hopes to better serve and meet the social, cultural, recreational, and personal development needs of the campus community. The Council will meet at least one time each semester or as called by the Chair of the Council.

The membership of the Council consists of the following as continuing but non-voting members: Director of University Union and Student Activities, Director of Student Activities and Organizations, and Director Union Programs and Major Events; as continuing and voting members: Chief Facilities Officer, Director CU Office of Multicultural Affairs, UPAC President, and Tiger Paw Productions Chair; as voting members elected for two-year terms: the CUPD Representative, Classified Staff Representative, and Faculty Senate Representative; as voting members elected for one-year terms: IFC/Panhellenic/NPHC (alternating), RHA Representative, SGA Representative/Vice President Student Body, Graduate Student Government Representative, Central Spirit Representative, and International Student Representative; as voting members appointed for one-year terms: a Student Employee of University Union (appointed by Director of Union Programs and Major Events) and a Media Representative (appointed by the chair of the Media Advisory Board). The Chair of the Council will be elected from the voting membership by the voting membership.
H. Committees, Boards, and Units Reporting to the Chief Financial Officer {pp. 58-59}

1. Accident Review Board. {pp. 58-59, NO CHANGE}

2. Bookstore Advisory Committee. {p. 59} CHANGE to "...two faculty representatives elected from each college and one elected from the Library; and annually from each of the following: a representative of the Faculty Senate;...."

3. Vending Machine Committee. {p. 59, NO CHANGE}

4. Office of Human Resources {p. 59}

I. Other University Organizations {p. 59}

1. Organization of Academic Department Chairs {p. 59, NO CHANGE}

2. Ad Hoc Committee Philosophy. {NEW} Ad Hoc Committees may be convened by appropriate University officials or organizations to carry out a SPECIFIC charge. Ad Hoc Committees MUST have a definite date by which time their work is to be completed and the committee disbanded. Ad Hoc Committees will normally consist of three to five members, never to exceed seven members. When a committee exceeds five members, representation must include the five colleges and the library.

c.c.: President James F. Barker
Academic Vice President and Provost Steffen H. Rogers
Editorial Consultant Robert A. Waller
ad hoc Committee Members
Mesdames Brenda J. Smith and Cathy T. Sturkie
Clemson University Business Systems


- Training
- News & Information
- Forms/Documentation
- Reports:
  - Summary BSR
  - Statement of Changes
- Other Reports
- Chart of Accounts
- FAQ
- Workstation Reqs
- Request Access
- PeopleSoft Home
- Help Desk
- Contact Us

New Financial & HR reports in CUBS soon available to departments to be run ad hoc
- Description of all reports available
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Center</th>
<th>Business Officer</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
<th>E-mail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADVANCEMENT (UADM)</td>
<td>Kay Shaw</td>
<td>656-1289</td>
<td><a href="mailto:shaw@clemson.edu">shaw@clemson.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE, FORESTRY AND LIFE SCIENCES (AFLS)</td>
<td>Leigh Dodson</td>
<td>656-3660</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dleigh@clemson.edu">dleigh@clemson.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE OF ARCHITECTURE, ARTS AND HUMANITIES</td>
<td>Roger Liska</td>
<td>656-3916</td>
<td><a href="mailto:riggor@clemson.edu">riggor@clemson.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE OF BUSINESS AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS (BUSN)</td>
<td>Jean Crenshaw, Acting</td>
<td>656-3440</td>
<td><a href="mailto:djcrens@clemson.edu">djcrens@clemson.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING AND SCIENCE (ENST)</td>
<td>Lynda Brock</td>
<td>656-5532</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lynda@clemson.edu">lynda@clemson.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT (HEHD)</td>
<td>Vickie Ramsey, Acting</td>
<td>656-2073</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rosetta@clemson.edu">rosetta@clemson.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC SERVICE AND AGRICULTURE (PBSA)</td>
<td>Linda Martin</td>
<td>656-3273</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lmartin@clemson.edu">lmartin@clemson.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROVOST AND VICE PRESIDENT FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS (PRAA)</td>
<td>Brett Dalton</td>
<td>656-2444</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dbrett@clemson.edu">dbrett@clemson.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESEARCH AND GRADUATE STUDIES (RSCH)</td>
<td>Stanley Richardson</td>
<td>656-2324</td>
<td><a href="mailto:stanley@clemson.edu">stanley@clemson.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES (ULIB)</td>
<td>Victoria King</td>
<td>656-3021</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kingv@clemson.edu">kingv@clemson.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIVISION OF COMPUTING AND TECHNOLOGY (DCIT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADMINISTRATIVE PROGRAMMING SERVICES</td>
<td>Bill Weathers</td>
<td>656-3733</td>
<td><a href="mailto:billact@clemson.edu">billact@clemson.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRESIDENT (PRES)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXECUTIVE SECRETARY TO THE BOARD (SECB)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINANCIAL AFFAIRS (CFO)</td>
<td>Steve Copeland</td>
<td>656-0983</td>
<td><a href="mailto:copelan@clemson.edu">copelan@clemson.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY FACILITIES (FM)</td>
<td>Todd Barnette</td>
<td>656-4926</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tebarne@clemson.edu">tebarne@clemson.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHLETICS (ATHL)</td>
<td>Robert Ricketts</td>
<td>656-0157</td>
<td><a href="mailto:score@clemson.edu">score@clemson.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUDENT AFFAIRS (STAF)</td>
<td>Rusty Guill</td>
<td>656-0935</td>
<td><a href="mailto:grussel@clemson.edu">grussel@clemson.edu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offices</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
<th>E-mail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COMPTROLLER</td>
<td>Charles Tegen</td>
<td>656-0879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCOUNTING SERVICES</td>
<td>Steve Crump</td>
<td>656-0586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUDGET OFFICE</td>
<td>Alan Godfrey</td>
<td>656-5516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROCUREMENT SERVICES</td>
<td>Jim Boleman</td>
<td>656-2067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPONSORED PROGRAMS</td>
<td>William Hallums</td>
<td>656-0864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUBS 2000</td>
<td>Logan Rice</td>
<td>656-4159</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
MARCH 14, 2000

1. Call to Order: The meeting was called to order at 2:45 p.m. by President Horace D. Skipper.

2. Approval of Minutes: The Faculty Senate Minutes dated February 15, 2000 were approved as written.

3. Election of 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. “Free Speech”: John Huffman, Professor of Chemistry, commented upon the issue of denominational prayer at University functions. At the Engineering and Sciences Award Banquet, held on February 24, 2000, Dean Keinath asked his Assistant, John Finn, to deliver an Invocation. This was an obviously Christian blessing, which many of the non-Christians attending the Banquet found offensive. Professor Huffman commented that although denominational prayer at an official Clemson University function was undoubtedly a violation of the constitutionally-mandated separation of Church and State, a much more serious concern was the lack of consideration for those non-Christian faculty members and students attending the Banquet. Professor Huffman also noted that Clemson has emphasized diversity among the Faculty and Student Body in recent years, and that denominational prayer was contrary to this concept of diversity, and should cease.

5. Committee Reports
   a. Senate Committees

   1) Policy Committee – Jim Acton, Chair, submitted this Committee’s Report and briefly explained (Attachment A). A subcommittee is examining the possibility of generating Form 1 from data entered into FAS.

   2) Research Committee – Vic Shelburne, Chair, submitted and briefly explained the Research Committee Report dated February 28, 2000 and March 13, 2000 (Attachment C). Senator Shelburne noted that interesting material is contained within the Research Summit Report which his Committee will review and a critique will be provided to the Senate at the April meeting.
3) Welfare Committee – No Report

4) Finance Committee – Senator John Bednar stated that there was no report from this Committee.

5) Scholastic Policies Committee – Senator Jim Zimmerman stated that the Summer Registration Policy will be in the Fall Announcements, but will not be implemented until next summer. This Committee continues to look at plus/minus grading; has met with the Senior Vice Provost’s Office about a test run of evaluations using the electronic system for evaluation of teaching; and discussed student evaluations next Fall, noting that the last day for doing evaluations next Fall will be the last day of class. This Committee continues to discuss with the Registrar possibility of dropping students who do not pay fees on time.

b. University Commissions and Committees

1) Libraries Advisory Committee - Senator Alan Grubb noted that this Committee had met for the second time this year. The report by the Harvard consultant was read and his recommendations discussed. Dean Boykin presented to the committee his goals for the 1999-2003 period, along with the year-by-year steps to achieve those goals. Dean Boykin agreed to the committee's request for more frequent meetings in view of the seriousness of the Library's situation and he agreed to call meetings on a monthly basis.

7. President’s Report: President Skipper:
   a) announced that there would be a Parking Summit tomorrow morning at the Madren Center;
   b) reminded Senators to be sure Faculty Senate elections are being held in all colleges;
   c) stated that at this point, graduation ceremonies would continue to involve the hooding of Ph.D. candidates;
   d) stated that due to renovations at Littlejohn Coliseum, Graduation Exercises will be held elsewhere; and
   e) encouraged all to participate in the Inauguration activities on April 7, 2000.

8. Special Order of the Day: Ronald T. Herrin, Director of Payroll and Employee Benefits, shared information regarding the State Health Plan including reimbursements for prescription drugs and the “Money Plus” medical spending account.

9. Old Business
   a. Senator Brenda Thames submitted for approval the Resolution on Election to the Faculty. Vote to approve resolution was taken and passed (Attachment C). This resolution will come before the General Faculty at the May meeting for final approval.
10. **New Business** The following items were submitted by Senator Acton for approval and each item was discussed separately. Vote to approve each was taken separately, and each passed with the required two-thirds vote.

   a. Motion for Renewal regarding the Revised “Research Professor” Concept (Attachment D) was made by Senator Acton and discussion was held during which objections were made. Call to Question was made; vote was taken; and passed. Vote to accept renewal motion was taken and passed. Following an explanation of the history and revisions by Senator Acton, discussion was held during which a motion was made and seconded to vote on Concept by secret ballot. Vote to hold secret ballot vote was taken and passed. Discussion continued. Call to Question was made and seconded; vote was taken; and passed. Vote by secret ballot to accept Concept was taken and passed (20-9).

   (Five Minute Break was taken)

   b. Correction of Paragraph on Withdrawal Policy (Attachment E).

   c. Policy on First Day Class Attendance (Attachment F).


   e. Role of Staff in Administrator Evaluation (Attachment H).

11. **Announcements:** President Skipper:

   a. reminded Senators to review parking material contained within the Agenda Packet.

   b. announced that Cathy Sturkie had received the 2000 Women’s Commission Award for Outstanding Classified Staff Woman and that Professor Syd Cross (a former Faculty Senator) received the Outstanding Faculty Award.

   c. announced that Alan Grubb was elected Faculty Senate Vice President/President-Elect and Peg Tyler was elected Faculty Senate Secretary for the year 2000-2001.
12. **Adjournment:** The meeting was adjourned by President Skipper.

Signed:

Elizabeth Dale

Cathy Toth Sturkie

Absent: D. Allison, F. Eubanks, K. Sturkie, J. Leininger (DuBreuil for), S. Saha (G. Lickfield for), S. Oldaker, (J. Huffman was present for E. Hare who was able to attend the meeting after all).
Faculty Senate Policy Committee Report

For March 14, 2000 Faculty Senate Meeting

The Policy Committee met on Monday, February 21, 2000 and on Tuesday, March 07, 2000

• "Research or Extension Faculty Positions".
After considerable feedback from Faculty Senators and faculty following the February Faculty Senate meeting regarding this proposal, the proposal was re-examined at the February 21st Policy Committee meeting. The proposal was slight modified regarding departmental and public service expectations and approved by a majority of the committee to be presented to the March Faculty Senate as a motion renewal. Subsequently, the proposal was approved unanimously by the Research Committee. It should be noted Departmental By-laws would need to be updated based on the proposal. The proposal will be considered under Old Business.

• University Committee Structure Modifications.
The Faculty Senate's approved proposal was subsequently approved by the Provost. The committee is addressing two concerns: (1) Parking Review Board, an ad-hoc committee assisting the Municipal Judge, has brought forth issues that seem to support making this a full university committee due to legal aspects of parking tickets. (2) The Academic Grievance Committee was erroneously omitted from the university committees reporting to the Council on Undergraduate Studies and we are moving to make the error known and have Faculty Senate correct it at the April Senate meeting.

• Instructor, Lecturer and/or "Senior Instructor" Possibilities
At the last 4 meetings of our committee, we have discussed possibilities of providing a pathway for advancement/promotion of Instructors and/or Lecturers who provide exemplary service to their departments and the university. We intend to bring a proposal with the following features to the April Senate meeting: (1) If an Instructor was appointed from a nationally advertised search, that Instructor would be eligible for promotion to Assistant Professor (tenure-track position) upon recommendation of the respective department promotion committee, department Chair and college Dean and approval by the Provost. (2) Provision for Instructor to be appointed/assigned to the rank of Lecturer, and after five years of service, with recommendations, be extended a three-year contract with requirement of one year notice before termination if the individual is to be terminated.

• Evaluation of Administrators
The committee reviewed staff participation in the evaluation of administrators and will be presenting a recommendation for faculty manual revision under New Business. The revision will provide for staff input into any academic administrator (examples: Chair, Dean, Provost) with separate, and hopefully, a more appropriate form for staff input.
• **Selection of Department Chairs**
  At our last 3 meetings we have discussed revision of the selection, terms and evaluation of department leadership in the form of the Department Chair. This is a follow-up to 1994 FS94-8-1P approved unanimously but never implemented. We will bring a proposal to the April Senate meeting that involves: (1) incorporation of renewal of appointment involving as an element, favorable vote of faculty, (2) providing accomplishments to the faculty, and (3) appointment from acceptable candidates on the search list.

• **Other Items**
  - Senate will consider: (1) proposal for incorporating the new policy into Faculty Manual relating to student Withdrawal Policy and First Day Class Attendance to be in line with the University Announcements/Student Handbook and (2) replacement of Academic Dishonesty Statement with the recently approved Academic Integrity Committee which now covers this subject area.

**Continuing/Future Committee Items.**

• **Professor’s in Charge (PIC)**
  The committee hopes to have a report on our findings by the end of the semester.

• **TPR/PTR Review**
  We continue to work in this area regarding timing and requirements for the "Tenure and Promotion Review Executive Summary Notebook" for TPR and PTR as relates to the Provost's requirements to the Deans of the colleges. What we need is faculty manual language that translates into a listing for faculty undergoing TPR/PTR review.

*The next Policy Committee meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, March 29 (1:00 pm) in the library conference room.*

Note: This report is provided with the assistance of Alternate Faculty Senator Ron Galyean who attends all Policy Committee meetings.
Faculty Senate Research Committee 1999-2000
Report #6 — February 28, 2000 Meeting & Report #7 — March 13, 2000 Meeting

Committee Members in attendance: V. Shelburne (Chair) (2/28 and 3/13), S. Anand (3/13), J. Brannan (3/13), B. Lee (3/13), E. Richardson (3/13), Cecilia Voelker (2/28)

1. The slight revision in the wording of the “Research and Extension Prof.” title to include a public service interaction component was reviewed at the February 28th meeting. This revision in wording was worked out by Shelburne with the Policy Committee on February 21. The Research Committee reviewed the wording on e-mail and approved it. The wording now reads *(added language in bold Italics):*

"Research or Extension Faculty. The titles of Research or Extension Professor, Research or Extension Associate Professor, and Research or Extension Assistant Professor (dependent on professional qualifications) may be granted to persons engaged in full time research or public service who are supported exclusively (including fringe benefits) from external funds or foundation accounts. Such appointments must be initiated by the host department(s) in accordance with departmental bylaws and approved by the Dean and the Provost. These positions are contingent on the availability of external funds and adequate space; termination is automatic upon expiration of external funding. Individuals holding these positions will be subject to annual review utilizing the Faculty Activity System for position continuance. Initial appointment, reappointment, and promotion will be based on departmental bylaws and will be contingent upon plans for and contributions to the department’s undergraduate, graduate, and public service programs that interface with research. Examples are participation in departmental seminars, research exposure with undergraduate and graduate students, provision for funding of graduate students, service on Graduate Advisory Committees, and public service activities related to the department’s mission. Distribution of indirect costs or overhead generated shall follow University policy. These positions are not tenurable, nor shall time spent in such a position count toward tenure.

2. At the March 13th meeting, the committee reviewed the need for the “Research and Extension Titled professors” and Shelburne reminded the group about all the interactions and compromise between this committee and the Policy Committee. Likewise, he reviewed the positive influence of President Barker’s luncheon wherein he tried to help find common ground in the issue. Considering all the work and compromise to bring this issue forward, the committee hopes the Faculty Senate will pass the motion at it next meeting.
3. Shelburne passed out DRAFT copies of the Research Summit which was a meeting held on February 17, 2000 among Clemson administrators. The purpose of the Summit was to "examine the obstacles and opportunities at Clemson for both sponsored and internally funded research and further to identify and develop strategies to remove obstacles and increase opportunities" for research. Although there were some faculty members present, he expressed regret that no one from the Faculty Senate had been invited to the meeting; however, the DRAFT was readily available and he stated that the Research Committee would review it and offer a critique before the April Faculty Senate meeting. Members of the Research Committee should send their comments to Shelburne before April 1.

4. Shelburne announced that the next meeting of the University Research Council would be on March 28, 2000 at 3 PM in 132 Fluor Daniel EIB. The meeting was scheduled by Dr. Shah at the request of Shelburne in order to air some issues concerning the University Grant Committee and research compliance subcommittees which had come to the attention of the Faculty Senate Research Committee. Also, Shelburne had requested that a more formal interaction occur between the Faculty Senate Research Committee and the subcommittees under the University Research Council. In this way, Faculty concerns and ideas would have a more direct link to these areas.

5. With respect to the above discussion, the committee members were asked by Shelburne to consider a more formal charge in the Faculty Manual for the role of the Research Committee. The broad charge now reads "The Research Committee shall study and make recommendations on policies, procedures and practices primarily related to research." It was discussed whether this charge should specify more interaction with the five subcommittees (Animal Research, Institutional Biosafety, Human Subjects, Intellectual Property, and University Grants) under the Chief Research Officer and thereby the University Research Council. It was also suggested by a member of the committee that maybe we should only have the status as an ad hoc committee and only meet when there is a need.

6. Shelburne noted that both the Policy and Scholastic Policy Committees cover academics and that this Research Committee covers matters in research but that public service (Extension in particular) is not well-represented. Ed. Note—the following material was added by Shelburne during the writing of the minutes and was not formally discussed among the membership the committee—it is added for discussion at our next meeting: This third major component of the University has representation with the Extension Senate but the role of this body is quite different and has no link to the Faculty Senate. Perhaps this committee should be renamed the Research and Public Service (Policy) Committee with more formal linkage to the subcommittees noted above and to the Extension Senate.
RESOLUTION ON ELECTION TO THE FACULTY

FS00-3-1 P

Whereas, Dr. Robert F. Testin has served with distinction in the Department of Packaging Science for 13 years as Professor and Chair;

Whereas, Dr. Testin has 29 years of previous, relevant industrial experience at Reynolds Metals and the Battelle Memorial Institute;

Whereas, Dr. Testin has brought honor and recognition to Clemson University and the Department of Packaging Science through development of a department with a national and international reputation for excellence;

Whereas, Dr. Testin has secured funding and developed facilities for the Department of Packaging Science including the Sonoco Packaging Laboratory and the DuPont Packaging Evaluation Laboratory;

Whereas, Dr. Testin’s efforts led to the establishment of the $1.5 million endowment for a Cryovac Chair in Packaging Science;

Whereas, Dr. Testin’s close working relationship with the packaging industry and the Packaging Advisory Board has led to a formal development campaign targeting $10 million for the Department of Packaging Science;

Whereas Dr. Testin’s efforts, with those of his colleagues, have led the South Carolina Commission on Higher Education to accept the Department of Packaging Science’s proposal for a Master of Science in Packaging Science;

Whereas Dr. Testin has been selected for the College of Agriculture, Forestry and Life Sciences Honor Roll of Professors;

Whereas Dr. Testin is national and internationally recognized for his professional excellence and his contributions to packaging;

Whereas Dr. Testin was selected for a Lifetime Achievement Award by the Food Industry Association of South Carolina for his role in developing the Packaging Science program and leading its maturation as a department.

Whereas Dr. Testin received the Packaging Institute International Education Award, was recipient of a Trustees Award for Faculty Excellence, and was inducted into the Packaging Hall of Fame;

Whereas Dr. Testin has been an exceptional chair and faculty member and is retiring in August, 2000, after 13 years of service, the faculty of the Department of Packaging Science wish to retain him as a valuable resource and a member of the faculty even though he does not meet
the time qualifications for normal granting of emeritus faculty status;

Resolved, That the Faculty of the Department of Packaging Science respectfully request that the President of the Faculty Senate submit the name of Dr. Robert F. Testin before the Faculty as a whole at the next General Faculty Meeting and recommend to the Faculty that he be elected to the Faculty as an Emeritus Professor of Packaging Science.

Passed by the Faculty Senate
on March 14, 2000

EMERITI.WPD/15J
15 March 2000

To: Academic Vice President and Provost Steffen H. Rogers

From: Faculty Senate President Horace D. Skipper

Re: Revised "Research Professor" Concept

Thanks to the diligence and persistence of the chairs and members of the Policy and Research Committees, we now have an approved definition of what it means to be a "Research Professor" at this university. Yesterday on March 14th the Faculty Senate approved by the requisite two-thirds majority the statement reproduced below for inclusion in the next edition of the Faculty Manual. Implementation can be immediate upon your approval and that of the Board of Trustees.

You will recall that at the Board of Trustees meeting on July 11, 1999, approval "in principle" was given to the Faculty Senate's recommendation of March 10, 1999, concerning the establishment of the titles for "Research Scientist or Research Scholar." The Board's approval emphasized that the support for such individuals should be "entirely from self-generated funds" and that the Administration work with the Faculty Senate in determining an appropriate title for these individuals. The need for such a Special Faculty rank was accentuated by the recommendation from the Committee on the Future of the University which urged the addition of non-tenure track faculty ranks supported entirely by research funds generated by the individual and those individuals would engage modestly in the intellectual life of this academic community.

