Minutes  
Faculty Senate Meeting  
January 13, 1998

1. **Call to Order.** President Francis A. McGuire called the meeting to order at 2:42 p.m.

2. **Approval of Minutes** Both the November and December, 1997 Faculty Senate Minutes were approved as corrected and written, respectively.

   President McGuire thanked Anne McMahan, Graduate Student Assistant in the Faculty Senate Office, and Rosa Grayden, participant in the University Mentoring Program, for their office assistance during the past several weeks.

3. **Special Order of the Day** Provost Steffen H. Rogers:

   described the online Faculty Activity System; noted workshop dates; and requested faculty volunteers to provide information regarding what faculty do (Attachment A);

   announced the good news that leaders of the Commission on Higher Education have invited the three provosts of the three state research universities to meetings regarding performance indicators. Suggestions and changes will be offered by the provosts. Action is being taken by Clemson University in the discussion regarding funding;

   stated that this administration has no intention of putting an early retirement plan on the table;

   noted that the Information Technology Fees were divided into three parts and that one-third went to the Administrative Council which voted on two projects for the next two years: $190,000 to finish wiring dormitories and $450,000 to install a new system for the Libraries;

   noted that the meeting with the Educational Policy Committee of the Board of Trustees went well. Vision/Mission Statements and Implementing Concepts have been returned for revisions which will be shared in the near future. The responses from faculty and students were very positive; and

   shared plans to renovate Sikes Hall reiterating that this renovation is necessary for aesthetic presence for the visiting public, especially during the forthcoming capital campaign.

4. **“Free Speech”** Carla Rathbone, of DCIT, informed the Senate of the Collaborative Learning Environment (CLE), an initiative that will propel Clemson University into a national leadership position in the campus-wide integration of information technology into the curriculum (Attachment B).
5. Committee Reports


b. Scholastic Policies Committee - Chair Nancy Ferguson submitted the Committee’s Report (Attachment D); requested and received a Sense of the Senate that this Committee is moving in the right direction regarding the evaluation of teaching; stated that evaluations for graduate courses may be done with the existing red form; and asked that suggested changes be forwarded to her.


d. Finance Committee - Senator Robert Campbell noted that this Committee will meet on Tuesday at 3:30 p.m. in 414 Brackett Hall and will discuss the progress and consensus of program level contribution proposed by the University of Rhode Island Self-Study.

President McGuire inquired about the salary report to which Senator Campbell responded that the Committee is attempting to replicate last year’s salary survey but that it is not ready at this time (appears to be some inconsistencies of faculty coding).

Provost Rogers announced that detailed college budgets are now available to share with faculty.

e. Policy Committee - Senator John Huffman submitted and explained the January 13th Report (Attachment F).

Board of Trustees Committee Reports

a. Student Affairs Committee - Secretary Kathy Neal Headley informed the Senate of the approval of: a four percent increase in Housing fees which will go to the full Board for approval; changes to general student regulations regarding issues such as computer misuse, hazing, sexual harassment, and skateboarding; the completion date of July, 1999 for the revised design for the Hendrix Student Center; and renovations and expansion of Redfern.

b. Agriculture and Natural Resources Committee - Senator Horace Skipper submitted and briefly explained a Report regarding this Committee meeting dated January 6, 1998 (Attachment G).


d. Educational Policy Committee - President McGuire noted that: Chris Duckenfield, of the Computer Center and DCIT, explained concerns regarding the lack of participation of computer training opportunities; Vision/Mission Statements and Implementing Concepts responses were well-received and resulted with the directive to administration to revise documents based on input from student and faculty to come back to the Trustees; Dori Helms presented and explained the faculty workload effort mentioned earlier by the Provost.
University Committees and Commissions

a. Senator Headley asked Senators to share information regarding the position description for the Director of the Office of Teaching Effectiveness and Innovation (Attachment I) and informed the Senate that the Ombuds position process has been delayed for further clarification.

b. Senator Ferguson noted that the Search Committee for the Dean of the Graduate School will begin to review applications this week and thanked the Provost’s Office and Dr. Shah’s Office for assistance in answering her questions during a search process at this level. President McGuire stated that the rumor that this search is a “done deal” is not true - that it is an open search. Senator Ferguson further noted that in response to concerns additions to the Search Committee have been made to include representatives from the Colleges of Engineering & Sciences and Agriculture, Forestry & Life Sciences.