The Policy and Research Committees have reviewed the issue and, with the endorsement of the full Senate, offered jointly the following modification of the previously approved policy:

"Research or Extension Faculty. The titles of Research or Extension Professor, Research or Extension Associate Professor, and Research or Extension Assistant Professor (dependent upon professional qualifications)
may be granted to persons engaged in full time research or public service who are supported exclusively (including fringe benefits) from external funds or foundation accounts. Such appointments must be initiated by the host department(s) in accordance with departmental bylaws and approved by the Dean and the Provost. These positions are contingent upon the availability of external funds and adequate space; termination is automatic upon expiration of external funding. Individuals holding these positions will be subject to annual review utilizing the Faculty Activity System for position continuance. Initial appointment, reappointment, and promotion will be based on departmental bylaws and will be contingent upon plans for and contributions to the department's undergraduate, graduate, and public service programs that interface with their research or public service activities. Examples are participation in departmental seminars, research exposure with undergraduate and graduate students, provision for funding of graduate students, service on Graduate Advisory Committees, and public service activities related to the department's mission. Distribution of indirect costs or overhead generated shall follow University policy. These positions are not tenurable, nor shall time spent in such a position count toward tenure.

In this manner Clemson University would facilitate the attraction of specialists -research and service-oriented individuals- as Special Faculty with the potential for a long-term institutional commitment given self-generated funds but without a major teaching obligation as expected of Regular Faculty members.

c.c.: President James F. Barker, A.I.A.
Chief Research Officer Y. T. Shah
Faculty Representative Patricia T. Smart
Policy Committee Chair James C. Acton
Research Committee Chair Victor B. Shelburne
Editorial Consultant Robert A. Waller
Mesdames Brenda J. Smith and Cathy T. Sturkie
To: Academic Vice President and Provost Steffen H. Rogers

From: Faculty Senate President Horace D. Skipper

Re: Correction of Paragraph on Withdrawal Policy

In March of 1999 the Faculty Senate approved and you as Provost endorsed a modification of the description of the "W" grade in the Faculty Manual (pages 69-70); however, the elaboration of that policy was not corrected. That oversight needs to be corrected. Yesterday the Faculty Senate approved by the required two-thirds majority the amendment reproduced below.

It is recommended that paragraph three (page 69) under "Attendance Policy" be revised to read as follows:

A student who incurs excessive absences in a given course may be dropped from that course by the instructor in accordance with stated course policy. Students may withdraw from a course by using the online drop and add system. Students who withdraw after the first two weeks of classes shall have grades recorded for those courses. Prior to the last seven weeks of classes, this grade would normally be "W". Students are limited to no more than seventeen hours of "W" grades during their academic careers. Transfer students, however, may withdraw from no more than twelve percent of their total academic work (up to seventeen hours of course work, whichever is fewer) remaining in their chosen undergraduate curriculum at the time of their transfer to Clemson University.

In this manner the whole of the Faculty Manual would be brought into conformity with the redefinition of the "W" grade previously added. As an editorial change to implement policy already approved, this amendment to the Manual should become effective upon approval by you as Provost.

C.C.: Registrar Stanley B. Smith
Senior Vice Provost Jerome V. Reel, Jr.
Policy Committee Chair James C. Acton
Scholastic Policies Committee Chair David J. Allison
Editorial Consultant Robert A. Waller
Mesdames Brenda J. Smith and Cathy T. Sturkie
To: Academic Vice President and Provost Steffen H. Rogers

From: Faculty Senate President Horace D. Skipper

Re: Policy on First Day Class Attendance

At yesterday afternoon's meeting of the Faculty Senate, the policy change outlined below was approved by the requisite two-thirds majority for placement in the next edition of the Faculty Manual.

Recent experience indicates that enrollment pressures require that the Manual alert instructors to the existence of the campus policy requiring first day attendance on the part of students or contract with the instructor to assure a place in the class. While the August 1999 Faculty Manual draws attention to the detailed regulations in Undergraduate Announcements, there is no summary statement of this important policy as there is for several others.

To correct the omission, the Senate recommends that the Faculty Manual's initial paragraph on "Attendance Policy" (page 69) be amended to read as follows [new language underscored]:

2. Attendance Policy. The full attendance policy for undergraduates is set forth in Undergraduate Announcements but the key points are as follows: All students are required to attend the first day of classes and labs or contact the instructor to indicate their intention to remain in that class. {The remainder of the paragraph would remain unchanged.}

In this fashion instructors would be reminded of the student's required initiative in order to remain registered in the class at the beginning of each regular semester or summer session. This addition to the Manual should be implemented upon your approval as Provost.

C.C.: Registrar Stanley B. Smith
Senior Vice Provost Jerome V. Reel, Jr.
Scholastic Policies Chair David J. Allison
Policy Committee Chair James C. Acton
Editorial Consultant Robert A. Waller
Mesdames Brenda J. Smith and Cathy T. Sturkie
To: Academic Vice President and Provost Steffen H. Rogers

From: Horace D. Skipper, Faculty Senate President

Re: Replacing Academic Dishonesty Statement in Faculty Manual

In November and December 1999 the Faculty Senate endorsed the Student-Senate generated policy on “Academic Integrity” and that proposal was approved by the Board of Trustees in January of this year. As a consequence, the current statement on “Academic Dishonesty” (Part VII. “Professional Practices,” Section F. “Teaching Practices,” Subsection 6.) in the August 1999 Faculty Manual needs to be modified.

Upon recommendation of the Policy and the Scholastic Policies Committees, the Faculty Senate on February 14th approved by the required two-thirds majority that a totally new Subsection 6. be substituted for the current language as follows:

“6. Academic Integrity. As members of the Clemson University community, we have inherited Thomas Green Clemson’s vision of this institution as a ‘high seminary of learning.’ Fundamental to this vision is a mutual commitment to truthfulness, honor, and responsibility, without which we cannot earn the trust and respect of others. Furthermore, we recognize that academic dishonesty detracts from the value of a Clemson degree. Therefore, we shall not tolerate lying, cheating, or stealing in any form.

a. Any breach of the principles outlined in the Academic Integrity Statement is considered an act of academic dishonesty.

b. Academic dishonesty is further defined as:

1. Giving, receiving, or using unauthorized aid on any academic work;

2. Plagiarism, which includes the copying of language, structure, or ideas of another and attributing the work to one’s own efforts;

3. Attempts to copy, edit, or delete computer files that belong to another person without the permission of the file owner, account owner or file owner;
c. All academic work submitted for grading contains an implicit pledge and may contain, at the request of the instructor, an explicit pledge by the student that no unauthorized aid has been received.

d. It is inherent that faculty members enforce the Academic Integrity Policy. Please consult *Undergraduate Announcements* for details concerning the hearing committee structure, procedures, and penalties.

In this manner the *Faculty Manual* would be brought into conformity with the newly adopted policy to become effective with Fall 2000 registration. The reference to *Undergraduate Announcements* is the 2000-2001 issue forthcoming this August.

This policy clarification can become effective for inclusion in the 2000 edition of the *Faculty Manual* upon your approval since the Board of Trustees has already approved the concept.

c.c.: Senior Vice Provost Jerome V. Reel, Jr.
Undergraduate Ombudsman George E. Carter, Jr.
Policy Committee Chair James C. Acton
Scholastic Policy Committee Chair David J. Allison
Student Justice James R. Wyche
Editorial Consultant Robert A. Waller
Mesdames Brenda J. Smith and Cathy T. Sturkie
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To: Academic Vice President and Provost Steffen H. Rogers

From: Faculty Senate President Horace D. Skipper

Re: Role of Staff in Administrator Evaluation

Accumulated experience with the review of Academic Administrators suggests that some refinements need to be made to clarify the role of Staff in the process at the level of departments, schools, colleges, and university (see pages 11-12 of the August 1999 Faculty Manual).

In the Spring of 1998 the Faculty Senate approved and the Board of Trustees accepted a major revision in the way in which academic administrators are reviewed. That proposal included definitions of the constituent groups in each unit and the design of a standard form to be used by faculty and staff in submitting evaluations. Last January 28, 1999 the Senate approved and on April 16th the Board endorsed the clarification that Staff could nominate individuals for membership on the evaluation committee.

Still to be addressed, however, is the place of Staff in the constituent groups and the need for a separate evaluation form for Staff members to use. The reports from the evaluation committees for the first three reviews of collegiate deans suggested that there needed to be separate forms for staff members. The form which appears as Appendix G (pages 106-107) needs recasting to reflect better the concerns of Staff. The design of a new form for Staff will require extensive consultation with the leadership of the Classified Staff Commission, but it seems appropriate now to frame the language necessary for the specific inclusion of Staff in the various constituent groups.

To that end, the Faculty Senate on March 15th by the required two-thirds vote endorsed the proposal that the following language be inserted in the next edition of the Faculty Manual on page 11 of paragraph 2 of Section L. "Review of Academic Administrators" [new language underscored]:

"In the normal performance of their duties, administrators are subject to evaluations of their performances. Such evaluations shall employ the standard Clemson University form for the evaluation of administrators submitted to the chair of the evaluation committee and will involve the
Faculty/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/staff constituent group is defined as follows: A) All tenured and tenure-track faculty members and the staff directly rated or reviewed by that administrator in a department or school, B) All continuing members of the appropriate college faculty and the staff directly rated or reviewed by the academic dean, and C) The academic deans, the department chairs, the faculty, and the staff directly rated or reviewed by the provost. Faculty and staff will submit separate forms. Faculty using form G-1 and staff using form G-2.

Attached is a slightly revamped form G-1 for use just by the faculty and administrators in performing the required evaluation. There is no change except for the altered check-off space deleting the staff entry. A new form G-2 will need substantial revision in consultation with the leadership of the classified staff commission beyond the cosmetic removal of the academic ranks and this consideration is proceeding. A revised form will be forthcoming.

The purpose at the moment is to establish the principle of separate faculty and staff involvement in the personnel review process and the definition of the staff involved in each unit. The details of a revised form G-2 for staff can be established later. Once the revised staff form is submitted the whole package should be referred to the board of trustees for review and approval.

C.C.: Classified Staff Commission President Catherine Bell
Policy Committee Chair James C. Acton
Editorial Consultant Robert A. Waller
Mesdames Brenda J. Smith and Cathy T. Sturkie

Enclosure: Revised Form G-1
MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
APRIL 11, 2000

1. Call to Order: The meeting was called to order at 2:38 p.m. by President Horace D. Skipper.

2. Approval of Minutes: Both the General Faculty & Staff Minutes dated December 15, 1999 and the Faculty Senate Minutes dated March 14, 2000 were approved as written.

3. "Free Speech": CU 101, University Success Skill, is an elective course for freshman and first semester transfer students. It is a two credit hour course with three contact hours and the credits do apply to graduation. Classes are limited to 25 students to encourage discussion and interaction; the course focuses on a variety of topics to help students develop academic and intellectual competence/personal identity. It is primarily designed to help new students make a successful transition to college life and make a significant contribution to CU. The course is housed in the CAFLS in the Department of Biology Instruction and Agricultural Education. It is taught primarily by faculty in the college but is open to all qualified and student-oriented faculty; qualified staff may also teach the course. Staff involvement will be limited to 25% or less. The purpose of the presentation to the Faculty Senate was to increase awareness of the course and the availability of opportunities to teach the course. A $500 development stipend will be available for each instructor in the fall of 2000.

Eleanor Hare, Lead Senator of the College of Engineering and Sciences, reported that Dean Keinath had canceled a meeting to elect Senators on March 29th because there was not a full slate of nominees. The College Senate delegation had considerable difficulty persuading Dean Keinath to reschedule the meeting without a full slate of nominees having been obtained. After the Senate delegation unanimously requested that the meeting be called, Dean Keinath scheduled the meeting for April 20th.

4. Committee Reports
   a. Senate Committees
      1) Policy Committee – Jim Acton, Chair, announced his resignation from the Senate and stated that Senate Alternate Ron Galyean will complete his term. Senator Eleanor Hare submitted and briefly explained this Committee’s Report (Attachment A).
2) **Research Committee** – Vic Shelburne, Chair, submitted and noted highlights of the Research Committee Final Report dated April 3, 2000 (Attachment B).

3) **Welfare Committee** – Chair John Leininger submitted the Welfare Committee Report dated April 11, 2000 (Attachment C).

4) **Finance Committee** – Chair John Bednar submitted the Final Finance Committee Report for 1999-2000 (Attachment D).

5) **Scholastic Policies Committee** – David Allison, Chair, noted that March 27th will be the last meeting of this Committee. Stan Smith, Registrar, met with the Committee to discuss eliminating obstacles for students to be reinstated after they pay their delinquent payments. The student evaluation process is getting geared up again. The Committee met with Jerry Reel and DCIT to discuss formatting, online issues, and the implementation of evaluations by graduate students.

b. **University Commissions and Committees**
   1) **Libraries Advisory Committee** – Senator Alan Grubb noted that this Committee will hold its second meeting of the year tomorrow, April 12, 2000 and announced that a Library Summit will be held on May 26, 2000.

c. **University Grievance Activity Report** – President Switzer, as Acting Chair of the Faculty Senate Advisory Committee (which is the Hearing Panel for Grievance I Petitions) submitted the Grievance I Procedure Activity Report from April, 1999 through February, 2000 (Attachment E). Senator Sandy Edge submitted and briefly explained the Activity Report of the Grievance Board which hears Grievance II Petitions for the same time period (Attachment F).

5. **Old Business**
   a. James Wyche, representing the Student Government, provided an update of the Academic Integrity Policy.

The following Faculty Manual changes were submitted by Senator Eleanor Hare and were passed by the Faculty Senate with the required two-thirds vote:

b. Affirmation of the Academic Grievance Committee (Attachment G).


d. Coordination of Athletic Council Elections (unanimous) (Attachment I).

e. Selection of Department Chairs with Term Limits and Faculty Review (as amended) (Attachment J).

f. Clarification of Syllabus Requirement (Attachment K).

g. Redefinition of Instructor and Lecturer Positions (unanimous as amended) (Attachment L).
h. Following two-thirds vote by applause and acclamation, Senator Alan Grubb submitted for approval and read aloud the Resolution to Honor Elizabeth Dale. Vote to approve resolution was taken and passed with one abstention (FS00-4 P) (Attachment M).

6. President Jim Barker, Provost Stef Rogers, and Faculty Senate President Skip Skipper presented certificates of service to those Faculty Senators upon their retirement from the Senate.

Provost Rogers shared his feelings with the Faculty Senate regarding the good working relationship he has had with the Senate during his tenure at Clemson University. Following the Provost’s remarks, he received a standing ovation from members of the Faculty Senate.

7. Outgoing Remarks and Introduction of Senate President: Outgoing remarks were made by President Horace D. “Skip” Skipper who then introduced Fred S. Switzer, III, as the Faculty Senate President for 2000-01. New officers were installed at approximately 4:15 p.m.

8. New Business - President Switzer:
   a. introduced the new Faculty Senators and Senate Alternates as a group, and
   b. asked the Senators to complete and return the Committee Preference Questionnaires as soon as possible so that committees may be set.
   c. Senator Peg Tyler reminded the Senate of the President’s Walk/Run on Saturday morning, April 15, 2000 to benefit the Clemson University Libraries and encouraged all to enter.
   d. Senator Shelburne questioned the status of the University Committee structure.

9. Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned by President Switzer at 4:32 p.m.

Peg Tyler, Secretary

Cathy Toth Sturkie
Faculty Senate Policy Committee Report

For April 11, 2000 Faculty Senate Meeting

The Policy Committee met on Wednesday, March 29, 2000

SPECIAL ORDER OF THE DAY: Dori Helms on TPR and PTR

On invitation, the committee had a very good session reviewing areas of concern on TPR procedures, descriptions for requirements, and potential revisions for improving the overall process. Dr. Helms provided the Policy Committee with ideas for revisions of faculty manual Part IV, Personnel Practices, paragraphs C-K. The idea is to streamline the TPR and PTR processes with stated criteria on requirements for the faculty member, peer committee and administration. The committee hopes the next Policy Committee addresses the entire area.

COMMITTEE ACTION ITEMS FROM OLD BUSINESS:

- Instructor, Lecturer and/or "Senior Lecturer" Faculty Ranks
  After 5 meetings of fact-finding and discussions on possible pathways for the promotion of Instructors and/or Lecturers, the Committee developed a proposal to present to the Faculty Senate. The proposal provides for revision of the ranks with two major points: (1) If an Instructor was originally appointed following a nationally advertised search, that Instructor would be eligible for promotion to Assistant Professor (tenure-track position). (2) A Lecturer, after five years of service, with appropriate recommendations, may be granted an extended appointment contract. Additionally, a Senior Lecturer would have a one year notice prior to termination of appointment.

- Proposal for Revision of Endowed Chair and Professorships Reviews
  A proposed change to initiating a review of faculty holding endowed chairs or professorships by the respective college Dean without a request from the department faculty and Chair was not approved. The committee felt the faculty manual provisions for review should remain as is.

- University Committee Problem Areas.
  (1) The Policy Committee approved a proposal to make the current ad-hoc Parking Review Board a permanent university committee that will report to the President of Clemson University. This addresses an important legal issue pointed out by the administration and the Municipal Judge.
  (2) The Policy Committee approved "Affirmation of the Academic Grievance Committee" which was erroneously omitted from the university committees reporting to the Council on Undergraduate Studies.
  (3) The Policy Committee approved a proposal which addresses "Coordination of Athletic Council Elections" with other college-held elections for the university committees and councils. Two changes are proposed: (a) elections are made in March, and (b) faculty representatives may have terms renewed once.

- Selection of Department Chairs
  After 4 meetings of discussions on Department Chair selection, service terms and Chair leadership for departments, the Policy Committee developed and approved a proposal which
follows up a 1994 Faculty Senate resolution (FS94-8-1P). The proposal incorporates: (1) appointment renewal contingent on a favorable vote of a majority of all tenured faculty; (2) a Chair’s initial written statement of administrative goals and objectives for the department with a written report on accomplishments to the faculty at the end of each academic year; (3) how a selection committee shall be constituted, incorporating a faculty vote on candidates, and selection of the Chair from the acceptable candidates.

- **Syllabus Requirement for Undergraduate and Graduate Courses**
  
  To confirm the intent that a syllabus will be made available to students for all CU classes, the Graduate Council had requested clarification regarding graduate-level courses. The Policy Committee will make its proposal to the Faculty Senate.

**Continuing Committee Items.**

- **Professors in Charge (PIC)/Coordinators**
  
  The Policy Committee accepted a report from Alan Grubb regarding the status of the earlier PIC’s which are currently being structured into "Coordinators." Since this is evolving, the Policy Committee will await documentation of collegiate faculty approval for this structure and the collegiate by-laws which will provide for this type of "administrative" coordination.

Note: This report is provided with the assistance of Faculty Senator Ron Galyean.
Committee members in attendance: V. Shelburne (Chair), S. Anand, J. Brannan, B. Lee, C. Voelker

1. Vic Shelburne reported on his meeting with the University Research Council on March 28th as follows:

- The "Research and Sponsored Programs Activity Status" report was given to the members. This document reports the research and sponsored program activity by the University as a whole and by College through March 2000. Likewise, the Colleges reported data on proposal submission and how those submissions related to targets as set. Summaries of these data are attached. Dr. Shah noted that this entire report would soon be available on the web so faculty members will not have to access it through their chair or dean. When available, an announcement will be sent to all faculties.

- Dr. Shah reported on problems related to Research Compliance and noted that the importance of research compliance with respect to federal funding. Three committees in particular, Animal Research, Human Subjects, and Biosafety must be able to perform their duties. Because of problems noted by faculty, he has appointed an ad hoc committee to review problems and insure research compliance at Clemson. This committee will address problems that have been sent to the Faculty Senate Research Committee by individual faculty members.

- Because of the importance of research compliance, Dr. Shelburne suggested that the Chairs of these three major Committees (Animal Research, Human Subjects, and Biosafety), may need officially sanctioned release time (3 cr hr?) per semester in order to adequately perform these duties for the University. He will check with the Faculty Senate Research Committee for a recommendation.

- The new make-up of the University Research Council as approved by the Faculty Senate and the Provost was reviewed. This new make-up essentially reduces the membership from over 30 to 16 (an elected and appointed faculty member from each College along with the Chair of the five Committees (Human Subjects, Animal Research, Biosafety, Intellectual Property, and Research Grant) and the representative of the Faculty Senate Research Committee). This make-up was more or less approved by the existing Council with a recommendation that the Dean of the Graduate School, the Director of Technology Transfer, and Compliance Office Director also be ex officio members. Shelburne agreed to check with the Research Committee for a recommendation to the Faculty Senate on this issue.
The problem of inequitable distribution of University Research Grant Funds was discussed. Specifically, the fact that the arts, humanities and social sciences have historically received fewer awards and dollars was reviewed. Previous discussions between the Chair of the Senate Research Committee and the Chair of the Research Grant Committee (Hap Wheeler) indicated that there was an awareness of the problem and that Research Grant Committee would rectify the problem through a modified review procedure. The Chair of the committee would propose that each college would have their elected reps along with a third college faculty member review all proposals from that college and send the best proposals forward. The entire committee would then fund proposals based on the numbers of good proposals from each College. Dr. Shah suggested that the social sciences, arts, and humanities should be allocated half the total awards (not necessarily dollars) in order to ensure that they received an equitable share. Shelburne said he would discuss this idea with the Senate Research Committee but that he believed that the University Research Grant Committee should solve the problem.

2. With respect to the above items, the Senate Research Committee made the following recommendations:

- The three administrators noted above be *ex officio* members of the University Research Council.
- Chairs of the Human Subjects, Animal Research and Biosafety Committees be given release time.
- The University Research Grant Committee should work out an equitable distribution of funds/awards.

3. The Research Summit DRAFT was reviewed by the Committee. Most of the points made in the report were considered valid; however, there were a few items that Research Committee took issue with and are outlined below:

- The lack of any official participation from the Faculty on the Summit; it appeared to be purely an administrative group (although the actual Summit membership is unknown). Perhaps a member of the Faculty Senate research Committee should have been present.

- Lack of discussion on the lack of support for research by the State.

- Lack of discussion on the importance of the Library (and its deficiencies) in supporting the research effort at Clemson.

4. With respect to the recent changes in membership on the University Research Council, Shelburne stated that it would be desirable for the Senate Research Committee to work more closely with this group especially since there are now elected representatives from each College. Subash Anand questioned why the Research Committee should meet every month especially since the URC meets only
three times per year. He suggested that the work of the Senate Research Committee be in concert with the URC and we only meet three times likewise. Most members of the committee agreed that monthly meeting may not be necessary, but that we meet only in concert with the URC or when the Chair deems it necessary. This would be a good recommendation for future Senate Research Committees. This particular recommendation is also in keeping with Shelburne’s review of the committee’s charge at the Senate Retreat in December wherein he recommended that an ad hoc committee might address the work of this committee. However, keeping it as a standing committee and working more closely with the URC seems to be a good compromise and more efficient.

5. Shelburne Reviewed the Research Committee’s major accomplishments/highlights for the year as follows:

- In concert with the Policy Committee, the “titled research and extension professor” positions were approved by the Faculty Senate.
- In concert with the Finance Committee, problems with the CUBS 2000 software (Peoplesoft) were aired with the administration, especially as they related to the inability of research investigators to adequately keep track of their outside grants.
- Research Compliance issues from faculty were aired and brought to the University Research Council.
- Reviewed plans and promoted changes in the distribution of University Research Grant funds.
- Reported to the Faculty Senate on the definitions of Carnegie Foundation’s definitions of the various classes of research universities and how those definitions are changing.
- Reviewed the Research Summit DRAFT.
- Questioned the actual charge of the Faculty Senate Research Committee and its relationship to the University Research Council—made recommendations for interaction with this committee for the future.
### Awards Summary by Fiscal Year ($)

**Five-Year Comparison**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Award Year</th>
<th>Award ($)</th>
<th>$ - Millions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 96</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 97</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 98</td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 99</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Date FY 2000</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clemson University
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>FY 99 Total Awards</th>
<th>FY 2000 To Date ($M)</th>
<th>Percentage of FY 99.5%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College of Architecture, Arts &amp; Humanities</td>
<td>308,523</td>
<td>224,910</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Business &amp; Public Affairs</td>
<td>499,757</td>
<td>512,541</td>
<td>103%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Agriculture, Forestry &amp; Life Sciences</td>
<td>10,938,439</td>
<td>9,564,420</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Engineering &amp; Science</td>
<td>27,230,867</td>
<td>21,764,780</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Health, Education &amp; Human Development</td>
<td>3,305,543</td>
<td>1,642,756</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division of Computing &amp; Information Technology</td>
<td>6,643,830</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate School &amp; Interdisciplinary Institutes</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>102,000</td>
<td>5100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Non-College Related Departments</td>
<td>900,137</td>
<td>610,539</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Service and Agriculture</td>
<td>5,415,790</td>
<td>3,224,565</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>FY 99 Total Awards</th>
<th>FY 2000 To Date ($M)</th>
<th>Percentage of FY 99.5%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clemson University Research Foundation (CURF)</td>
<td>5,191,655</td>
<td>5,580,177</td>
<td>107%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Includes both Clemson University Direct/Indirect plus CURF Direct/Indirect sponsored programs awards.

Includes patents such as Cooper Library, Student Health Center, and Assessment.

Includes non-college affiliations.

In FY 99, the College of Forestry, Agriculture, & Life Sciences included Public Service and Agriculture. In FY 2000, the units are reported individually.

Includes awards such as patent gifts; these were not included in the FY 99 total. ($12.3M-Hoechst & $38M-Easley)
Research and Sponsored Program Activity

March 1999 to March 2000 Comparison

FY 99 Awards ($) FY 2000 Awards ($)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College/Department</th>
<th>Through March 10, 1999</th>
<th>Through March 10, 2000</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College of Agriculture, Forestry &amp; Life Sciences (2)</td>
<td>9,564,420</td>
<td>$11,076,373</td>
<td>1,511,953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Architecture, Arts &amp; Humanities</td>
<td>350,887</td>
<td>512,541</td>
<td>161,654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Business &amp; Public Affairs</td>
<td>19,971,567</td>
<td>19,684,635</td>
<td>286,932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Engineering &amp; Science</td>
<td>1,894,564</td>
<td>1,642,756</td>
<td>251,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Health, Education &amp; Human Dev</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division of Computing &amp; Information Technology</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate School &amp; Interdisciplinary Initiatives (CUBS Codes 207, 208, 304, 306, 307, and 308)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Non-College Related Departments (5)</td>
<td>32,031,137</td>
<td>85,866,366</td>
<td>53,835,229</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL

Clemson University Research Foundation (CURF) (5) $5,580,177

CURF: Patent Technology Gifts ($ Valued) (1)

Sponsored Programs Awards

Public Service and Agriculture (6)

Other Non-College Related Departments (6)

Graduate School & Interdisciplinary Initiatives (6)

Division of Computing & Information Technology

College of Health, Education & Human Dev

College of Engineering & Science

College of Business & Public Affairs

College of Architecture, Arts & Humanities

College of Agriculture, Forestry & Life Sciences (6)
PROPOSAL SUBMISSIONS

March, 1999 to March, 2000 Comparison

The units are being reported separately beginning FY 2000.

In FY 99, the College of Ag, Forestry, Life Sciences included Public Service and Agriculture. The units are being reported separately beginning FY 2000.

Institutes without collegiate affiliations

** Institutes without collegiate affiliations

TOTAL UNIVERSITY

College of Engineering & Science

College of Ag, Forestry, Life Sciences

College of Architecture, Arts & Humanities

College of Health and Education & Human Dev

College of Business & Public Affairs

Grad School & Interdisciplinary Institutes

Other Non-College Related Departments

Public Service and Agriculture

March 1, 1999 Through March 10, 1999

March 11, 1999 Through March 10, 2000

PROPOSAL SUBMISSIONS
The Welfare Committee dealt with several issues during the past year, several of which are either carrying over to next year's committee activities or have some value to review for new senators. Some of the issues may also have some impact on how other committees in the Faculty Senate handle their responsibilities, so below and attached is a summary of some of the key activities of the Welfare Committee from the past year.

In May of 1999, the Welfare Committee put together an updated Faculty Survey. During the summer of 1999 the results were processed and during the fall semester the results were distributed to all of the Faculty Senate and were also posted on the Faculty Senate web page for all of the faculty across campus to examine (for new senators, the information is still on the web at http://www.lib.clemson.edu/fs/facsrv99.pdf). The survey built upon the 1996 survey, but it regrouped certain issues and broke other issues down into more defined areas. I think it is important to realize that this survey is a snapshot of what the faculty was dealing with in the late Spring of 1999. In summary the six issues that came to the top of the list were:

- Adequacy of salary increases for faculty.
- Faculty evaluation procedures.
- Trust in University administration.
- Availability of a Faculty Club.
- Relationships between faculty and University administration.
- Adequacy of support for undergraduate instruction.

Several of these issues have already been addressed by the current actions of the Senate.

In December the Welfare Committee hosted a Faculty Senate Retreat which was designed to focus on communications and interaction between faculty and administration. There were over 75 participants involved during the day's activities, which was highlighted by an opportunity to spend time and get some firsthand communications with Clemson's new President, James Barker. Attached to this report is a listing of the comments participants made on the evaluation form distributed at the end of the retreat. Keep in mind that these comments were made by both faculty and administrators present at the retreat.

In addition there were several focus groups that recorded their thoughts on improving communications throughout the university. Attached is an attempt to categorize these comments into a format to allow future committees in the Faculty Senate to either address issues or communicate their activities effectively. This is a compilation of comments and is not meant to be stated as a consensus or majority viewpoint. The comments are ideas to allow all of us to build upon as we all strive to communicate more effectively with our peers, administrators, staff and students.

In addition the Welfare Committee dealt with issues relating to employee health insurance, employee exit interviews, faculty loads relating to lab and lecture breakdowns, academic calendar with regards to holidays, and other issues needing to be addressed for individual faculty members. Recommendations for the continued review and follow up discussions will be forwarded to the new Welfare Committee Chair.
Communications—Across and around the university
(a summary of comments from focus groups at the December 1999 Faculty Senate Retreat)

What needs to be communicated?
- Too much information (email/memo) that is not relevant causes individuals to miss critical messages because they get desensitized to the system of receiving messages
- Not just the message, there needs to be a dialog.
- What is the top priority? (consistency of the message)
- Financial issues and budget
- Strategic plan
- Operational plan
- Reason for tough decisions that go against certain groups
- Facility/campus issues

How should we communicate?
- Electronically
  - Email
    - civility of emails (recording our words permanently)
    - when to use and when not to use—too many emails that are not relevant
    - people are communicating with email as if it is guaranteed contact
    - email etiquette—lesson on email communications
    - email formatting for maximum readability
  - The web page
    - could use live video feed
    - weekly video message from President and/or Provost, etc.—everyone sees and hears the same message
    - ease of locating information
    - target faculty and staff
    - video conference with call in access from faculty and staff
    - keeping things updated (ie. faculty directory on the web page)
    - make it a two-way flow of information
  - Weekly phone messages from the President/Provost/etc.
- Face-to-Face
  - Retreats
  - Breakfast/lunch meeting with President/Provost/Deans/Department Heads, etc
  - Tea time (by college, department, etc.)
  - Faculty Club
  - Informal meeting/visit the troops by the administration and Board of Trustees
- Official communications
  - Are the issues covered mandates or suggestions?
  - How do we get all of the colleges to respond the same?

Who needs to be communicating?
- Clearly state who and where it is coming from.
- Need input from all that are concerned
- Formal line of command and informal structure
- The message can get distorted when it is transferred through too many levels
- Faculty meeting with President/Provost without Deans and Department Chairs present

Obstacles to communicating?

Concerns that need to be addressed in our communications
- Trust—establishing and rebuilding
- Consistency of the message and expectations
What did you learn to improve your communication skills?

Need input from all levels in organization.
Pay more attention to style on E-mail.
Listening (2)
Some good ideas I would like to see implemented.
Learned from the keynote address, but not from the workshops.
Information alone is not communication.
Informal is better.
Awareness of different interpretations of communications.
Need to communicate over different levels of hierarchy.
Less E-mails; more face to face communication.
Nothing new - but a reminder of what's important.
Importance of combining electronic and face to face communication. They complement each other.
The speech was very good.
Just a great reinforcer.
Sharing strategies.
Good ideas for improving campus wide communication; better use of technology; breakfast meetings.
Make sure everyone in the room is on the same page.
Face to face, informal communication is probably the most effective.
Nothing really; I have heard all of this before.
There are different viewpoints/perspectives.
Clarify idea or concern; listen to others.
Don't just gather facts, find out why.
Not only give information, talk about it.
Put faculty needs in terms of mission statement.
Constant, open, accurate flow of information.
Openness, discuss, listen.
Learned more about the faculty's potential contributions to our messages to the legislature.
Talk openly; we all have some focus and should work together.
7 points
Reinforced things I forgot.

How can the Faculty Senate be more effective in communicating with Clemson University faculty?

E-mail from senate as a whole.
E-mail; representatives send info. to their constituents.
Create new forums for meeting colleagues.
More informal meetings.
Have open senate/faculty meetings, specifically to solicit input on senate and university matters (i.e. no other business).
By providing information in an easy to follow format.
Regular updates and requests for input. Faculty senate meetings should be replaced.
Build trust.
Use short E-mail updates.
Sponsor meeting to enable communicating w/CU faculty.
Open forums, have minutes, etc. easily accessible (now on WEB), take initiative to continue visits of senate officers to department meetings.
Take time to reach departments who may not have a senator from the dept.
Minutes of meetings in E-mail or voice mail. Maybe I'm not on the list server because I'm administrative.
Too new to say.
See comments from activity.
More retreats; regular updates.
Revitalize the responsibilities of lead senators; sponsor workshops like this.; continue to solicit input from faculty via phone calls, dept visits, surveys.
We need to work together (senate, communications staff) to create an Intranet to provide discussion of issues.
Continue practice of president and VP visiting departments; suggest Provost and President do same.
Frequent E-mails.
Senators hold face to face meetings w/constituents for informal discussions.
Have open forum sessions by college.
E-mail issues.
Face to face meetings w/faculty to "flatten the line."
Use CU-wide E-mail for minutes, major issues, agenda. This info. may also be available at the senate’s web page.
Meet on campus occasionally; have brunch for faculty and do a little business; senate newsletter via E-mail.
Lots of suggestions given - don’t put on the shelf - share with all.
Help implement suggestions given in groups; be positive and professional.
Do it - truly represent faculty rather than self-reward that time to do that.

Would you be interested in the Faculty Senate sponsoring a retreat again?

No - 1  Yes - 30

Topics you would like to see addressed:
More like this 'til we get it.
Have deans/VPs/other administrators come and interact; team building exercises w/faculty, staff, administrators.
Faculty rewards in addition to pay, what would faculty see as meaningful recognition of their hard work.
Balance among teaching, research, service; long term goals for the university.
Another one on communication; interdisciplinary collaboration.
How to listen; how to participate in policymaking and legislating.
Faculty-Administration relationships.
More on communication, team building. (2)
Coping with change.
University priorities, i.e. a strategic plan.
Motivating
Building professional relationships, i.e. collaboration or conflict resolution.
Faculty morale.
Spearhead vital issues for dialogue; continue communication.
Communication of shared vision for university.
Involvement of faculty in university affairs/administration, etc.; more discussion of communication.
Communication within departments.
Morale; communication.
Problems specific to the senate itself; internal leadership problems.
After class is out and grades are due! We need to address faculty senate-board communication.
Effective change; communicating/persuading target groups - administration, legislators, parents.
Communication (2) - Encourage civil communication.
Balancing teaching, research, public service (w/administrators and trustees).

COMMENTS:
Thanks for including administrators.
Very useful.
Disappointed at attendance rate of senators.
It is really great that our president and provost spent time with us.
I was very glad to see Stef Rogers and Jim Barker in attendance; it’s the right tone to set.
Well done.
Excellent meeting. (2)
Eaglin is powerful; he’s on the interpersonal and spiritual level. He’s so right on. Thank you for bringing him here again.
The success of this workshop was the selection of the keynote speaker.
Thanks for including communications staff.
Thanks.
Retreat is an excellent idea.
Very good workshop.
As always, not enough time to discuss all the ideas and concerns people have.
Need to focus on "real" issues and discuss means to achieve them.
Delighted to be included and look forward to more and better communication.

Submitted By: Welfare Committee/January 2000
FACULTY SENATE

FINANCE COMMITTEE REPORT

1999 - 2000

1. Finance Committee members met with Dot Burchfield of the Clemson University Foundation in order to understand the ways funds are collected and dispersed by the Foundation.

2. Several Finance Committee members met with Cathy Bell, President of the Classified Staff Commission, to familiarize the Committee with the problems experienced by the membership of the Commission, and to solicit recommendations regarding how the Faculty Senate could be supportive of the Commission's efforts. Subsequent to our meeting, Cathy forwarded her Commission's recommendations to the Advisory Committee.

3. In response to continuing problems involving PeopleSoft, the Committee had two meetings with key PeopleSoft persons on campus and arranged a PeopleSoft presentation to the full Senate.

4. The "Out-of-Pocket Expenses" Survey was completed and some findings were presented at the October Senate meeting. However, since only about 15% of the faculty responded to the Survey, these findings could not be generalized to the faculty as a whole. Therefore, they were not widely distributed.
# CLEMSON UNIVERSITY GRIEVANCE BOARD

## GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE ACTIVITY

### GRIEVANCE I PROCEDURE PETITIONS

April, 1999 through February, 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Number of Grievances</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Withdrawn Grievances</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Grievances found</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Grievable by Grievance Board</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Grievances found</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to be Grievable by Grievance Board</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grievances In Process</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Suspended Grievances                               |    |
| Number of Petitions                                |    |
| Supported by Hearing Panel                         | 1  |
| Number of Petitions                                |    |
| Not Supported by Hearing Panel                     | 1  |
| Not Yet Determined Grievable or Non-Grievable       | 0  |

Page 1
Number of Hearing Panel
Grievance Recommendations
Supported by Provost 2

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 no decision at this time

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>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4/3/00
## CLEMSON UNIVERSITY GRIEVANCE BOARD
### GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE ACTIVITY

#### GRIEVANCE II PROCEDURE PETITIONS

*April, 1999 through March, 2000*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Grievances</td>
<td></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>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Grievances found to be Grievable by Grievance Board</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grievances In Process</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspended Grievances</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Petitions Supported by Hearing Panel</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Petitions Not Supported by Hearing Panel</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Yet Determined Grievable or Non-Grievable</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Page 1
Number of Hearing Panel
Grievance Recommendations
Supported by Provost 4

Number of Petitions
Supported by Provost 0

Number of Grievances Appealed 1

Number of Presidential Decisions
Supporting Petitioner 0

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>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4/3/00
To: Academic Vice President and Provost Steffen H. Rogers

From: Faculty Senate President Horace D. Skipper

Re: Affirmation of the Academic Grievance Committee

On behalf of the Faculty Senate I present for your review, approval, and immediate implementation this reaffirmation of the role of the Academic Grievance Committee. This recommendation was approved by the required two-thirds majority.

The institution this Fall of the new policy with respect to “Academic Integrity” has led to confusion about the role of the previous “Academic Grievance Committee” (page 54 of the current Faculty Manual and pages 25-27 of the current Undergraduate Announcements). It was never intended to abolish this committee, but rather to exclude from its original jurisdiction in matters concerned with academic dishonesty, now academic integrity.

In order to reaffirm the slightly revised function for the “Academic Grievance Committee,” the following language is recommended for the next version of the Faculty Manual (page 54):

10. Academic Grievance Committee  This committee hears all grievances involving allegations by undergraduate students against a faculty or staff member of discrimination in academics on the basis of race, color, national origin, sex, age, religion, disability, or veterans status (except in those cases where the grievance involves student employment), grievances of a personal or professional nature involving an individual undergraduate student and a faculty member, and claims by undergraduate students concerning the inequitability of final grades. Details concerning this committee’s functions may be found in Undergraduate Announcements.
Membership of the committee consists of the following: fifteen faculty members (three from each college) elected by the collegiate faculty for three-year rotating terms, the Dean of Student Life or designee, and ten undergraduate students (two from each college) nominated annually by the Student Body President and approved by the Student Senate. The Committee selects its own chair from among the continuing members of the committee. The terms of appointment begin with each Fall registration.

In this manner a redefined purpose for the “Academic Grievance Committee” would find its way back into the committee structure of the University as a compliment to the newly instituted “Academic Integrity Committee” previously approved by the Student Senate, the Faculty Senate, you, and the Board of Trustees.

c.c.: General Counsel Ben Anderson
Vice President Almeda Jacks
Secretary to Trustees Thornton Kirby
Senior Vice Provost Jerome V. Reel, Jr.
Assistant Dean George E. Carter, Jr.
Registrar Stanley B. Smith
Dean of Student Life Joy S. Smith
Vice President/President Elect Fred S. Switzer, III
Policy Committee Chair James C. Acton
Editorial Consultant Robert A. Waller
Mesdames Brenda J. Smith and Cathy T. Sturkie
To: Academic Vice President and Provost Steffen H. Rogers

From: Faculty Senate President Horace D. Skipper
Re: Establishment of Permanent Parking Review Board

Today the Faculty Senate approved by the requisite two-thirds majority the following addition to the Faculty Manual. As a regularization of present ad hoc practice, it should be approved by the Board of Trustees.

Beginning in Academic Year 1998-1999 the University has functioned with an ad hoc Parking Review Board established by then President Curris in accordance with Parking Regulations (Section 27-3005.4B). Experience suggests that this body should become permanent by placement in the Faculty Manual as among the committees reporting to the President (a new number 12 on page 52).

Language as to the charge and composition of the committee takes this form as recommended by the Senate (totally new language):

12. Parking Review Board. The Board consists of forty-three members drawn from faculty, staff, and students (with alternates from each of the constituent bodies) who in subcommittee panels of five members (one Faculty/Librarian and one Staff member, two undergraduate students, and one graduate student) constitute the campus administrative review body for appealed parking violations.

The membership will be selected in the following manner: each college will elect two faculty members for a three-year rotating term with the Faculty Senate selecting an alternate; the Library will elect one member and an alternate; eight Classified Staff plus three alternates on a three-year rotating term basis will be selected by the President of the Classified Staff Commission; the Attorney General of the Student Body will select sixteen undergraduate students and six alternates; and the President of Graduate Student Government will select eight graduate students plus three alternates for one-year terms.
Making the Parking Review Board a permanent administrative body will satisfy the conditions set down by the South Carolina State Supreme Court and the Court of Appeals in guaranteeing to appellants access to a representative body of peers not associated with Parking Services in a non-criminal environment.

c.c.: President James F. Barker, A.I.A.
Municipal Judge Deborah R. Culler
Vice President Almeda R. Jacks
Vice President/President Elect Fred S. Switzer, III
Classified Staff Commission President Catherine G. Bell
Student Body Attorney General Mark S. Cothran
Graduate Student Government President Craig R. Dawson
Senior Vice Provost Jerome V. Reel, Jr.
Policy Committee Chair James C. Acton
Editorial Consultant Robert A. Waller
Mesdames Brenda J. Smith and Cathy T. Sturkie
11 April 2000

To: Academic Vice President and Provost Steffen H. Rogers

From: Faculty Senate President Horace D. Skipper

Re: Coordination of Athletic Council Elections

By the required two-thirds majority the Faculty Senate recommends these changes in the Faculty Manual with regard to the Athletic Council. Assuming acceptance by that Council, these minor modifications can be implemented upon your approval.

Current provisions for the Athletic Council reporting to the President may be found on pages 47-49 of the August 1999 Faculty Manual. Recent experience suggests very strongly that the timing of the faculty elections to this Council needs to coincide with other campus elections for University-wide committees, councils, and commissions.

Toward that end, it is recommended that the provisions for faculty elections to and officers within the Athletic Council be modified as follows:

In the paragraph on the 24 voting members on page 48, Subsection a. would be modified as follows (new language underscored):

“a. Two elected faculty representatives from each college and one from the Library selected in March. In addition, the colleges and the Library shall each select one alternate who shall have voting rights on the Athletic Council in the absence of the elected representative. Faculty representatives serve staggered three-year terms. Consecutive terms renewable once are permitted.”

In the final paragraph on page 48 concerning the election of officers, the procedure to be revised as follows (new language underscored; deleted language bracketed):

FACULTY SENATE
R. M. Cooper Library Box 345104 Clemson, SC 29634-5104
864.656.2456 FAX 864.656.3225
"At the Biennial February [March] meeting of the Athletic Council the voting members elect from the regular, full-time faculty members a Chair and Vice Chair whose two-year terms commence at the first Athletic Council meeting after May 15th of that year. All regular full-time faculty Athletic Council members are eligible for election to these offices regardless of the length of time remaining on their terms; successful candidates will have their terms extended if necessary.

The adoption of these changes will make it easier for colleges to conduct faculty elections in a timely fashion and clarify the terms of faculty members and officers on the Athletic Council. Assuming acceptance of this recommendation and endorsement by the Athletic Council, then the "Policies and Procedures" Manual for the Athletic Council should be amended as well.

c.c.: President James F. Barker, A.I.A.
      Athletic Council President Ronald L. Thomas
      Athletic Director Robert W. Robinson, Jr.
      Senior Vice Provost Jerome V. Reel, Jr.
      Vice President/President Elect Fred S. Switzer, III
      Policy Committee Chair James C. Acton
      Editorial Consultant Robert A. Waller
      Mesdames Brenda J. Smith and Cathy T. Sturkie
To: Academic Vice President and Provost Steffen H. Rogers

From: Faculty Senate President Horace D. Skipper
Re: Selection of Department Chairs with Term Limits and Faculty Review

On behalf of the Faculty Senate I submit, with the required two-thirds approval, for your endorsement this change in the University role for Department Chairs. Such a significant modification would also require the approval of the Board of Trustees.

The present Faculty Manual discusses the role of Department Chairs in Section J. (p. 9), their selection in Section K. (p. 10, paragraph 5), and their review in Section L. (pp. 11-12).

During administrative reorganization, the Faculty Senate expressed in resolution form (FS 94-8-1 P approved unanimously on August 25, 1994) some sentiments about the selection, term, and evaluation of departmental leadership, but these suggestions were never implemented. The passage of time suggests that these features of departmental administration be re-examined now. Toward that end, the Faculty Manual should be amended as follows (new language underscored):

On page 9, paragraph 3, a virtually new paragraph would be substituted to read as follows:

“Department chairs will serve at the discretion of the Dean of the College who shall seek and be receptive to the advice of the departmental faculty. Terms of appointment shall be four years. Subsequent renewal is contingent upon a favorable vote of a majority of all tenured faculty. Failing that, the Dean shall replace that individual by appointing an Acting Chair, and begin immediately a search for new departmental leadership. At the beginning of each academic year, the Chair shall submit a statement of administrative goals and objectives for the department. This statement shall be written and shared with the department faculty and the Dean. At the end of the academic year, the Department Chair shall submit a written report on his/her administrative accomplishments to the faculty and for the Dean’s evaluation. All chairs of academic departments hold faculty rank and engage in the teaching, research, and public service functions of the faculty.”
On page 10, paragraph 5, the existing language would be modified as follows [deleted language bracketed]:

"For the selection of an academic chair or other equivalent academic administrators within a department, a search and screening committee shall be selected as follows: a committee composed of a minimum of three and a maximum of five faculty within that [college] department as elected by the departmental faculty [, plus one student]. [The majority of the members of this committee shall be chosen by the faculty of the effected department; the minority may be appointed by the dean of the college.] One additional member of the committee may be appointed from outside the department by the Dean. The committee shall conduct a faculty vote and based on that vote forward the names of the acceptable candidates in order of preference to the Dean. [The dean shall make the appointment from the list submitted by the committee, subject to the approval of the Provost and the President.] The Dean shall make the selection from this list. If the Dean’s selection is not the first choice of the faculty, then the Dean must explain the choice in writing to the faculty.

Section L. (pages 11-12) essentially incorporates the principles of administrative review conceived as desirable in 1994 EXCEPT that the vote of the departmental faculty should be incorporated in the report from the administrator evaluation committee.

In this manner the Faculty Manual would be brought into conformity with collegiate practices elsewhere including term limits for department chairs and periodic, formal expressions of faculty confidence.

c.c.: Organization of Academic Department Chairs William M. Surver
Vice President/President Elect Fred S. Switzer, III
Policy Committee Chair James C. Acton
Editorial Consultant Robert A. Waller
Mesdames Brenda J. Smith and Cathy T. Sturkie
To: Academic Vice President and Provost Steffen H. Rogers

From: Faculty Senate President Horace D. Skipper

Re: Clarification of Syllabus Requirement in Faculty Manual

Today by the required two thirds majority the Faculty Senate approved the Faculty Manual change described below. Such a minor modification in campus practice can be implemented upon your approval.

The Graduate Advisory Council had noted that the provision in the Faculty Manual with respect to the requirement for a course syllabus (page 68 of the current Manual) requires clarification. The present wording is ambiguous about syllabi being required in graduate-level courses.

To clarify the intent, the Faculty Senate proposes that Section D. under “Professional Practices” be rewritten to read as follows in its entirety (with new language underscored):

“D. Syllabus A syllabus will be prepared for every undergraduate and graduate class and made available to students at as early a class meeting as practicable, but no later than the last class period before the last day for a student to add a class. It should give the course expectations, including a topical outline of the course, grading policies, and attendance policies.”

In this manner an expectation that faculty in graduate courses were required also to present a syllabus would be clearly specified.

c.c.: Graduate Dean Bonnie Holiday
Senior Vice Provost Jerome V. Reel, Jr.
Vice President/President Elect Fred S. Switzer, III
Policy Committee Chair James C. Acton
Editorial Consultant Robert A. Waller
Mesdames Brenda J. Smith and T. Sturkie
To: Academic Vice President and Provost Steffen H. Rogers

From: Faculty Senate President Horace D. Skipper

Re: Redefinition of Instructor and Lecturer Positions

Today the Faculty Senate membership approved by the required two-thirds majority this change in the Faculty Manual with regard to the definitions of “Instructor” and “Lecturer.” This modification requires the approval of the Board of Trustees.

The qualifications and role of the “Instructor” as a Regular faculty rank may be found on page 17 of the current Manual. It is recommended that a revision occur as follows (new language underscored; deleted language bracketed):

“Instructor. Normally, the master’s degree or equivalent is required, with preference given to those pursuing the terminal degree. Appointees should show promise for advancement to higher ranks. Instructors are eligible for promotion to assistant professor if originally hired from a national search. Otherwise, if not promoted to assistant professor by the end of the third [fourth] year of service, an Instructor will receive a one-year terminal appointment. Instructor is not a tenurable rank, but three [four] years of service or less in that rank may be credited toward the tenure [probationary] period.”

This language addition would have the effect of clarifying that the title is generally reserved for tenure-track individuals needing to complete their terminal degree and that promotion in the REGULAR faculty ranks lies only in the direction of assistant professor, not to Lecturer as some have contended. However, see the proposed change below.
The qualifications and role of the "Lecturer" as a SPECIAL faculty rank may be found on page 18. The following revision is proposed (new language underscored; deleted language bracketted):

"Lecturer and Senior Lecturer. This rank is assigned to individuals for whom [with special qualifications or for special functions in cases in which] the assignment of other faculty ranks is not appropriate. Initially, the term of appointment shall not exceed one year, but may be renewed. Following five years of satisfactory service, the department promotion/tenure committee may recommend promotion to Senior Lecturer. Senior Lecturers shall be extended one to three-year contracts with the requirement of one year's notice before termination.

The language changes would clarify the status of individuals in the rank of Lecturer and provide some job security and promotion for Lecturers after an extended period of satisfactory service.

The adoption of these changes will more clearly define the route of promotion for individuals and provide for continuity of professional service.

c.c.: Administrative Intern Doris R. Helms
Vice President/President Elect Fred S. Switzer, III
Policy Committee Chair James C. Acton
Editorial Consultant Robert A. Waller
Mesdames Brenda J. Smith and Cathy T. Sturkie
Resolution to Honor Elizabeth Dale

FS00-4  P

Whereas, Elizabeth Dale began her tenure with the Clemson University Faculty Senate in 1997 from the College of Architecture, Arts & Humanities and with this meeting completes her term as Senator and Secretary of the Faculty Senate; and

Whereas, during Senator Dale's term as a Faculty Senator, she served as a member of the Scholastic Policies Committee, Lead Senator, Secretary of the Faculty Senate, the Executive/Advisory Committee, Chair of the Ad Hoc Committee on Tenure and Promotion, and on numerous other committees; and

Whereas, Senator Dale has forcefully and energetically been a spokesperson of the needs of the Library and faculty governance; and

Whereas, Senator Dale has enthusiastically and tirelessly represented and served the Faculty of Clemson University with the utmost respect and in an honorable manner; has eagerly accepted all responsibilities; and has performed Faculty Senate duties in an always dependable, timely and exemplary manner; and

Whereas, Elizabeth, as a person, has most especially served her fellow Senators as a Friend and Colleague;

Be It Resolved, That the Clemson University Faculty Senate appreciates and thanks Elizabeth Dale for her constant efforts on behalf of Faculty to enhance further the work of the Faculty Senate and Faculty governance; and

Be It Further Resolved, That the Faculty Senate recognizes the diligent work performed by Elizabeth Dale in the few years she has been with the University to work with faculty, administration, staff, and students to better the University in pursuit of its mission and responsibility as an institution of higher learning; and

Be It Further Resolved, That the Faculty Senate will miss her professional services sorely and wishes only the best for Our Friend, Elizabeth, in her new position at University of Florida.

This resolution passed
by the Faculty Senate
on April 11, 2000
1. Call to Order: The meeting was called to order at 2:36 p. m. by President Fred S. Switzer. Individual introductions were made by Faculty Senators.

2. Approval of Minutes: The Faculty Senate Minutes dated April 11, 2000 were approved as written.

3. 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.

4. “Free Speech”: None

5. Committee Reports
   a. Senate Committees
      1) Welfare Committee – No report.
      2) Policy Committee – John Huffman, Chair, announced that the first meeting of this Committee will be on May 16 in Room LL2 of the Cooper Library. Minor matters will be undertaken and then the Committee will go into Executive Session.
      3) Research Committee – Vic Shelburne, Chair, encouraged Senators to read the Clemson University Research Council Minutes (Attachment A).
      4) Finance Committee – Chair John Bednar stated that there was no report but that the Committee will look at percentages of administration raises compared to faculty raises contained within the Budget Accountability Report.
      5) Scholastic Policies Committee – On behalf of Jim Zimmerman, Chair of this Committee, David Allison, informed the Senate that this Committee is investigating the issue of plus/minus grading. An e-mail message to all faculty requests feedback that the Committee is anxious to receive.
   b. University Commissions and Committees: None
c. **Budget Accountability Report** – Jim Davis, Chair of this Committee, and Dave Fleming, Director of Institutional Research, provided an overview of portions of the 1999-2000 Cooperative Salary Study and explained how the Committee arrived at the figures contained within the Salary Study (Attachment B). It was noted that the entire Study will be housed in the Faculty Senate Office for perusal. Answers were then provided to questions from Senators.

6. **President’s Remarks**: President Switzer reminded members of the Executive/Advisory Committee that the next meeting will be held at 3:15 p.m. on May 25th and that there are several important agenda items. Senators were also reminded of the General Faculty and Staff Meeting at the Brooks Center at 1:00 p.m. on May 11th. Two Faculty Senate items will be brought to the full Faculty for approval.

7. **Old Business**: None

8. **New Business**:
   a. President Switzer called attention to membership assignments of Senate Standing Committees (Attachment C).

9. **Announcements**:
   a. President Switzer announced the retirement of Robert A. Waller, as Faculty Manual Editorial Consultant and thanked Bob for his diligent work on behalf of the Faculty.

10. **Adjournment**: The meeting was adjourned by President Switzer at 3:13 p.m.

Peg Tyler/Secretary

Cathy Toth Sturkie

Absent: Grimes, Hupp, Linvill (Kluepfel for), Bradshaw, Zimmerman, Galyean, Smith (Chapman for), Voelker (Chamberlain for), Malloy, Warner, Brannan, B. Lee, Ogale (Lickfield for), Bridgwood, Meriwether (Hare for), Linnell, Backman, Thames (Thomason for), Oldaker (C. Lee for)
University Research Council
Tuesday, March 28, 2000
3:00 pm
132 Fluor Daniel

I. Opening Remarks

Dr. Shah welcomed the Council and thanked the members for their attendance.

II. Research and Sponsored Programs Activity Report

The Council received copies of the current month's "Research and Sponsored Program Activity Status" report. Dr. Shah explained that this report is used as a tracking mechanism more than anything else. The report consists of two parts: 1) comparative analysis for each unit and 2) projected targets for each unit in order to achieve the $100M university goal. Dr. Shah noted President Barker receives and closely reviews the report every month.

The Council noted that they were not receiving this information and that the faculty needs to see this data. Dr. Shah stated that his approach was to provide the information to the deans and let them make a determination on further distribution. He asked the Council for recommendations regarding circulation of the report.

The Council suggested that the report be available on a website with an initial e-mail notification to all faculty informing them that the site is up and that it will be updated monthly.

The Council questioned how the college targets were established. Dr. Shah noted that they were developed using three factors:

a) size of the faculty in the college,
b) availability of external funding for the discipline,
c) external funding being achieved by peers.

President Barker has a goal of seeing Clemson listed in the "Top 20 Public Universities and Colleges." Fifteen of the top 20 are also within the top 20 in research expenditures. Statistics indicate that overall stature has strong ties with research and graduate education. It was noted that these goals would be a big jump for Clemson to achieve without a medical school. The question was raised as to the current success of the GHS/CU Biomedical Cooperative. Dr. Shah stated that the faculty are not responding very aggressively.

The question was raised of how Clemson's teaching load policy compares with benchmark institutions. Dr. Shah stated that teaching load is an important parameter
and that it has to be looked at very carefully and that an adjustment will have to be made or the $100M goal will not be achieved. He stated that Clemson would not make the $100M goal without a significant change in the way we conduct business.

It was stated that an investment must be made by the institution in order for a change to occur. President Barker recently conducted a Research Summit at which he recognized the need for a limit on undergraduate enrollment and an increase in doctoral students.

The Council stated that they were impressed with the way President Barker handled the research professor title issue. He got close enough to get the faculty to talk about it and then he let the faculty handle the matter.

III. Infrastructure

Areas of concern:
- Centralized facilities & equipment
- Space
- Computing & information technology
- Library

Regarding centralized facilities & equipment, Dr. Shah noted that he is not concerned with the management but that faculty has access. The College of Engineering & Science has a good model with the Electron Microscope Facility.

Dr. Shah asked what the URC should do in regards to infrastructure. Discussion pursued regarding the mixed message that faculty receive regarding research. They are told to do research, yet the infrastructure for obtaining necessary approvals is not stable nor sufficient. Reference was made to the frequent office relocations of the IRB (Institutional Review Board). Dr. Shah stated that he was aware that there are problems in the research compliance area. He is stressing the importance of research compliance to the Provost and the President to make them aware that NIH's Office for Protection from Research Risks is in the same arena as NCAA and SACS — you cannot function without them. Dr. Shah asked Dr. Harold Farris to provide an update on the status of Research Compliance.

IV. Research Compliance

Dr. Harold Farris, Assoc Vice President for Research Compliance, stated that Dr. Shah has formed an ad hoc committee consisting of the following members: Dr. Steve Chapman, Dr. Hal Farris, Dr. Jim Fischer, Dr. Bonnie Holaday, Mr. Thornton Kirby, Dr.-Tom-Scott, Dr. Y.T. Shah. (It has been most beneficial to have Thornton Kirby, Executive Secretary to the Board of Trustees, on the committee as he has the legal expertise to understand the seriousness of compliance and the administrative connection to communicate the seriousness of compliance.) This committee was formed at the request of Dr. Shah who has asked for an overarching plan regarding research compliance.

Clemson is an institution that is not at all mindful of the importance of research compliance. Institutions such as Duke University and the University of Alabama-Birmingham have encountered suspension of federal funds due to non-compliance. Animal care and use, biosafety, protection of human subjects, accounting, and conflict of
interest are all compliance issues and institutions are being audited in these areas. During these audits, institutions are being found in non-compliance for not having the procedure set-up properly. We need to take a proactive not a reactive approach to compliance.

AAALAC (Association for Assessment and Accreditation of Laboratory Animal Care International) was on campus February 29 - March 2 to conduct an assessment of programs. While the final report will be provided by AAALAC in June, comments were made during the exit briefing that indicate concerns regarding institutional oversight and monitoring of animal care at farm units and the coordination of veterinary care. AAALAC strongly suggested that a letter confirming Clemson University’s commitment to AAALAC would be of benefit to Clemson during the Council’s deliberations. President Barker has sent a letter to AAALAC stating that Clemson will put forth a strong effort to address these problems.

Dr. Farris stressed the significance of an institution having AAALAC accreditation. In 1994, Clemson University was the 5th land-grant institution to achieve accreditation of all programs by AAALAC. The AHA (American Heart Association) stipulates AAALAC accreditation as a requirement for an institution to receive AHA funds. Without AAALAC accreditation, Clemson is put at a competitive disadvantage in obtaining NIH funds.

The ad hoc committee will be addressing issues such as:

- campus-wide communication of necessity of research compliance,
- development of an adequately staffed research compliance program,
- support and encouragement for faculty serving on federally-mandated research compliance committees,
- establishment of clear lines of reporting and responsibility,
- development of mechanism for providing current status of programs.

Faculty serving on these federally-mandated committees should receive credit hour equivalent as faculty serving on SACS are getting.

The ad hoc research compliance committee should formulate plan and work with Dr. Vic Shelburne to route the plan through the Faculty Senate Research Committee prior to forwarding to the President.

Dr. Shah indicated that internal auditing is striving to tighten up the policy regarding consulting and faculty-owned companies. His concern is that you cannot put a policy in place that you cannot police. He mentioned the current approval form for consulting and that some colleges are more conscientious than others about submitting the forms. It was suggested that the best way to monitor consulting is at the college level.

It was stated that the critical issue is financial disclosure and not the consulting form. Dr. Przirembel recommended an article in the February issue of The Atlantic Monthly entitled, “The Kept University” (copy attached) which lists issues that need to be addressed.

General discussion pursued that reflected the following:

- consulting is an important element of the university’s total research effort,
consulting has the potential as a source of conflict of interest, but this can be managed and must not be used as exclusive grounds to restrict consulting,
- consulting associated with grant support through Sponsored programs may be a more serious issue with respect to ownership of intellectual property,
- supervising graduate students should (or must) be part of academic responsibility, not part of faculty consulting when student research is supported by same source as faculty consulting.

V. University Research Grant Committee

The University Research Grant Committee distributes $50,000 annually through a competitive proposal process. President Barker has noted a concern that he feels there could be a more balanced distribution of funds among the disciplines. Dr. Shah would like to see more awards going to younger faculty, but not at the expense of the quality of the proposals.

The Council was in agreement that the selection process used by the URGC should be reviewed in order to provide a more equitable distribution between the colleges. Discussion pursued that maybe a 3rd person (non-committee member) from each college along with the colleges’ two committee members could do a preliminary review of the proposals from their respective colleges and send only the top proposals to the full committee. The question was posed as to whether or not this would be a beneficial use of faculty time considering the amount of the individual awards.

Other suggestions were to conduct a more extensive recruitment process to stimulate proposal submissions from the units with low proposal submission rates. It was noted that another potential hindrance might be the way the proposal requirements are written. With the current requirements, humanities faculty does not feel comfortable that their proposals will receive a serious review by the committee.

Vic Shelburne will talk with Hap Wheeler who is the current chair of the URC to discuss some of the suggestions made by the URC.

VI. Structure of University Research Council

The initial concept of the URC was for the President, CRO and Deans to identify a group of individuals with an interest and a background in research who would discuss research related issues and provide feedback to the administration. With the Provost’s initiative to overhaul the university’s committee structure, the URC membership guidelines have been revamped. The Provost and the Faculty Senate have approved the recommendation by the ad hoc committee that the committee make-up will be: one faculty member will be elected from each collegiate faculty and the Library for a three-year term; one faculty member appointed from each college by the Chief Research Officer in consultation with the collegiate dean; the current Chair of the Faculty Senate Research Committee (or designee), and the chairs of the Animal Research Committee, the Institutional Biosafety Committee, the Human Subjects Committee, the Intellectual Property Committee, and the Research Grants Committee. These appointments will be effective August 15, 2000.
VII. Research Summit

Dr. Shah had planned to distribute a summary report for the Research Summit that was held by President Barker on February 17, 2000 at the Madren Center; however, President Barker will be initiating distribution. Vic Shelburne stated that Thornton Kirby had provided the draft report to him for distribution to the Faculty Senate Research Committee.

Meeting adjourned at 4:45 pm.
The 1999-00 Cooperative Salary Study is an annual report prepared by the Office of Institutional Research for, and under the direction of, the Faculty Senate Budget Accountability Committee. The Senate Accountability Committee is comprised of representation from academics, administration, the Classified Staff Commission, and the Office of Institutional Research. This is the fourth year of this particular study, and represents an additional phase of the Freedom of Information Act report kept on file in the University’s Cooper Library. The Cooperative Salary Study is organized into two major sections:

❖ University Summaries
❖ Budget Center Summaries.

Within each section is a detailed report of salary increases for all full-time, permanent employees of Clemson University during a period of time selected by the Faculty Senate Budget Accountability Committee members. The increases were tabulated from personnel system transactions for a period between September 2, 1998 (the ending date of last year’s study) and March 10, 2000 (a freeze date after increases had been posted). **PLEASE NOTE THAT THIS STUDY WAS OVER AN EIGHTEEN RATHER THAN A TWELVE MONTH PERIOD DUE TO THE SPLIT PAY RAISE FOR CLASSIFIED STAFF. THE STUDY ALSO CONTAINS MANDATORY SALARY ADJUSTMENTS FOR INDIVIDUALS EARNING BELOW $28,000 AND OTHER SALARY ADJUSTMENTS OF CLASSIFIED STAFF AS RECOMMENDED BY THE HUMAN RESOURCES DEPARTMENT.**

The details contained in each of the two major sections are as follows:

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

Each report contains data compiled within Groups and Categories. Groups are determined by the employee’s home department code filed by departmental personnel when the employee is hired or changes positions. Category codes are determined by the employee’s title code whenever possible. A determination was made by the Accountability Committee three years ago that in some cases, title codes do not accurately reflect job duties. Therefore, an attempt was made to categorize these exceptions manually. This process could be considered to be somewhat less than desirable due to the subjectivity in determining the category for a particular employee.

The five groups determined by an employee’s home department code are Academic, Administrative, PSA, Athletics, and Auxiliaries. These groups tend to loosely follow funding lines within the University. Within the five groups are nine categories:

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

In some years, it is the case that the academic categories need to be further broken down to reflect those faculty members who have converted from a 9 to 12 month status and from a 12 to 9 month status. Salary increases and decreases tend to skew average increases within groups and categories containing these employees. This further segregation helps to ensure that as accurate a picture as possible is presented.

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

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

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

Every effort was made to produce an accurate, understandable analysis of salary increases for the past year, but as this document attempts to answer many questions within a concise format, some further questions may occur. Please direct all questions either to the Office of Institutional Research or to a member of the Faculty Senate Accountability Committee.
Average Percent Salary Increase by Category
Salary Study 1999-2000

Faculty
7.62%

Administration
8.33%

Staff
9.46%

Total of all employees excluding coaches and conversions (9 to 12, 12 to 9)
Frequency of Faculty Pay Raises for 1999-00 Salary Study

* 1 percent is range of 1-1.99
### Average Percent Increase for All Employees by Budget Center

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Centers</th>
<th>Administration and Advancement</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration and Advancement</td>
<td>4 6.71% Gen/Col</td>
<td>6.71% Perf/Merit</td>
<td>Rec/Prom/Trans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>6.89% Gen/Col</td>
<td>5.24% Rec/Prom/Trans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Agriculture, Forestry and Life Sciences</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7.54% Gen/Col</td>
<td>0.51% Rec/Prom/Trans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Architecture, Arts &amp; Humanities</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15.38% Gen/Col</td>
<td>9.62% Rec/Prom/Trans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Business and Public Affairs</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12.41% Gen/Col</td>
<td>5.85% Rec/Prom/Trans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Engineering and Sciences</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8.65% Gen/Col</td>
<td>6.66% Rec/Prom/Trans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Health, Education and Human Development</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.47% Gen/Col</td>
<td>5.93% Rec/Prom/Trans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division of Computing and Information Technology</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.10% Gen/Col</td>
<td>6.00% Rec/Prom/Trans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.92% Gen/Col</td>
<td>4.63% Rec/Prom/Trans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Affairs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.40% Gen/Col</td>
<td>5.15% Rec/Prom/Trans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.00% Gen/Col</td>
<td>5.00% Rec/Prom/Trans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.58% Gen/Col</td>
<td>4.99% Rec/Prom/Trans</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Transaction dates include 09/02/98 - 03/10/2000

Printed: 5/1/2000 9:29:16 AM
### Average Percent Increase for All Employees by Budget Center

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Centers</th>
<th>Administration</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6.53%</td>
<td>5.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.63%</td>
<td>5.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.91%</td>
<td>6.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.67%</td>
<td>5.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>8.33%</td>
<td>6.04%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Transaction dates include 09/02/98 - 03/10/2000

Printed: 5/1/2000 9:29:16 AM
### Average Percent Increase for All Employees in Group and Category - University Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category Description</th>
<th>Academic</th>
<th>Administrative</th>
<th>PSA</th>
<th>Athletics</th>
<th>Auxiliaries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Counts</td>
<td>Gen/ Col.</td>
<td>Perf/ Merit</td>
<td>Rec/ Prom/ Transf</td>
<td>Pay/ Adj/ Misc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATION - LEVEL 1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATION - LEVEL 2</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT - LEVEL 1</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT - LEVEL 2</td>
<td>1,727</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACULTY</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>838</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACULTY - 12 to 26 Month</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COACH</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY - LEVEL 1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY - LEVEL 2</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Transaction dates include 09/02/98-03/10/2000
### Average Dollar Increase for All Employees in Group and Category - University Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category Description</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Academic (Gen / Col, Perf / Prom / Transf)</th>
<th>Administrative (Gen / Col, Perf / Prom / Transf)</th>
<th>PSA (Gen / Col, Perf / Prom / Transf)</th>
<th>Athletics (Gen / Col, Perf / Prom / Transf)</th>
<th>Auxiliaries (Gen / Col, Perf / Prom / Transf)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18,669</td>
<td>7,658</td>
<td>11,302</td>
<td>6,667</td>
<td>6,139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATION - LEVEL 1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9,483</td>
<td>5,487</td>
<td>3,371</td>
<td>2,284</td>
<td>2,284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATION - LEVEL 2</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>5,960</td>
<td>4,510</td>
<td>1,204</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>5,033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT - LEVEL 1</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>3,644</td>
<td>1,247</td>
<td>1,247</td>
<td>1,020</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT - LEVEL 2</td>
<td>1,727</td>
<td>2,395</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>836</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACULTY</td>
<td>844</td>
<td>836</td>
<td>4,434</td>
<td>4,105</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACULTY - 12 to 9 Month</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COACH</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,063</td>
<td>3,063</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY - LEVEL 1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5,799</td>
<td>1,421</td>
<td>1,776</td>
<td>2,324</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY - LEVEL 2</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>4,477</td>
<td>1,096</td>
<td>1,004</td>
<td>2,254</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Transaction dates include 09/02/98 - 01/10/2000
## Average Percent Increase for Employees Receiving Increases - University Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category Description</th>
<th>Academic</th>
<th>Administrative</th>
<th>PSA</th>
<th>Athletics</th>
<th>Auxiliaries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gen/Col</td>
<td>Perf/Col</td>
<td>Perf/Col</td>
<td>Pay/Adj/Misc</td>
<td>Gen/Col</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEVEL 1</td>
<td>14.58%</td>
<td>5.89%</td>
<td>25.26%</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEVEL 2</td>
<td>8.87%</td>
<td>3.03%</td>
<td>12.49%</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT - LEVEL 1</td>
<td>8.16%</td>
<td>3.01%</td>
<td>3.14%</td>
<td>9.49%</td>
<td>12.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACULTY</td>
<td>9.80%</td>
<td>7.39%</td>
<td>8.22%</td>
<td>7.30%</td>
<td>6.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COACH</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY - LEVEL 1</td>
<td>12.40%</td>
<td>3.05%</td>
<td>2.83%</td>
<td>8.29%</td>
<td>11.80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Transaction dates include 09/02/98-03/10/2000*
### Average Dollar Increase of Those Employees Receiving Increases - University Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Academic</th>
<th>Administrative</th>
<th>PSA</th>
<th>Athletics</th>
<th>Auxiliaries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gen/ Col</td>
<td>Perf/ Merit</td>
<td>Rec/ Prom</td>
<td>Pay Adj/ Misc</td>
<td>Gen/ Col</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8,959</td>
<td>7,653</td>
<td>33,905</td>
<td>6,867</td>
<td>6,139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATION - LEVEL 1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9,483</td>
<td>5,986</td>
<td>26,967</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>6,852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATION - LEVEL 2</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,092</td>
<td>3,262</td>
<td>4,770</td>
<td>7,383</td>
<td>6,414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT - LEVEL 1</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,644</td>
<td>1,247</td>
<td>1,301</td>
<td>3,673</td>
<td>4,709</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. **Call to Order**: The meeting was called to order at 2:36 p.m. by President Fred S. Switzer. Individual introductions were made by Faculty Senators once again.

2. **Approval of Minutes**: The Faculty Senate Minutes dated May 9, 2000 were approved as written, as were the General Faculty & Staff Minutes of May 11, 2000.

3. **“Free Speech”**: Senator David Allison spoke on the community item of interest regarding the possible location of a Walmart in Clemson, South Carolina.

4. **Committee Reports**
   a. **Senate Committees**
      1) **Research Committee** - Senator Dan Warner, Chair, stated that there was no report.
      2) **Welfare Committee** - Chair Amod Ogale stated that there was no report but that the issues of parking and retirement will be addressed at the first meeting of this Committee.
      3) **Finance Committee** - Chair John Bednar noted that the Finance Committee will continue to look at the salary situation for staff and the importance of improvement of staff salaries; the 28-year retirement plan; and the impact of restructuring on the finances of the University.
      4) **Policy Committee** - John Huffman, Chair, noted that this Committee had met twice. Three *Faculty Manual* changes were approved and two allegations of *Faculty Manual* violations were determined during the first meeting. During the meeting on August 10th, the Committee addressed changes to the Intellectual Property Committee; evaluations of associate deans and directors; questions regarding emeritus faculty; an allegation of a *Faculty Manual* violation; and the issue of placing the *Faculty Manual* primarily on the web instead of hard copies for faculty. The Policy Committee has begun working with the newly-appointed *Faculty Manual* Editorial Consultant, Alan Schaffer. President Switzer asked members of the Faculty Senate to notify him of any potential problems with the placement of the *Manual* on the web.
      5) **Scholastic Policies Committee** - Jim Zimmerman, Chair, stated that there was no report.

   b. **University Commissions and Committees**: None
President’s Remarks: President Switzer noted the following:

a. that the Provost Search Committee has been formed and has begun its work. At this point, the nomination process has begun. The Committee has been asked to start providing names for consideration. President Switzer asked the Senate to forward names to him of possible candidates. The application process will be streamlined. Also requested of the Senate were desired qualities of Clemson’s next provost. President Switzer stated that the Faculty Senate is well represented with three members in addition to him: Vice President/President-Elect Alan Grubb and Senators Mickey Hall and Brenda Thames.

b. that during a President’s Cabinet meeting, President Barker asked for Senate input regarding what the optimal size Clemson University should be. Input is to be forwarded to President Switzer.

c. that Scott Ludlow has mentioned that Open Forums have been scheduled in order to discuss changes in benefits.

d. that stop signs have now been placed at Cherry Road and to be aware.

6. Old Business: None

7. New Business:

a. Senator Huffman submitted three Faculty Manual changes individually for approval by the Senate which were: Adding Classified Staff to Libraries Advisory Committee, Addition to the Vending Machine Committee Membership, and Immunity for the Ombudsman. Vote was taken on each proposed change and all passed unanimously (Attachments A, B, and C).

b. Senator Peg Tyler submitted for endorsement and explained the statement, Intellectual Freedom Principles for Academic Libraries, noting that if endorsed by the Senate, the statement will be duly noted in the Library Faculty Statement of Policies. Motion was seconded. Vote to endorse principles was taken and passed unanimously (Attachment D).

8. Announcements: President Switzer:

a. announced that Cecil Huey will continue as Faculty Representative to the NCAA.

b. informed the Senate that the next faculty display at the Madren Center will highlight the public service of faculty. Senators are to forward any faculty public service to Senator Tyler so that she may pursue.

c. reminded all that Convocation will be held on August 22, 2000 at 9:00 a.m. Faculty Senate will gather at the Brackett Hall Atrium at 8:15 a.m.
d. announced that the Faculty Senate Retreat will be held on December 19th and will focus on Faculty Senate initiatives.

e. informed the Senate of the new website www.lib.clemson.edu/fs/ and thanked Gordon Cochrane, Librarian, for his diligent efforts as the Faculty Senate’s web manager, which is done in a service capacity.

f. reminded the Senators of their responsibilities as a member of the Faculty Senate and noted the importance of regular attendance at Senate meetings.

9. **Adjournment:** The meeting was adjourned by President Switzer at 3:17 p.m.

Peg Tyler, Secretary

Cathy Tom Sturkie

Absent: Galyean, Moise (Chapman for), Voelker (Chamberlain for), Malloy, Brannan, B. Lee, Bridgwood, Ellison, Meriwether (Hare for), Backman,
To: Faculty Senate President Fred S. Switzer, III  
From: Robert A. Waller, Editorial Consultant  
Re: Adding Classified Staff to Libraries Advisory Committee

On February 23rd a formal request that a member of the Classified Staff be added to the Libraries Advisory Committee was submitted from the Classified Staff Commission through Dean Boykin and approved in the Provost's Office. Unfortunately, notice that such a change was being considered did not reach me in time to be reflected in the major Committee restructuring approved by the Senate on February 16th.

This addition needs to be reflected in the recently approved revisions in the University committee structure. As a committee reporting to the Provost, the following language changes would reflect the inclusion of a Classified Staff member (new language underscored):

2. Libraries Advisory Committee. This committee reviews and advises on policies for the University Libraries. Membership consists of the Dean of the Libraries (chair, non-voting); one faculty representative serving a three-year term elected from each college and the Library; a representative of the Faculty Senate elected annually; a representative of the Classified Staff Commission appointed annually by the President of the Classified Staff Commission; an undergraduate Student appointed by the President of the Student Senate; and a graduate student appointed by the President of Graduate Student Government.

This slight modification would enfranchise a major University constituency with an abiding interest in the future of the Library.

c.c.: Academic Vice President and Provost Steffen H. Rogers  
Dean of Libraries Joseph F. Boykin, Jr.  
Classified Staff Commission President Brian K. Becknell  
Past Classified Staff Commission President Catherine G. Bell  
Policy Committee Chair John W. Huffman  
Mesdames Brenda J. Smith and Joy T. Sturkie
To: Faculty Senate President Fred S. Switzer, III
   
From: Robert A. Waller, Editorial Consultant

Re: Addition to the Vending Machine Committee Membership

The Classified Staff Commission on September 30, 1998 requested membership on the Vending Machine Committee through Scott Ludlow. It was approved by the Administrative Council on October 19th of that year. That action, however, had not been reported to me until now. Thus, a minor addition to the Faculty Manual is needed.

The composition and charge to the Vending Machine Committee is found on page 59 of the August 1999 Faculty Manual. With the addition of a person from this Commission the revised paragraph would read as follows (new language underscored):

"3. Vending Machine Committee. This committee consists of the Budget Director (chair); the Provost; the Vice President for Student Affairs; the President of the Faculty Senate; the President of the Graduate Student Government; the President of the Student Body; the President of the Classified Staff Commission; and the Director of Fiscal Affairs or their designees. The committee reviews requests from university departments or organizations for the funding of special activities from the Vending Machine Fund."

Such a minor addition could be implemented upon the endorsement of the full Faculty Senate and approval of the Provost.

C.C.: Academic Vice President and Provost Steffen H. Rogers
   Policy Committee Chair John W. Huffman
   Budget Director Alan M. Godfrey
   Chief Financial Officer Scott A. Ludlow
   Classified Staff Commission President Brian K. Becknell
   Past Classified Staff Commission President Catherine G. Bell
   Mesdames Brenda J. Smith and T. Sturkie
To: Faculty Senate President Fred S. Switzer, III 
From: Robert A. Waller, Editorial Consultant 
Re: Immunity for the Ombudsman

Experience with the operation of the Office of the University Ombudsman (page 34 of the 1999-2000 Faculty Manual) suggests that the person holding that office should enjoy the same immunity that currently is accorded members of the Grievance Boards (pages 38-39 and 42). It is the recommendation of the subcommittee concerned with the operation of the Office of the Ombudsman that similar protection should be accorded that officer.

To accomplish this objective, it is requested that the following change be approved for addition to the Faculty Manual on page 34 (new language underscored) as added last sentences to paragraph 3):

"In conducting the affairs of this office the ombudsman shall be independent and free from any or all restraint, interference, coercion, or reprisal. The ombudsman shall be protected from retaliation. Should these principles be violated, the violations should be brought to the attention of the Provost, and subsequently (if necessary) to the President."

In this manner the protection in the grievance process would be extended clearly to all the parties involved. As a clarification of an existing principle, this change could be implemented upon the approval of the Faculty Senate and the endorsement of the Provost.

c.c.: Academic Vice President and Provost Steffen H. Rogers 
Subcommittee Chair Patricia T. Smart 
Ombudsman R. Gordon Halfacre 
Policy Committee Chair John W. Huffman 
Mesdames Brenda J. Smith and Cathy T. Sturkie
May 22, 2000

Dear Colleagues:

As you may be aware, ACRL’s Intellectual Freedom Committee has developed the statement, Intellectual Freedom Principles for Academic Libraries. Following an open hearing at the 1999 ALA Annual Conference in New Orleans, the statement was unanimously approved by the ACRL Board of Directors. At Midwinter 2000, it was endorsed by ALA’s Intellectual Freedom Committee and will appear in the forthcoming edition of the Intellectual Freedom Manual.

The final section of the document recommends “… that this statement of principle be endorsed by appropriate institutional governing bodies, including the faculty senate or similar instrument of faculty governance.”

To date, our experience has been that faculty senates welcome this document. In addition to reflecting positively on the role of college and university librarians in the academic milieu, the document is a useful policy statement which is helpful should your library be challenged on the basis of a display, a library resource, or Internet access.

We hope you will initiate submission of the Principles to your faculty senate and administration. We believe it strengthens the ability to provide that freedom of access which is indispensable to the mission of academic and research libraries.

Larry Hardesty, President
ACRL

Laurence Miller, Chair
ACRL Intellectual Freedom Committee

Enclosure: Intellectual Freedom Principles
Intellectual Freedom Principles for Academic Libraries

A strong intellectual freedom perspective is critical to the development of academic library collections and services that dispassionately meet the education and research needs of a college or university community. The purpose of this statement is to provide an interpretation of general intellectual freedom principles in an academic library setting and, in the process, raise consciousness of the intellectual freedom context within which academic librarians work. These principles should be reflected in all relevant library policy documents.

1. The general principles set forth in the Library Bill of Rights form an indispensable framework for building collections, services, and policies that serve the entire academic community.

2. The privacy of library users is and must be inviolable. Policies should be in place that maintain confidentiality of library borrowing records and of other information relating to personal use of library information and services.

3. The development of library collections in support of an institution’s instruction and research programs should transcend the personal values of the selector. In the interests of research and learning, it is essential that collections contain materials representing a variety of perspectives on subjects that may be considered controversial.

4. Preservation and replacement efforts should ensure that balance in library materials is maintained and that controversial materials are not removed from the collections through theft, loss, mutilation, or normal wear and tear. There should be alertness to efforts by special interest groups to bias a collection though systematic theft or mutilation.

5. Licensing agreements should be consistent with the Library Bill of Rights, and should maximize access.

6. Open and unfiltered access to the Internet should be conveniently available to the academic community in a college or university library. Content filtering devices and content-based restrictions are a contradiction of the academic library mission to further research and learning through exposure to the broadest possible range of ideas and information. Such restrictions are a fundamental violation of intellectual freedom in academic libraries.

7. Freedom of information and of creative expression should be reflected in library exhibits and in all relevant library policy documents.

8. Library meeting rooms, research carrels, exhibit spaces, and other facilities should be available to the academic community regardless of research being pursued or subject being discussed. Any restrictions made necessary because of limited availability of space should be based on need, as reflected in library policy, rather than on content of research or discussion.

9. Whenever possible, library services should be available without charge in order to encourage inquiry. Where charges are necessary, a free or low-cost alternative (e.g., downloading to disc rather than printing) should be available when possible.

10. A service philosophy should be promoted that affords equal access to information for all in the academic community with no discrimination on the basis of race, values, gender, sexual orientation, cultural or ethnic background, physical or learning disability, economic status, religious beliefs, or views.

11. A procedure ensuring due process should be in place to deal with requests by those within and outside the academic community for removal or addition of library resources, exhibits, or services.

12. It is recommended that this statement of principle be endorsed by appropriate institutional governing bodies, including the faculty senate or similar instrument of faculty governance.

Adopted by ACRL Intellectual Freedom Committee: June 28, 1999
Approved by ACRL Board of Directors: June 29, 1999
1. **Call to Order**: The meeting was called to order at 2:36 p.m. by President Fred S. Switzer.

2. **Approval of Minutes**: The Faculty Senate Minutes dated August 15, 2000 were approved as written.

3. **“Free Speech”**: Beth Jarrard, of News Services, invited Senators and their colleagues to attend the Celebration to Honor Clemson University as *Time Magazine*’s Public College of the Year. The Celebration will be held on Friday, September 15 from 11:00 a.m. until 2:00 p.m. at the Hendrix Student Center (Attachment A).

4. **Committee Reports**
   a. **Senate Committees**
      1) **Research Committee** – Senator Dan Warner, Chair, noted that a new University Research Committee has been established with a different constituency for membership and will be chaired by Y. T. Shah.
      2) **Welfare Committee** – Chair Amod Ogale submitted this Committee’s Report #1 dated August 25, 2000 (Attachment B).
      3) **Finance Committee** – Chair John Bednar noted that in addition to the items contained within the August Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, this Committee will look at administrative salary supplements and the relationship between Barnes and Noble and the University Bookstore.
      4) **Policy Committee** – John Huffman, Chair, stated that this Committee met on September 19th and passed a *Faculty Manual* modification regarding the reorganization of the Intellectual Property Committee. Other issues the Policy Committee will address are: the evaluation of associate and assistant deans; the incorporation of the position description of the Faculty Representative to the NCAA within the *Faculty Manual*; an allegation of a *Faculty Manual* violation; the reorganization of the Animal Research Committee; and the TERI Retirement Program.
      5) **Scholastic Policies Committee** – Jim Zimmerman, Chair, submitted the August, 2000 Report (Attachment C).

5. **University Commissions and Committees:**
Alcohol and Other Drugs Task Force – Senator Connie Lee reported that this Task Force would like information from the Faculty Senate regarding faculty's non-academic responsibilities with students and alcohol and drug abuse in addition to faculty's comfort level in dealing with this non-academic responsibility. Senator Lee explained that now is an opportune time to establish support groups for students on campus in order to deal with these issues. Senator Lee will prepare information which will be forwarded to the Senators for a response.

5. President's Remarks: President Switzer noted the following:
   a. that the Faculty Manual is now accessible on the Faculty Senate Web Page via the Clemson University Home Page. He then asked for a sense of Senate regarding the quantity and substance of Faculty Senate information to share with the general faculty via electronic mail. Discussion followed.
   b. that President Barker is making a serious effort to gauge the feelings of constituent groups regarding the size of the University. President Switzer shared with President Barker that there was not a consensus size-wise but that there was consensus regarding that this effort is irrelevant unless the resources are available. President Switzer also noted that the role of the Faculty Senate in the future of the University will be an important discussion during our Retreat.

6. Old Business: None

7. New Business:
   a. Senator Huffman explained and submitted for acceptance the Faculty Manual Modification to the Intellectual Property Committee. Vote to accept modification was taken and passed unanimously (Attachment D).
   b. Graduate Student Government President, Craig Dawson, explained and submitted for endorsement the Resolution to Create a University Graduate Student Health Insurance Task Force. Following discussion, vote to endorse GSG Resolution was taken and passed unanimously (Attachment E).
   c. Noting that it was passed unanimously by the Executive/Advisory Committee, President Switzer explained and submitted for approval the Resolution Conferring to the Great Class of '39 Status as Honorary Faculty Senators. There being no discussion, vote to accept resolution was taken and passed (Attachment F) (FS00-9-1 P).
   d. President Switzer explained to the Faculty Senate the issue of legal services for the Faculty Senate by stating that on occasion the advice of legal counsel is necessary, for example, to the Executive/Advisory Committee, to the Senate, or to Grievance Hearing Panels. Members of the Senate were asked to think about this issue which will be referred to committee for a report to the Senate.
e. An inquiry by Senator Linnell regarding the issue of nine-month faculty being paid (for nine months work) over a twelve-month period was referred to the Welfare Committee.

8. Announcements: President Switzer announced:
   a. the Review Committee for the Class of ’39 Award for Excellence will be: Judy Melton, Chair; Larry Bauer, Melanie Cooper, Bill Lasser, Kelly Smith, and Bob Green, Alternate.
   b. nominations for the Class of ’39 Award for Excellence are due to the Faculty Senate Office by October 24, 2000.
   c. that he was asked to announce that a demonstration on Digital Documents Design by the Xerox Corporation will be held on October 18 and 19, 2000 in Godfrey Hall sponsored by the Department of Graphic Communications
   d. as a reminder that the Faculty Senate Retreat will be held on December 19th.
   e. that the announcements are now out for the Provost Search and that nominations are still being accepted. The question of whether or not the Interim Provost could participate as a candidate in this search has arisen. At this time the Interim Provost is not a candidate. Internal procedures will be discussed at the next Provost Search Committee meeting on Thursday and the Committee will meet with the former Provost later in September.
   f. in response to a question regarding the status of the Vice President for Research position, that he is not aware of the status.

9. Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned by President Switzer at 3:50 p.m.

Peg Tyler, Secretary

Cathy Toth Sturkie

Absent: Grimes, Linvill, Bradshaw, Hall, Miller (Walker for), Allison, Placone (LaForge for), Malloy, Ellison, Meriwether (Hare for), Backman (D. Switzer for)
TIME TO CELEBRATE CLEMSON'S HONOR

By now you know that Clemson was named TIME magazine's "Public College of the Year." Now it's TIME to celebrate, and all faculty, staff and students are invited to join the party.

A campus celebration will be held Friday, Sept. 15, 11 a.m.-2 p.m., at the Hendrix Student Center (second floor). Enjoy refreshments, pick up a free "College of the Year" car decal and button, and buy your "College of the Year" T-shirt for only $5.

PLUS — The first 500 people to drop by get a free copy of the TIME/Princeton Review Best College for You special issue.

PLUS — All faculty who have participated in Clemson's Communication Across the Curriculum programs and come to the celebration will get a free lunch in the form of a $5-gift certificate good at any campus dining facility.

A ceremony honoring lead faculty in Communication Across the Curriculum and featuring President Jim Barker will be held at 12:30 p.m. in the multipurpose room of the Hendrix Center.

Off-campus faculty and staff — or those on campus who cannot attend the celebration — may order a "College of the Year" T-shirt by sending a check for $5, made payable to Clemson University, to:

College of the Year
c/o Cathy Sams
Clemson University
Trustee House
Clemson, SC 29634-5606

We'll enclose a button and a decal when we fill your order.
Faculty Senate Welfare Committee
Report # 1 August 25, 2000 Meeting
Committee members in attendance: Amod Ogale (Chair), Eleanor Hare, Burt Lee.

1. PTR review by the Dean.
Hare pointed out that the faculty manual clearly states that for a faculty member to receive an "Unsatisfactory" final evaluation, both the peer review committee and the Departmental Chair must have given an "Unsatisfactory" ratings. However, she noted that some Deans give "Unsatisfactory" rating regardless of the two earlier level decisions being "satisfactory". Discussion followed about the loss of morale. Ogale noted that the Faculty Manual has provision for the Dean to provide an independent opinion (irrespective of the outcome at the two earlier levels). Therefore, it would not be appropriate to request the upper administration to prevent the Dean from issuing an opinion. However, there was clear agreement that under such circumstances the Dean's letter should not say or imply in any way that his/her "unsatisfactory" evaluation of a faculty member is the final outcome. Discussion to continue in the next meeting.

2. Graduated parking rates.
Ogale summarized his conversation with Ben Anderson, University General Counsel who could not find anything illegal about the graduated parking rates. Members present in the meeting also did not see anything illegal with the policy. Discussion to continue in the next meeting.

3. "Retirement benefits" issue raised by an individual faculty member.
It was not clear to the committee members why the existing system is unfair. If faculty members on a 9-month salary do not have opportunities during summer while on regular employment, their annual salary is then equal to their 9-month salary, and that is what is treated as their base salary in retirement. Hare noted that even public school teachers receive only 9 months of salary and that the retirement income is based on this "annual" salary. If they teach summer school, they get paid additional salary, which is reflected in a higher retirement benefit. Discussion to continue in the next meeting.
The Scholastic Policies Committee had their initial meeting Wednesday, August 31, 2000 in 108 Long Hall. The Student Senate President, the Student Body President, and the President of the Graduate Student Body are invited to all of these meetings.

Items already on the table for consideration are:

- Looking at a +/- grading system. The results from last Spring's request for input were presented to the committee

- Continuing work on the Teaching Evaluation forms

- Grade inflation

- Note-taking services such as versity.com. (A note added after the meeting: The Council on Undergraduate Studies also has this on its agenda)

- The potential for true on-line teaching evaluations. At the next meeting Carla Rathbone will talk to the committee about what is possible under the MYCLE system.

The next meeting of the committee will be 3:30 pm on Wednesday, September 20th, in 108 Long Hall.

Jim Zimmerman, Chair
MODIFICATION TO THE
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY COMMITTEE

"This committee consists of a chair appointed the Chief Research Officer; the Senior Contract Advisor (secretary); the General Counsel or his/her designee; a representative." The only change is the addition of the phrase "...or his/her designee..."

Unanimously passed by the Faculty Senate on September 12, 2000.
Title: Health Insurance Committee
Resolution No 00 JUL
Author: Craig Dawson
Date: August 7th, 2000

Whereas Clemson University has as one of its goals to become a "Top 20" Institution, and

Whereas many of the current "Top 20" public institutions offer health insurance to graduate students as part of their assistantship packages, and

Whereas many of our peer institutions offer health insurance to graduate students, and

Whereas comprehensive health insurance greatly benefits graduate students,

Therefore be it resolved that Graduate Student Government supports the creation of a University Graduate Student Health Insurance Task Force to 1) discuss the importance of health insurance and 2) put forth a working document to detail a course of action for the implementation of health insurance as part of the graduate assistantship package.

Kate Brady
GSG Vice-President

Craig R. Dawson
GSG President

Endorsed unanimously by the
Faculty Senate on September 12, 2000
MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
NOVEMBER 14, 2000

1. **Call to Order:** The meeting was called to order at 2:35 p.m. by President Fred Switzer. Alan Schaffer, *Faculty Manual* Editorial Consultant, was introduced to members of the Senate.

2. **Approval of Minutes:** The Faculty Senate Minutes dated October 10, 2000 were approved as written.

3. **Class of ’39 Award for Excellence**
   a. President Switzer appointed Vice President/President-Elect Alan Grubb to assist with the Class of ’39 ballot count.
   
   b. The election of the 2000 Class of ’39 Award for Excellence recipient was held by secret ballot.
   
   c. President Switzer shared comments that he has received regarding the format for nominations contained within the Memo of Understanding of the Award and stated that any suggestions may be forwarded to Cathy Sturkie to share with next year’s Review Committee.

4. **“Free Speech”:** Steven Marks, Professor of History, and Michael Morris, Professor of Political Science and Languages, informed the Senate of their reasons to include a yes or no question for every Faculty Activity System category regarding an international dimension of activities in order to share this information with a database of international-related faculty projects and programs. The Policy Committee will address this issue further.

5. **Committee Reports**
   a. Senate Committees
      1) **Research Committee** – Senator Dan Warner, Chair, submitted and briefly discussed Committee Report dated November 14, 2000 (Attachment A).
      
      2) **Welfare Committee** – Senator Brenda Thames noted that the Committee had heard from the lead senators from the Colleges of Agriculture, Forestry, & Life Sciences and Health, Education, and Human Development regarding 24-hour parking on campus for faculty. They await hearing from the other four colleges. The Committee will address faculty recognition on our website but would like further information from the President. Next meeting will be on November 27th at 9:15 a.m. in Earle Hall.
3) **Finance Committee** – Chair John Bednar reported that the Committee has been in contact with David Fleming regarding application or non-application of University’s policy of removing administrator supplements from one’s salary who is no longer an administrator.

4) **Policy Committee** – Senator Ron Galyean reported that this Committee met on October 17 and approved two items to be considered under New Business. Other items discussed included: need for consideration of post tenure review faculty related to the TERI Program; evaluation of assistant and associate deans; instructor, lecturer, and senior lecturer ranks; and office and laboratory space for emeritus faculty.

5) **Scholastic Policies Committee** – Senator Jim Zimmerman, Chair, submitted and discussed the Committee Report dated October 18, 2000 (Attachment B).

b. **University Commissions and Committees:**

   (1) **Libraries Advisory Committee** – Vice President/President-Elect Alan Grubb thanked those who have responded to his request for information regarding electronic theses versus hard copies. Comments may still be forwarded to him which will be shared with the Graduate School and the University Libraries Advisory Committee.

6. **President’s Remarks:** President Switzer:

   a. implored Senators to encourage constituents to take the SACS Faculty Survey as seriously as possible.

   b. shared information about his knowledge of changes to the final exam schedule. He was asked to meet with George Carter and students about the exam schedule but was unaware that a committee had already been addressing this topic since last spring. Students’ main concern was time between exams. An additional Saturday has been added to the exam week to give three additional exam periods. There will be no exams on Sunday. The Provost shared her understanding of this issue particularly noting that the extra day is at the front end of the week. Senator Zimmerman stated the importance that those involved be certain that rooms will be available and open for this extra day of exams.

   c. stated that the Budget Accountability Committee has been established with John Warner as Chair and that Salary Reports should be distributed shortly.

7. **Old Business:** None
8. **New Business:** Senator Huffman individually explained and submitted for approval the following proposed *Faculty Manual* changes:
   a. Protection for Those Involved in Grievances – No discussion. Vote was taken and proposed change passed unanimously (Attachment C).
   b. Change in Grievance Procedure – No discussion. Vote was taken and proposed change passed unanimously (Attachment D).

9. **Announcements:** President Switzer reminded the Senators:
   a. of the Faculty Senate Retreat on December 19, 2000 beginning at 8:30 a.m. The regular Faculty Senate meeting will be held at 2:30 p.m. on that same day.
   b. of the Celebration of the Class of ’39 to be held on January 8, 2001 from 6-8:00 p.m. at the Madren Center. Invitations will be mailed shortly.

10. **Adjournment:** The meeting was adjourned by President Switzer at 3:40 p.m.

Absent: Grimes, Miller, Bradshaw, Hall (N. Walker for), Heusinkveld (W. Chapman for), Voelker (F. Chamberlain for), Placone (LaForge for), Huffman (G. Lickfield for), Malloy, Meriwether (Hare for), B. Lee, Ogale, Backman (D. Switzer for)
Faculty Senate Research Committee Report

November 14, 2000

1. The Faculty Senate Research Committee met on Tuesday, October 31. Present were Cecilia Voelker, Vic Shelbume, and Dan Warner.

Vic Shelburne had represented this committee at the meeting of the Research Committee of the Board of Trustees on Friday morning, October 13, and Vic gave a report on this meeting. Two main points were that President Barker pointed out the research should not be viewed as a revenue stream, and Trustee Bill Amick remarked that it is important to keep in mind that research is done by faculty. This seems to underscore the sincere desire of the trustees and the administration to improve the quality and quantity of research at Clemson University. An intrinsic problem is that the trustees and the administration have very little access to data about the quality and quantity of research other than research expenditures.

Vic also reviewed the efforts from last year, which led to the restructuring of the University Research Council. The main reason for the restructuring was the need to insure those who were responsible for overseeing various areas of research compliance were in positions that could be effective.

Dan Warner reported on his earlier meeting with Y. T. Shah, which touched on the new structure of the University Research Council and when it would have its first meeting. It had not been scheduled as of October 31.

Dan Warner also reported on the first meeting of the Search Committee for the new Vice President of Research. This is a new position, which will subsume the existing position of Chief Research Officer. President Barker made it clear that this person should be a facilitator and should work closely with the Provost and the Vice President of Public Service. President Barker appears to feel that it is important to have a vice-president level person in charge of each of the university's missions.

The committee discussed issues about improving the research environment at Clemson University as well as the need to maintain the focus on quality research and not simply funded research. The committee decided that it should seek to find inexpensive ways to help promote the research environment, particularly intellectual curiosity and the enthusiasm for learning. We also discussed the need to get some insight into the dollars associated with sponsored research and the extent to which that money helps to improve Clemson University.

2. On Thursday, November 9, Brian Malloy and Dan Warner represented this committee in a meeting with Y. T. Shah.

We reviewed the new research structure from the Board of Trustees' committee on down. Dr. Shah's goal was to insure that there were adequate lines of communication for the faculty. It appears that the chair of the University Research Council will automatically attend the Board's Research Committee meetings. Dr. Shah felt that since there are only three administrators on the University Research Council that the chair would almost surely be a faculty member and thus guarantee a good channel of communication. It would appear that this would be a good point to examine and perhaps insist on in the faculty manual. We also learned that the first meeting of the University Research Council will be on Friday, November 17.

We also learned that Dr. Shah was meeting regularly with the five Associate Deans of Research (who are no longer members of the University Research Council).
Dr. Shah also reviewed the Report on Research and Sponsored Program Activity. Dan Warner suggested that examining the numbers from the perspective of budget categories would provide more insight into the sustainability of the funding and the value of the funding to the university. Dr. Shah set up a meeting between Dan Warner and Bill Geer for the following day.

3. On Friday, November 18, Dan Warner and Bill Geer met. It appears that it will be fairly straightforward to generate a spreadsheet showing expenditures by budget account for the last two fiscal years.
The Scholastic Policy Committee met on Wednesday, October 18. Attending were Ed Moise, Kelly Smith, Fred Switzer, Jim Zimmerman, Rita Bolt, Megan Capobianco, Craig Dawson, and Genie Wooten.

Faculty Senate President Fred Switzer made a presentation to the committee concerning a CEDA Workshop on Faculty Evaluations held October 9-10 in San Diego.

Jim Zimmerman presented a follow-up on the potential for a test of an electronic version of the teaching evaluations done by students at the end of each semester. This test was requested by the Graduate Student Council last year and will be restricted to 800 level courses with low enrollments. Acting Provost Helms gave approval to continue but pointed out some possible problems regarding Performance funding and directed him to David Fleming. Mr. Fleming confirmed that there could be problems if the rate of response was not high. On the other hand, some of the current problems presented by the paper forms would be avoided. A meeting with Carla Rathbone and Phil Lyles was very enthusiastic and indicated that essentially everything was in place and that under very optimistic conditions the test could even be done this semester. Since the major obstacle seems to be the fear that students would not participate and that would adversely affect the University, Dr. Zimmerman ask the student leaders to discuss this issue with their constituency.

Because the topic of +/- grading has created so many outside questions with no detailed proposal being discussed, it was agreed that this will be the last statement until a detailed proposal has been discussed thoroughly in committee (including student leaders).

The next meeting will be on Wednesday, November 15, in the 108 Long.

Jim Zimmerman
MEMORANDUM

TO: Fred Switzer
THROUGH: John Huffman
FROM: Alan Schaffer

RE: Protection for those involved in grievances

At its meeting on October 17th the Policy Committee unanimously approved a stronger statement on protection from retaliation for all those involved in grievances. The revised statement, which follows, is of sufficient importance to go into the Manual as a new and separate section in boldface under General Information on pages 26 and 27. The new material is in bold:

“Protection of faculty members and others involved in grievance procedures. Each faculty member and any other person involved in any grievance procedure, including grievance counselors and members of the grievance board or hearing panel, shall be free from any and all restraint, interference, coercion, threat, or reprisal on the part of associates or administrators in filing a grievance, in accompanying a faculty member filing a grievance, in seeking information in accordance with the procedures described in this section, in appearing as a witness, or in hearing and ruling on a grievance. These principles apply with equal force after a grievance has been adjudicated. Should these principles be violated, the violations should be brought to the attention of the President of the Faculty Senate and the Provost for appropriate remedial action. Should the faculty member not receive satisfaction from the remedial action taken by the Provost, an appeal may be made to the President and subsequently, if necessary, to the Board of Trustees.”

If approved this statement will replace similar but less comprehensive statements repeated on pages 30 and 33 of the current Manual. I would appreciate if you would put this on the agenda for discussion by the Senate.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Fred Switzer
THROUGH: John Huffman
FROM: Alan Schaffner

RE: Change in grievance procedure

At its meeting on October 17th the Policy Committee unanimously approved a change in the faculty grievance procedure to cover grievances involving post-tenure review. Only a single sentence is being changed and this can be found in the Faculty Manual, page 31, Procedure c. As recommended the sentence will now read (new material in bold):

“If the grievance involves non-reappointment, denial of tenure or promotion, or post-tenure review, the requirement to meet with the department chair and/or the dean is waived.”

I would appreciate it if you would put this on the agenda for discussion by the Senate at your earliest convenience.
1. **Call to Order:** The meeting was called to order at 2:36 p.m. by Vice President/President-Elect Alan Grubb.

2. **Approval of Minutes:** The Academic Convocation Minutes of August 22, 2000 and the Faculty Senate Minutes dated September 12, 2000 were approved as written.

3. **“Free Speech”:** None

4. **Special Order of the Day:** Bill D’Andrea, Director of the Student Athlete Enrichment Program, shared general information regarding this Program and how it assists all student athletes, both successful and at-risk students, to become better, all-around individuals. In addition, Mr. D’Andrea informed the Senate that Clemson University is only one of two institutions of higher education in the country that has established a tutoring program for its student athletes certified by the National Tutoring Association. The goal of the Enrichment Program is for students to leave Clemson possessing the requisite skills needed upon Graduation including the components encompassing personal growth and development, career opportunities, community service, in addition to athletics.

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

      2) **Welfare Committee** – Chair Amod Ogale informed the Senate that he and President Switzer forwarded a memo to the Provost regarding the final outcome of Post-Tenure Review. Senator Ogale also noted that lead senators are polling colleagues regarding interest in 24-hour parking on campus.

      3) **Finance Committee** – Chair John Bednar stated that this Committee met last week with John Gilbert, Campus Services Manager, who answered all their questions about Barnes and Noble. They have a five-year contract that is renegotiated every five years and was just renegotiated last Spring. All booklists submitted by professors are shared with all bookstores in town. The only obligation by Barnes and Noble is to provide all of the books that are requested by professors which is not the case with the bookstores in town. Senator Bednar also noted that the contract
between Barnes and Noble and the University is that the Bookstore will receive $900,000 a year minimum or if sales are greater, the percentage of the University’s cut is 11.2%. This seems to be the policy elsewhere. Also noted by Senator Bednar is that the Board of Trustees has a motion on the table to address this week to decide what to do with the $900,000 or a portion thereof. It is Senator Bednar’s understanding that the money may be spent on the Library.

4) **Policy Committee** – John Huffman, Chair, stated that this Committee met on September 19th. Issues under consideration include: a change to grievance procedures relative to individuals undergoing post-tenure review and stronger protection for all parties involved in grievances; the result of a possible situation of a Grievance Procedure I Petition determined not grievable, but Petitioner then files a Grievance Procedure II Petition; and another allegation of a *Faculty Manual* violation. Senator Huffman also noted that he and the *Faculty Manual* Editorial Consultant, Alan Schaffer, met with the Provost and discussed post-tenure review. The issue of the Senior Lecturer position will be revised and submitted to the Senate for approval at a later date. The Policy Committee will next meet on October 17th at 3:30 p.m. in LL2 of the Cooper Library.

5) **Scholastic Policies Committee** – Senator David Allison submitted and discussed with the Senate the items contained within the Committee Report (Attachment A). This Committee will next meet on October 18 at 3:30 p.m. in the Jordan Room.

b. **University Commissions and Committees:**

(1) **Libraries Advisory Committee** – Vice President Grubb submitted Clemson University Libraries: Redefining the Future Business Plan (Attachment B) which was shared with the Committee by the Dean of the Libraries, Joe Boykin, at the Committee meeting last week. Vice President Grubb noted that contained within the Report is the possibility of theses being presented in electronic format rather than hard copy. He is going to Virginia Polytechnic Institute next week and will investigate all ramifications of electronic theses. All senators were requested to share their thoughts with Vice President Grubb regarding doing away with the hard copy thesis. Dori Helms, Interim Provost, shared information with the Senate regarding additional funds she has designated and requested for the Library. The Provost also noted that there may be ticket increases for all events held at the University which will go to information technology and the Library and shared information regarding campus storage.

6. **President’s Remarks:** On behalf of President Switzer, Vice President Grubb noted the following:

a. that a Budget Summit was recently held similar to the Library and Research Summits to examine ways to modify the current budget process to make it “more effective and responsive to the mission and goals of the University.” Two points
in particular came out of the session: 1) FTEs do not drive Clemson funding (apparently this concept is left over from the pre-performance funding days) and 2) The consensus seemed to be that Clemson needs an open budget process in which an integrated budget is allocated consistent with the goals of the University. The crucial details of just how such a process is implemented are still being examined.

b. that an ad hoc group will address the issue of final exams. Ideas being discussed include: more days for exams, an increase to four exam periods a day, and shortening exam periods. Senators were encouraged to forward their opinions and those of their colleagues to President Switzer.

c. that he will appoint an ad hoc Committee on Faculty Performance Appraisals to study all aspects of faculty performance appraisals, not just student evaluations, and to offer recommendations for improvements to the current system for accuracy and fairness.

7. Old Business: None

8. New Business: Senator Huffman individually explained and submitted for adoption the following proposed Faculty Manual changes:

a. Animal Research Committee – No discussion. Vote was taken and passed unanimously (Attachment C).

b. Faculty Athletics Representative - No discussion. Vote was taken and passed unanimously (Attachment D).

c. Review of Academic Administrators – following offers of friendly amendments (one accepted, two not accepted, and one withdrawn) vote on proposed amended change was taken and passed (Attachment E).

9. Announcements: Vice President Grubb announced:

a. that the Senate will lunch at noon with the Board of Trustees on Thursday, October 12th at the Owen Pavilion of the Madren Center;

b. that Calls for Nominations for the Class of '39 Award for Excellence are to be forwarded to Cathy Sturkie no later than October 24, 2000; and

c. that the Faculty Senate Retreat will be on December 19, 2000 at the Madren Center. Attendance responses are to be forwarded to Cathy Sturkie. Further information is forthcoming.

d. Senator Bednar reminded the Senate that the Finance Committee will look at administrative supplements – who receives them, whether or not the supplement is lost if the person returns to a teaching position, etc. There is a great deal of
variety as to how supplements are handled across the University. Senator Bednar requested that any information regarding this issue may be forwarded to him.

10. **Adjournment:** The meeting was adjourned by Vice President Grubb at 4:24 p.m.

Absent: Hupp, Bradshaw, Hall (N. Walker for), Zimmerman, Placone (LaForge for), F. Switzer, Malloy, Bridgwood, Meriwether (Hare for), Linnell, Thames (D. Switzer for)
Scholastic Policies Committee

The Scholastic Policies Committee met on Wednesday, September 20.

Attending were: David Allison, Ed Moise, Kelly Smith, Jim Zimmerman, Rita Bolt, Megan Capobianco, Tim McDonald, and Genie Wooten.

Carla Rathbone gave a presentation of the "Survey" feature of MYCLE and answered questions as to how its features might be utilized for teaching evaluations. It appears as if all of the technical features are available to accomplish what we want. Jim Zimmerman will visit with the Provost to explore the possibility of using some graduate courses as a test group—this is in direct request from the Graduate Student Association for such an electronic version.

Kelly Smith presented his survey of registrars concerning the +/- grading issue. A copy of this survey was given to all present. Student Senate has discussed this issue and, at this point, are opposed. As the students pointed out, however, since there was no specific proposal on the table this was more a "gut" reaction.

Rita Bolt requested that a question be added, to be worded in a very positive manner, as to indicate whether the student filling out the form would recommend the instructor for consideration for a teaching award. This concept was greeted warmly by the committee.

Megan Capobianco suggested some sort of universal survey on the effectiveness of advising. It was recognized that this would be a different survey. It was also pointed out that currently the University does not have any electronic record of who is the advisor for a given student. How a list linking students and advisors could be implemented will be explored. It was also pointed out that this could be linked to a FAS report so that faculty would not have to report numbers individually and that this could also be linked to the Degree Progress Reports. The next meeting will be on Wednesday, October 18, in the Jordan Room.
Clemson University Libraries: Redefining the Future

Business Plan

Background

The last several years have seen the world of information access in rapid transition. The emergence of the World Wide Web has provided the mechanism for converting much of what has historically been distributed in print to electronic access. This transition is having a significant impact on the methods available to libraries to provide information to their users.

The Clemson University Libraries were leaders in the early efforts at electronic information provision, locally loading computerized versions of not only the Clemson card catalog, but also indexes and abstracts of journal articles. With the advent of the Web, these products were quickly followed by remote access to databases that provided the full text of some of the articles being indexed. At the same time, many of the Libraries' traditional print reference resources were becoming available in electronic form and new Web-based reference sources were being created. In very recent years, a large percentage of journals began being offered by the publishers in electronic format and libraries now have the option of receiving their subscriptions in either electronic or print format (or both). This year, 2000, has seen increased activity in providing books in electronic format, with two major efforts – NetLibrary a Web-based service, and several versions of electronic reading devices called e-books. The Clemson University Libraries have been active participants in all of these changes.

Library Summit I

During the spring of 2000, the University recognized that the Libraries must redefine their future due to both the changing environment of information access and the need for University community members to collaborate in the learning and research environment. In late spring, a University-wide “Library Summit” was held, which brought together faculty, students, administrators, staff, and trustees to help define the future role of the University Libraries.

At the Library Summit, the participants examined several traditional areas of library activity and looked to the future to speculate how our new environment would change these areas. A significant number of suggestions came from the summit, focusing on three major themes:

1. The Clemson University Libraries should be evaluated on how well they meet the information needs of the Clemson community, not on how many volumes or items
they hold in their collections. There is a clear understanding that continuing to develop collections, both print and electronic, is critical to meeting those information needs, but technology provides other opportunities as well. Clemson University Libraries must declare independence from being judged solely upon their holdings and more on their success in meeting the needs of their users.

2. The Libraries should increase efforts to provide more databases, reference resources, and journals electronically to the user’s desktop.

3. Cooper Library should increasingly become the academic center of the campus, becoming less of a warehouse and more of a meeting house for collaboration between students and faculty. Cooper should be renovated to reflect that new role and little used library materials should be relocated to a remote storage facility.

Library Summit II

After the first Library Summit, the staff of the University Libraries held their own internal gathering to begin the process of specifying how those three major themes identified in the first Summit could be implemented. The staff of the Libraries looked at these issues and followed the request of the President to:

1. Write a “declaration of independence”.
2. Consider everything currently done and “put it all out on the lawn and decide which things will be brought back in and which would be left on the lawn.”

From the two highly productive half-day sessions that took place, literally hundreds of items and ideas were identified to add, to keep and to “leave on the lawn.” Those lists of suggestions were sorted into five topics:
1. Declaration of Independence
2. Collections and Services
3. Facilities
4. Staff
5. Funding

The Business Plan follows this same topical structure developed in the Summits.
As the primary measure of success, Clemson University Libraries will focus on meeting the user’s needs. Success will be defined as providing the information, services, and facilities for the University to do its job of research, service, and teaching (including lifelong learning) in the most efficient and effective manner possible. Traditional quantitative measures, especially those dealing with size of collection, will not be the sole standard we use to measure the achievement of the Libraries’ goals. While we are declaring our independence from the traditional ways of measuring the strength and value of academic libraries, we must also declare our interdependence on collaborative partnerships with other research libraries to ensure that our users have the greatest possible access to the information they need.

During 2000-2001, the Libraries will collaborate with the University Assessment Committee on a special project to determine the items which need to be measured, what types of measurements will be used, and how to work with the results of those measurements. Below are some illustrative types of assessment activity that may be recommended by the joint effort.

I. Evaluate the Libraries’ success in providing the access to information needed by the Clemson University community.

1. Use a variety of information-gathering techniques to determine if our users are accessing the resources they need. Projected Costs: Internal
   A. Identify our constituents
   B. Determine information-gathering methods to use
2. Make the resulting data available to the Clemson University community via a Web page. Projected Costs: Internal
3. From the data, identify where improvements can be made, and put into practice all those that can be implemented with funding available. Projected Cost: Internal

The Libraries will actively seek collaborative partners and be proactive in the initiation of collaborative programs. Further, the Libraries will annually evaluate the success of its collaborative efforts.

I. Take advantage of opportunities as they present themselves to increase cooperation and collaboration with other information providers, attempting to add at least one new collaborative venture each year.

1. Be proactive with every group the Libraries are associated with, by taking leadership in the creation of collaborative efforts within the group.
A. During 2000-2001 provide the leadership with South Carolina academic libraries to acquire, on a consortial basis, access to all of the Elsevier Science journals in electronic form. Projected Cost: $55,000 annually

B. During 2000-2001 join with a number of ASERL (Association of Southeastern Research Libraries) libraries to expand our users' access to the collective resources of other ASERL libraries. Projected Cost: $70,000 (2000-2001), $30,000 annually thereafter

C. During 2001-2002 work with the appropriate consortia to provide access to the IDEAL product, expanding access to Academic Press journals. Projected Cost: $60,000 annually - estimated

2. Identify resources that are both needed and that can be best acquired cooperatively with other libraries.

II. Evaluate the success of collaborative efforts with other libraries and companies.

1. Each year work with collaborators to establish target goals for the joint effort agreed upon. Projected Cost: Internal

2. Each year evaluate the degree of meeting those target goals and work with collaborators to improve the effort where necessary. Projected Cost: Internal

We will provide information resources and services to our users when they need them with a heavy emphasis on providing information electronically to the user's desktop.

I. As rapidly as practical from both use and cost perspective, convert our existing journal subscriptions from print to electronic format.

1. Review current titles for which we are receiving journals in both formats and determine which ones can be acquired only in electronic format.

2. Identify current subscriptions available electronically but not received in that format by Clemson University Libraries and convert as appropriate.

II. Expand our subscriptions to journals (especially in electronic form) to provide greater access for students, staff and faculty. Projected Costs: $40,000 (2000-2001), $50,000 (2001-2002), $75,000 (2002-2003).

III. Implement the "utility" concept for maintaining subscriptions.

1. During 2000-2001 add $250,000 to maintain existing subscriptions.

2. During 2001-2002 and following years, automatically add recurring funds equivalent to the percentage increase cost estimated by the primary three subscription firms to the Libraries' subscription budget.
3. In 2002-2003 and every three years thereafter, the Information Access Group of the Library will work with the reference liaisons and the faculties of the various colleges and departments to review the subscription list to determine if titles should be deleted and others added.

IV. Increase our collections for most immediate access by our users and to provide value to our collaborative partners.

1. Expand our holdings of monographs with particular emphasis on undergraduate disciplines that rely heavily upon this form of publication. Projected Costs: $300,000 new additional annually
2. In 2000-2001, Clemson should join the Center for Research Libraries as an Associate Member. Project Cost: $15,000 annually

V. We will develop services and systems to increase access to information.

1. Add toll-free telephone number to increase service to remote users during 2000-2001. Projected Costs: $2,000 annually
2. During 2001-2002 we will collaborate with other libraries to provide our users access to an interactive online reference service 24/7. Projected Costs: $10,000 annually
3. We will continue to acquire more reference resources in electronic form and available from any location. Projected Costs: See Below
4. We will increase the number of assistive devices and services to allow disabled users greater access to collections and information during 2001-2002. Projected Costs: $5,000
5. We will expand services to external constituent groups such as alumni, distance education students, and faculty and extension offices. Projected Costs: $10,000 (2001-2002)

VI. Evaluate, purchase and implement existing technologies to improve the services provided by the Libraries.

1. In 2000-2001, purchase the ILLIAD interlibrary loan system to improve the ILL process. Projected cost: $20,000.
2. In 2000-2001, purchase the Baker & Taylor Title Source II online database for the ordering section of the Acquisitions Unit to expedite and improve the current ordering procedures. This purchase will depend upon the successful merger of the Baker & Taylor and Yankee ordering operations. Projected cost: $2500.
3. In 2000-2001, modify and implement FULOAD program to accept MARCIVE loads in place of GTO.
4. In 2000-2001, incorporate wireless technology into cataloging and database maintenance operations to expedite various functions.


VII. Expand the number and variety of electronic databases available and make them accessible remotely. Concentrate on providing access to the databases historically receiving heavy use on the Dialog DIY system.

   2. Implement a proxy server during 2000-2001 to allow remote access to at least 90% of our electronic resources. Projected Costs: $5,000
   3. Add subscription to BIOSIS and other major databases during 2001-2002. Projected Cost: $75,000
   4. Add subscription to other major databases during 2002-2003. Projected Costs: $100,000

VIII. Partner with the Graduate School to provide the storage and access to theses and dissertations submitted electronically.

   1. Set up the hardware and software necessary to provide access via the WWW to Clemson electronic theses and dissertations. Projected Costs: $65,000 during 2001-2002, $25,000 during 2002-2003
   2. Revise the cataloging process to deal with the submission of theses and dissertations in electronic format. Projected Costs: Internal

IX. Introduce and evaluate the provision of books in electronic format.

      A. Survey users immediately after use to sample reader opinions.
      A. Include questions regarding use of electronic books in library assessment tools to determine user opinion.
   3. Expand access to electronic books in 2001-2002. Projected Cost: $15,000
      A. Increase number of titles available via eBooks platforms.
      B. Participate in any expansion of the ASERL collection from NetLibrary.
      C. Selectively add books from NetLibrary outside of the ASERL purchase; especially consider purchasing e-books for reserve materials and coordinate access to them via CLE.
X. Within the Libraries, provide up-to-date workstations and Internet connections for library staff and library users.

1. Establish a replacement program to renew the workstations at least every three years.
   A. Begin to replace the current staff machines (which were put in service in 1998) during 2000-2001. Projected Cost: $80,000
   B. Complete the replacement of staff machines in 2001-2002. Projected Costs: $30,000
   C. Use the replaced staff machines to replace the public machines that were put into service in 1996.
   D. Follow the same procedure for the replacement of machines in 2002-2003. Projected Costs: $80,000

2. Establish a wireless network within Cooper Library during 2000-2001 and provide a check-out service for laptop computers with wireless antennas. Projected Cost: $12,000

XI. Review, select, purchase and implement a new state-of-the-art library computer system to replace the current NOTIS system by the end of 2002-2003.

1. During 2001-2002, review the existing systems, prepare and submit a RFP for a new system, select and purchase the system. Projected Costs: $1.2 million.
2. During 2002-2003, implement the new system. Projected Costs: $50,000

XII. Provide library facilities on a 24-hour basis.

1. During 2000-2001, open the Gunnin Architecture Library continuously from Sunday afternoon until Friday afternoon. Projected Costs: $13,000
2. When Cooper Library is renovated consideration should be given to designing a space for 24-hour use in that facility. Projected Costs: $25,000

Make the Libraries, especially Cooper Library, the academic center of the campus for collaboration.

The concept for the physical space for library services is to retain Cooper Library at its current size, but to totally renovate it so that it will more effectively serve as the center for information access and academic collaboration on campus. Total renovation of Cooper Library and an expandable remote storage facility to house little-used materials will be required.

I. To provide greater space for user collaboration, remove at least 25% of the Libraries' printed resources to other locations.
1. During 2001-2002, establish a remote storage facility for little-used materials and to house the University’s Records Management Program. Projected Costs: $1.5 million
2. During 2000-2001, complete a weeding program to discard materials that are no longer of value to the Libraries.
3. During 2000-2001, identify and relocate approximately 30,000 little-used materials to the USC remote storage facility until a Clemson facility can be acquired or built. Clemson items duplicating those already in storage by USC will be weeded instead of stored. Projected Costs: $17,000 annually
4. Once a Clemson remote storage facility is acquired, begin the systematic relocation of other little-used materials to the new facility. As a part of the selection process, collaborate with other members of the ASERL-VEL so not to store duplicates of the same titles.

II. During 2000-2001, work with the campus planners to prepare for the long-term renovation of Cooper Library.

1. Work with campus planners to arrange for a consultant to review the concept of retaining Cooper at its present size and relocating little-used materials to a remote storage facility.
2. Assure that renovation of Cooper Library is prominent in the campus plan.
3. Determine the impact of having a remote storage facility on the other library facilities such as Gunnin Architectural Library and Special Collections in the Strom Thurmond Institute Building.

III. During 2001-2002, initiate a building plan for the renovation of Cooper Library.

1. Provide a concept of how Cooper Library will be organized.
2. Identify the various functions that should take place in Cooper and the space requirements for them.
3. Determine the interrelationships of functional spaces.

IV. During 2000-2001, relocate two of the three current external book drops to allow users to “drive up” and deposit books in the return.

1. Relocate book return currently next to the 3rd level exit on the west side to the median in the west parking lot. Projected costs: $1,000
2. Relocate the return currently in Byrnes Hall to the median in the east parking lot. Projected Costs: $1,000

V. Until the total renovation of Cooper can take place, make improvements within the current restraints of the existing building.

1. Continue the plan for replacing the carpet in Cooper Library, completing all levels by 2003.
2. Replace the roof as scheduled in 2000-2001.
3. Begin retrofitting of the various HVAC systems within Cooper Library, completing the project by 2004.
5. Distribute most of the computers currently housed in the fifth level DCIT computer lab to larger worktables around the fifth level to provide users more space around the computers.
7. During 2001-2002, establish a facility to assist students and faculty in the creation of presentations and papers.
8. During 2000-2001, improve the working space for Records Management staff by adding offices with HVAC in Barre Hall. Projected Costs: $65,000
10. During 2001-2002, renovate the meeting rooms, conference room and study rooms.
13. During 2001-2002, refurbish or replace the public service desks in Cooper to include sections for disabled. Projected Costs: $30,000
15. During 2001-2002, work with the Office of Disabled Services to improve the physical access to Cooper Library.
   A. Investigate the feasibility of an adjoining outside elevator.
16. Acquire workstation furniture to accommodate users in wheelchairs.

**Staff the Libraries appropriately for the new mission of the Libraries.**

In addition to having the appropriate number of staff (both classified and unclassified) with the appropriate skills, it is critical to the concept of a broader mission for the Libraries that staff must have a commitment to expanding the role and services of the Libraries. The Libraries have a strong commitment to supporting the staff in their efforts to achieve the Libraries’ goals. The Libraries have a long history of exceptional service; that strength needs to be enhanced even further.

I. Include staff in the planning, implementation and evaluation of the Libraries’ Business Plan.
II. Identify additional staffing needs (both classified and unclassified) and priorities during 2000-2001:

1. Hire Human Resources Manager and set priorities related to staff issues in the changing library environment (such as improved communication and implementation of a more formalized system of training).
2. Determine the type of staff needed and competencies required.

III. In 2000-2001, work internally and externally to develop opportunities for staff training and development:

1. Within the Libraries, plan and conduct training sessions for staff before implementation of new services and resources occurs. Increase development opportunities such as mentoring and cross training.
2. Provide opportunities for staff training and development using the services of SOLINET, SCLA and other organizations.
   A. Establish a budget to be allocated by classified staff group. Projected Costs: $10,000
3. Participate with the ASERL – VEL group to enhance training opportunities for staff.
   A. During 2000-2001, work with other directors/deans of the participating libraries to urge the establishment of cooperative training committee to facilitate group training.

IV. As more and more of the library staff's tasks are performed electronically, investigate the feasibility of remote work sites and/or telecommuting.

1. During 2001-2002, establish a study group to investigate the issues involved and the recommendations regarding use of telecommuting by staff.

V. During 2000-2001, determine if outsourcing of some functions can be accomplished economically and efficiently.

VI. During 2001-2002, do an updated job analysis of classified and unclassified positions in the Libraries and prepare a complete market analysis of compensation for both.

VII. During 2001-2002, continue efforts to ease salary compression. Projected Costs: $40,000

VIII. During 2000-2001, develop appropriate performance measures for employee evaluation that reflect the Libraries' new goals and resulting job changes. Include
reward and recognition for employee development efforts and service to the Libraries and to the University.

IX. During 2000-2001, as part of a plan for improved communication with library staff, schedule sessions to seek input on the impact of the changing environment on staff needs. Other new or improved channels of communication within the Libraries will be discussed and developed.

Increase library funding from all sources to supply the funds necessary to meet the above goals.

I. Annually develop a list of major resources needed with costs.
   1. Calculate the size of endowment for each needed resource.
   2. Prioritize the major resources needed.
   3. Provide College development officers with funding requirements to support their College’s information needs with costs and endowment size.

II. Annually develop a plan for the Libraries for budget allocation and implementation.
   1. Identify new products, services and systems needed annually and forecast for the next three years.
   2. Give specific costs for each new initiative including the type (recurring or one-time) of funding needed.

III. Implement a three-level support plan
   1. Seek a major corporate sponsor --$10 million
   2. Seek several major gifts/grants from major foundations, government sources, individuals and naming opportunities
   3. Continue and expand annual giving campaigns
      A. Library Friends mailers
      B. Library Laurels mailers

IV. In 2001-2002, employ a full-time library development officer. Projected Cost: $35,000

V. During 2000-2001 establish a part-time public relations position.
   1. Use the position to develop materials for promotion of the Libraries.
   2. The position, with other volunteer staff, will do advance planning for the Libraries’ participation in campus events.
3. The position will maintain contact with University News Services to encourage dissemination of information about the Libraries to the campus as well as general public.

VI. With the University Administration, seek other sources of funding on campus.
1. Bookstore payments to the University.
2. An increase in the ticket prices for campus events with the additional revenue dedicated to funding the Libraries.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Fred Switzer, President
FROM: John Huffman, Chair, Policy Committee
THROUGH: Alan Schaffer, Editorial Consultant

RE: Faculty Manual change

At its meeting on September 19th, the Policy Committee unanimously agreed to change one sentence in the current Faculty Manual description of the Animal Research Committee on page 41.

The sentence now reads, "Committee appointments are made for three-year terms by the Chief Research Officer for indefinite terms." If approved by the Senate and the Provost, the new sentence would read, "Committee appointments are made for three-year terms by the President of the University."

The change from Chief Research Officer to President is necessary to bring us into compliance with the federal Health Research Extension Act of 1985.

cc: Cathy Sturkie
    Prof. T. Scott, Animal & Veterinary Sciences
MEMORANDUM

TO: Fred Switzer, President
FROM: John Huffman, Chair, Policy Committee
THROUGH: Alan Schaffer, Editorial Consultant

RE: Addition to Faculty Manual

At its meeting on September 19th, the Policy Committee unanimously agreed to add to the Faculty Manual a job description for the Faculty Athletics Representative. If approved by the Senate and the Provost, the paragraph would be inserted on page 38 of the current Manual at the end of the write-up on the Athletic Council. The proposed addition reads as follows:

"The Faculty Athletics Representative reports on a regular basis to the Athletic Council and on an annual basis to the Faculty Senate. The individual serving in this position must be a tenured Professor or Associate Professor with a minimum of three years service at the university. The major functions of the Faculty Athletics Representative are (1) to ensure academic integrity in the functioning of the university's athletic program and (2) to serve as Clemson's voting representative to both the Atlantic Coast Conference and the National Collegiate Athletic Association. Appointed by the President, the individual serves a four year term, once renewable."

cc: Cathy Sturkie
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, assistant or associate school director, school director, assistant or associate dean, collegiate or library dean, assistant or associate provost, vice-provost, or provost, does not assure continuance in office for any specific period of time.

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 for all college-wide academic administrators.

Each administrator evaluation committee shall consist of 3-5 members. Three members shall be selected 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 administrator shall have the option to choose and 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 the evaluating officer. In all instance 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, directors, assistant and associate school directors, school directors, assistant and associate deans, assistant and associate provosts, and collegiate and library 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 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 the evaluation committee. The same process, but including the faculty of the appropriate school and/or college, will be used in the evaluation of directors, assistant and associate school directors, school directors, and assistant and associate deans.

[No changes are made in the final two paragraphs of this section]
MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
DECEMBER 19, 2000

1. **Call to Order:** The meeting was called to order at 2:35 p.m. by President Fred Switzer.

2. **Approval of Minutes:** The Faculty Senate Minutes dated November 14, 2000 were approved as written.

3. **“Free Speech”:** Jim Zimmerman informed the Senate of an email message from Jerry Reel regarding proposals for new general education requirements which will change the curriculum and urged Senators to read this message. An open discussion will be held on January 12th in the Student Senate Chambers and Senators were encouraged to attend to express their opinions.

4. **Committee Reports**
   a. **Senate Committees**
      1) **Research Committee** – Senator Vic Shelburne noted that the Committee had not met since the last Senate meeting. He attended the University Research Council meeting and Dan Warner was elected chair. Chief Research Officer Shah led a discussion on compliance issues and the need for more training was noted by the Dean of the Graduate School, Bonnie Holaday. Search processes continue for the positions of Director of Compliance and Vice President for Research.
      2) **Welfare Committee** – Senator Amod Ogale, Chair, briefly informed Senators of issues addressed by this Committee: positive recommendation to appoint an oversight committee for the Faculty Activity System (FAS); receipt of information from all colleges regarding parking (there seems to be no major crisis) and the implementation of enforcement of parking is highly recommended; and the question of annual leave and how it counts towards retirement.
      3) **Finance Committee** – No report.
      4) **Policy Committee** – Senator John Huffman, Chair, reported that Committee met last Thursday and approved changes in description of lecturers, senior lecturers, and instructors; discussed other items such as laboratories for retired faculty, financial disclosure policy, and the patent policy.
5) Scholastic Policies Committee – Senator Jim Zimmerman, Chair, stated that Committee had met. An experiment with electronic evaluations for 800-level courses has been done this semester for 20 courses but they have not yet had the chance to check responses. This Committee continues to address the issue of plus/minus grading.

b. University Commissions and Committees None

c. Budget Accountability Committee – Ken Murr submitted and briefly explained the Fall 2000 Cooperative Salary Study noting that the full Report is housed in the Faculty Senate Office. Catherine Watt, of the Office of Institutional Research, provided further information regarding the report (Attachment A).

5. President’s Remarks: President Switzer:
   a. stated that candidates for Provost will come to campus on February 3rd and that names cannot be shared until they have been invited to campus. Discussion was held regarding the role of the Faculty Senate during these visits and all agreed that the Senate should be involved.
   
   b. noted that the *ad hoc* Committee on Faculty Performance Appraisals is looking at several items including research at other institutions.
   
   c. informed the Senate that the Dean of the Graduate School has officially approved the appearance of social security numbers on GS2 Forms is no longer required.

6. Old Business: None

7. New Business:
   a. Senator Huffman withdrew the *Faculty Manual* Change regarding the Grievance Board.
   
   b. Senator Huffman noted additional changes to the Addendum to Composition of Ombudsman Subcommittee and submitted for approval. No discussion followed. Vote was taken to accept changes to the Ombudsman Subcommittee composition and passed unanimously (Attachment B).
   
   c. Senator moved that three *Faculty Manual* Changes regarding Lecturers, Senior Lecturers, and Instructors be brought to the floor for consideration by the Senate. Vote was taken to bring to floor and passed unanimously. Senator Huffman then explained each of the three changes and moved acceptance of all three changes at one time. Discussion followed during which changes were made to the Instructor description. Vote to accept amended *Faculty Manual* changes was taken and passed unanimously (Attachment C).
8. **Announcements**: President Switzer reminded the Senators of the Celebration of the Class of '39 to be held on January 8, 2001 from 6-8:00 p.m. at the Madren Center and of the Bell Monument in the Carillon Garden Ceremony on Tuesday, January 9, 2001 at 10:00 a.m.

9. **Adjournment**: The meeting was adjourned by President Switzer at 4:03 p.m.

\[\text{Signature: Peg Tyler, Secretary}\]

\[\text{Cathy Toth Sturkie}\]

Absent: Linvill, Hall, Heusinkveld, Allison, Bednar (W. Chapman for), Voelker, Sturkie (M. Snyder for), Malloy, Warner, Brannan, Lee B., Bridgwood, Ellison, Meriwether (Hare for), Saha, Backman, Thames (D. Switzer for), Lee C., Tyler (S. McCleskey for)
Fall 2000 Cooperative Salary Study

The Fall 2000 Cooperative Salary Study is an annual report prepared by the Office of Institutional Research for, and under the direction of, the Faculty Senate Budget Accountability Committee. The Senate Accountability Committee is comprised of representation from academics, administration, the Classified Staff Commission, and the Office of Institutional Research. This is the fifth year of this particular study, and represents an additional phase of the Freedom of Information Act report kept on file in the University's Cooper Library. The Cooperative Salary Study is organized into two major sections:

- University Summaries
- Budget Center Summaries.

Within each section is a detailed report of salary increases for all full-time, permanent employees of Clemson University during a period of time selected by the Faculty Senate Budget Accountability Committee members. The increases were tabulated from personnel system transactions for a period between March 10, 2000 (the ending date of last year's study) and September 14, 2000 (a freeze date after increases had been posted). Please note that this study was over a six rather than a twelve month period due to ending date of the 1999-2000 study. The details contained in each of the two major sections are as follows:

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

Each report contains data compiled within Groups and Categories. Groups are determined by the employee’s home department code filed by departmental personnel when the employee is hired or changes positions. Category codes are determined by the employee’s title code whenever possible. A determination was made by the Accountability Committee three years ago that in some cases, title codes do not accurately reflect job duties. Therefore, an attempt was made to categorize these exceptions manually. This process could be considered to
be somewhat less than desirable due to the subjectivity in determining the category for a particular employee.

The five groups determined by an employee’s home department code are Academic, Administrative, PSA, Athletics, and Auxiliaries. These groups tend to loosely follow funding lines within the University. Within the five groups are nine categories:

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

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

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

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

Every effort was made to produce an accurate, understandable analysis of salary increases for the past year, but as this document attempts to answer many questions within a concise format, some further questions may occur. Please direct all questions either to the Office of Institutional Research or to a member of the Faculty Senate Accountability Committee.
Average Percent Salary Increase by Category
Salary Study Fall 2000

- Faculty: 4.26%
- Administrative: 4.31%
- Staff: 3.47%
Frequency of Faculty Pay Raises
March 2000 and September 2000

*1 percent is range of 1-1.99
Percent of increase*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Percent Increase by Budget Center</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admin &amp; Adv</td>
<td>3.01 (101)</td>
<td>5.03 (38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>2.99 (233)</td>
<td>2.99 (233)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFLS</td>
<td>4.03 (224)</td>
<td>4.03 (224)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAH</td>
<td>3.56 (38)</td>
<td>3.56 (38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPA</td>
<td>2.57 (42)</td>
<td>2.57 (42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E &amp; S</td>
<td>3.22 (158)</td>
<td>3.22 (158)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEHD</td>
<td>3.91 (91)</td>
<td>3.91 (91)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>3.08 (64)</td>
<td>3.08 (64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>Admin-1*</td>
<td>Admin-2 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFLS</td>
<td>2.61 (2)</td>
<td>5.18 (21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAH</td>
<td>6.31 (1)</td>
<td>6.00 (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPA</td>
<td>3.91 (3)</td>
<td>3.65 (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E &amp; S</td>
<td>4.31 (3)</td>
<td>4.28 (18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEHD</td>
<td>5.43 (4)</td>
<td>4.17 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>6.43 (1)</td>
<td>5.01 (25)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes deans, assoc. deans, and assist. deans.

**Includes chairs, county extension directors, and school directors.
## Average Percent Increase for All Employees by Budget Center

### Administration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Centers</th>
<th>Summ</th>
<th>Gen</th>
<th>Perf/ Merit</th>
<th>Rec/ Prom /Transf</th>
<th>Pay Adj/ Misc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration &amp; Advancement</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.02%</td>
<td>3.52%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>3.97%</td>
<td>3.14%</td>
<td>0.74%</td>
<td>0.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Agriculture, Forestry &amp; Life Sciences</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.86%</td>
<td>3.66%</td>
<td>0.08%</td>
<td>1.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Architecture, Arts &amp; Humanities</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.02%</td>
<td>5.14%</td>
<td>0.30%</td>
<td>0.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Business &amp; Public Affairs</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.71%</td>
<td>3.71%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Engineering &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.29%</td>
<td>4.04%</td>
<td>0.24%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Health, Education &amp; Human Development</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.61%</td>
<td>3.33%</td>
<td>0.44%</td>
<td>0.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division of Computing &amp; Information Technology</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.99%</td>
<td>3.73%</td>
<td>0.26%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.39%</td>
<td>3.39%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Affairs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.54%</td>
<td>3.67%</td>
<td>1.21%</td>
<td>3.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.43%</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
<td>2.43%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.21%</td>
<td>2.21%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Centers</th>
<th>Summ</th>
<th>Gen</th>
<th>Perf/ Merit</th>
<th>Rec/ Prom /Transf</th>
<th>Pay Adj/ Misc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration &amp; Advancement</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.02%</td>
<td>3.52%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>3.97%</td>
<td>3.14%</td>
<td>0.74%</td>
<td>0.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Agriculture, Forestry &amp; Life Sciences</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.86%</td>
<td>3.66%</td>
<td>0.08%</td>
<td>1.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Architecture, Arts &amp; Humanities</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.02%</td>
<td>5.14%</td>
<td>0.30%</td>
<td>0.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Business &amp; Public Affairs</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.71%</td>
<td>3.71%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Engineering &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.29%</td>
<td>4.04%</td>
<td>0.24%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Health, Education &amp; Human Development</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.61%</td>
<td>3.33%</td>
<td>0.44%</td>
<td>0.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division of Computing &amp; Information Technology</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.99%</td>
<td>3.73%</td>
<td>0.26%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.39%</td>
<td>3.39%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Affairs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.54%</td>
<td>3.67%</td>
<td>1.21%</td>
<td>3.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.43%</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
<td>2.43%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.21%</td>
<td>2.21%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Centers</th>
<th>Summ</th>
<th>Gen</th>
<th>Perf/ Merit</th>
<th>Rec/ Prom /Transf</th>
<th>Pay Adj/ Misc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration &amp; Advancement</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.02%</td>
<td>3.52%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>3.97%</td>
<td>3.14%</td>
<td>0.74%</td>
<td>0.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Agriculture, Forestry &amp; Life Sciences</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.86%</td>
<td>3.66%</td>
<td>0.08%</td>
<td>1.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Architecture, Arts &amp; Humanities</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.02%</td>
<td>5.14%</td>
<td>0.30%</td>
<td>0.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Business &amp; Public Affairs</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.71%</td>
<td>3.71%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Engineering &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.29%</td>
<td>4.04%</td>
<td>0.24%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Health, Education &amp; Human Development</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.61%</td>
<td>3.33%</td>
<td>0.44%</td>
<td>0.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division of Computing &amp; Information Technology</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.99%</td>
<td>3.73%</td>
<td>0.26%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.39%</td>
<td>3.39%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Affairs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.54%</td>
<td>3.67%</td>
<td>1.21%</td>
<td>3.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.43%</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
<td>2.43%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.21%</td>
<td>2.21%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Transaction dates include 03/11/2000 - 09/14/2000*
## Average Percent Increase for All Employees by Budget Center

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Centers</th>
<th>Administration</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Summ</td>
<td>Gen</td>
<td>Perf/ Merit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provost &amp; VP of Academic Affairs</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
<td>3.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Service &amp; Agriculture</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3.88%</td>
<td>2.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.55%</td>
<td>3.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary to the Board</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.31%</td>
<td>2.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.99%</td>
<td>3.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Grand Totals</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>4.31%</td>
<td>3.49%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Transaction dates include 03/11/2000 - 09/14/2000*

*Printed: 12/1/2000 1:11:57 PM*
### Average Percent Increase for All Employees in Group and Category - University Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category Description</th>
<th>Academic</th>
<th>Administrative</th>
<th>PSA</th>
<th>Athletics</th>
<th>Auxiliaries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Counts</td>
<td>Summ Gen Perf/Merit</td>
<td>Rec/Prom /Transf</td>
<td>Pay Adj/ Misc</td>
<td>Summ Gen Perf/Merit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. General Administrative</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2 0.88% 0.88%</td>
<td>5 7.59% 3.86% 1.00% 2.70%</td>
<td>2 3.87% 3.87%</td>
<td>1 0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Academic Administration - Level 1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>24 4.95% 3.90% 0.76% 0.29%</td>
<td>9 3.35% 3.35%</td>
<td>2 3.25% 3.00% 0.25%</td>
<td>5 3.85% 3.00% 0.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Academic Administration - Level 2</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>93 4.62% 3.92% 0.25% 0.45%</td>
<td>14 3.35% 3.11% 0.24%</td>
<td>33 3.68% 2.90% 0.79% 0.29%</td>
<td>5 3.85% 3.00% 0.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Administrative Support - Level 1</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>82 3.01% 2.50% 0.05% 0.46%</td>
<td>120 3.51% 2.52% 0.06% 0.84% 0.08%</td>
<td>210 4.10% 2.92% 0.35% 0.76% 0.07%</td>
<td>210 2.85% 2.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Administrative Support - Level 2</td>
<td>1,803</td>
<td>646 3.23% 2.64% 0.11% 0.46% 0.01%</td>
<td>574 3.28% 2.51% 0.07% 0.67% 0.03%</td>
<td>364 3.27% 2.58% 0.11% 0.55% 0.04%</td>
<td>364 5.50% 2.59% 2.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Faculty</td>
<td>881</td>
<td>870 4.24% 3.63% 0.23% 0.32% 0.00%</td>
<td>2 2.25% 2.20%</td>
<td>9 5.98% 3.02% 1.58% 1.38%</td>
<td>9 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Coach</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Information Technology - Level 1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22 4.21% 2.64% 0.04% 1.53%</td>
<td>3 13.97% 2.78% 11.20%</td>
<td>1 7.62% 2.50%</td>
<td>8.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Information Technology - Level 2</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>187 3.34% 2.51% 0.07% 0.76%</td>
<td>24 3.22% 2.50% 0.03% 0.69%</td>
<td>12 3.04% 2.50% 0.54%</td>
<td>12 2.50% 2.50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Transaction dates include 03/11/2000 - 09/14/2000

Printed: 12/1/2000 1:12:07 PM
### Average Percent Increase for Employees Receiving Increases - University Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category Description</th>
<th>Summ Gen Perf/ Prom Adj/ Misc</th>
<th>Summ Gen Perf/ Prom Adj/ Misc</th>
<th>Summ Gen Perf/ Prom Adj/ Misc</th>
<th>Summ Gen Perf/ Prom Adj/ Misc</th>
<th>Summ Gen Perf/ Prom Adj/ Misc</th>
<th>Summ Gen Perf/ Prom Adj/ Misc</th>
<th>Summ Gen Perf/ Prom Adj/ Misc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Administrative</td>
<td>1 1 0 0</td>
<td>5 5 2 2</td>
<td>2 2 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Administration - Level 1</td>
<td>24 24 6 1</td>
<td>7.59% 3.88% 2.56% 6.95%</td>
<td>3.87% 3.87%</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Administration - Level 2</td>
<td>92 89 20 0</td>
<td>3.38% 3.38% 3.00%</td>
<td>3.98% 2.90% 1.08% 9.02%</td>
<td>3.85% 3.00%</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
<td>3.81% 3.81%</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Support - Level 1</td>
<td>82 81 4 7</td>
<td>120 120 12 12</td>
<td>208 208 32 24</td>
<td>3 3 0 0</td>
<td>27 27 4 4</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Support - Level 2</td>
<td>646 645 45 34</td>
<td>574 573 27 41</td>
<td>364 364 29 23</td>
<td>32 32 0 4</td>
<td>187 187 24 24</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>856 853 137 42</td>
<td>4 8 8 8</td>
<td>7 7 1 1</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology - Level 1</td>
<td>22 22 1 3</td>
<td>3 3 2 2</td>
<td>1 1 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>2 2 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology - Level 2</td>
<td>187 187 9 14</td>
<td>24 24 1 2</td>
<td>12 12 0 1</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>17 17 1 1</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Transaction dates include 03/11/2000 - 09/14/2000

*Printed: 12/1/2000 1:12:27 PM*
### Average Dollar Increase for All Employees in Group and Category - University Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category Description</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Summ Gen</th>
<th>Perf/ Merit</th>
<th>Rec/ Prom /Transf</th>
<th>Pay Adj/ Misc</th>
<th>Summ Gen</th>
<th>Perf/ Merit</th>
<th>Rec/ Prom /Transf</th>
<th>Pay Adj/ Misc</th>
<th>Summ Gen</th>
<th>Perf/ Merit</th>
<th>Rec/ Prom /Transf</th>
<th>Pay Adj/ Misc</th>
<th>Summ Gen</th>
<th>Perf/ Merit</th>
<th>Rec/ Prom /Transf</th>
<th>Pay Adj/ Misc</th>
<th>Summ Gen</th>
<th>Perf/ Merit</th>
<th>Rec/ Prom /Transf</th>
<th>Pay Adj/ Misc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Administrative</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1,334</td>
<td>1,334</td>
<td>9,235</td>
<td>4,727</td>
<td>1,122</td>
<td>3,286</td>
<td>2,581</td>
<td>4,817</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Administration - Level 1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5,234</td>
<td>4,124</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>3,335</td>
<td>3,335</td>
<td>2,591</td>
<td>2,182</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>1,832</td>
<td>1,428</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>3,149</td>
<td>3,149</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Administration - Level 2</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>3,399</td>
<td>2,881</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>2,544</td>
<td>2,361</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>2,991</td>
<td>1,264</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>2,299</td>
<td>2,299</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Support - Level 1</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>1,332</td>
<td>1,106</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>1,692</td>
<td>1,216</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1,776</td>
<td>1,264</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1,337</td>
<td>1,337</td>
<td>708</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>187</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Support - Level 2</td>
<td>1,803</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>924</td>
<td>758</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>818</td>
<td>626</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>883</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>1,337</td>
<td>708</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>187</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>881</td>
<td>2,551</td>
<td>2,189</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1,671</td>
<td>1,671</td>
<td>5,508</td>
<td>2,783</td>
<td>1,458</td>
<td>1,258</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology - Level 1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2,480</td>
<td>1,555</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>903</td>
<td>6,674</td>
<td>1,327</td>
<td>5,347</td>
<td>3,240</td>
<td>1,064</td>
<td>2,182</td>
<td>1,418</td>
<td>1,418</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology - Level 2</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>1,346</td>
<td>1,012</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>1,015</td>
<td>788</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>1,034</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>2,190</td>
<td>2,190</td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1,321</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Transaction dates include 03/11/2000 - 09/14/2000
### Average Dollar Increase of Those Employees Receiving Increases - University Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category Description</th>
<th>Academic</th>
<th>Administrative</th>
<th>PSA</th>
<th>Athletics</th>
<th>Auxiliaries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Summ</td>
<td>Gen</td>
<td>Perf/ Merit</td>
<td>Rec/ Prom/Transf</td>
<td>Pay Adj/ Misc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 General Administrative</td>
<td>2,668</td>
<td>2,668</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Academic Administration - Level 1</td>
<td>5,234</td>
<td>3,201</td>
<td>2,668</td>
<td>2,668</td>
<td>9,236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Academic Administration - Level 2</td>
<td>3,436</td>
<td>863</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Administrative Support - Level 1</td>
<td>1,332</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>1,409</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Administrative Support - Level 2</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Faculty</td>
<td>2,603</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Coach</td>
<td>2,603</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Information Technology - Level 1</td>
<td>2,480</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>6,021</td>
<td>8,021</td>
<td>6,674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Information Technology - Level 2</td>
<td>1,346</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>4,093</td>
<td>2,626</td>
<td>1,015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Transaction dates include 03/11/2000 - 09/14/2000

Printed: 12/1/2000 1:12:48 PM