6. President’s Report

President McGuire discussed the following items:

a. The campus is in the process of interviewing for the Vice President for Advancement which includes time set aside for the Faculty Senate involvement and urged Senators to attend those interviews noting that the Senate had requested opportunities to be involved.

b. Faculty Senate elections for the offices of President/President-Elect and Secretary will be held soon.

c. The completed Faculty Senate Quasi-Endowment Program - Internal Agreement.

d. Thanks to all who participated in the Faculty Senate Reception to Celebrate the Class of ‘39 and the Bell Tower Ceremony to Honor Chalmers Butler.

7. Old Business (None)

8. New Business

a. President McGuire presented to Senator Huffman and read aloud a unanimous Resolution of Congratulations and Best Wishes on his recent marriage.

b. Senator Huffman submitted for consideration the addition of and subsequent Faculty Manual revision of a Consultative Committee of Endowed Chairs and Titled Professors. Following discussion, vote was taken and failed (Attachment J).

c. Submitted for approval by Senator Huffman were Possible Non-Voting Additions to the Academic Council, which would require a Faculty Manual addition. Following discussion vote was taken and passed unanimously (Attachment K).

d. Senator Huffman submitted, explained, and moved for adoption the Modification of Procedures for Evaluation of Administrators and the Proposed Amendment on Evaluation of Administrators (the latter receiving required two-thirds vote to bring to floor for consideration which passed). Discussion followed during which amendments were offered and accepted. Vote on amended modifications was taken and passed unanimously (Attachment L).
e. Senator Huffman submitted for adoption and explained the Form for the Evaluation of Academic Administrators Clemson University. During discussion, several amendments were offered and accepted. The Sense of the Senate was to share the document with staff to receive input. Revisions will be made by Senator Huffman to be forwarded to the Provost and the Faculty Senate Executive/Advisory Committee for final Senate approval. Vote on amended document was taken and passed unanimously (Attachment M).

f. President McGuire asked for nominations from the floor to the Grievance Board. There being none, elections were held by secret ballot.

9. Adjournment  The meeting was adjourned by President McGuire at 4:40 p.m.

FACULTY ACTIVITY SYSTEM

As an introduction to the new Faculty Activity System, please attend one of the following workshops. Bring your most current vitae!

Workshop Dates

Jan 20, 9am -12pm
Jan 22, 1-4pm
Jan 26, 1-4pm
Jan 27, 1-4pm

Place: 438 Brackett Hall (ATC Center)

NOTE:
Sign-up will be necessary since the number of computers is limited. Please e-mail Dori Helms at <BIOL110 @ Clemson.edu> or call 656-7359 to choose your time!
Collaborative Learning Environment

As part of an initiative to propel Clemson University into a national leadership position in the campus-wide integration of information technology into the curriculum, the university is developing the Clemson Collaborative Learning Environment. This will be a collection of tools and services that will facilitate the use of information technology in teaching and research and provide a forum for collaboration among students and faculty.

Current information technology support at Clemson has afforded us the opportunity to significantly advance our efforts in collaborative learning. The availability of unique features and programs has set the stage for the emergence of the Collaborative Learning Environment. Those features available include the fully automated registration and course management system, the single login system which assigns users rights to network services through a single userid and password, and the “virtual PC” environment for students. Comprehensive training programs that introduce students to computing and assist faculty in the integration of computing into the curriculum have established an environment conducive to collaborative learning, active learning and educational technology.

The three major components of the Collaborative Learning Environment are:

1) Group workspace. Like class email lists, NDS groups will be set up and maintained automatically based on the class enrollment. Access rights will be granted through the single userid and password which students use for access to the network. Group workspace for each course section can then be set up for purposes such as class notes and syllabus, class discussion, time-stamped submission of papers by students to the instructor (drop box), team groups and projects within the class, and access to library reserve materials and class homework data sets.

2) Faculty training. Faculty training will play a major role in the efforts to improve instruction through the use of technology. A faculty training group will be established this fall in cooperation with Student Training to develop and coordinate the training curriculum according to faculty needs. Training resources will also include faculty-led instruction, as well as visiting instructors with expertise in the desired area(s) of training. Training topics might include how to use the Collaborative Learning Environment, creation of Web pages to access course material and syllabi, as well as other specialized classes that faculty deem necessary to enhance their teaching strategies. Incentives will be offered to faculty to undergo training and implement technology in their classes.

3) Lab facility. A lab in Brackett Hall is being re-fitted as the primary training location. This lab will provide the necessary media, hardware and software to support faculty in their collaborative learning endeavors. Lab and training schedules will accommodate faculty by including one hour, one day, weekly seminars and week-long summer workshops, as well as one-on-one consulting, walk-in clinics and open lab time for development work.

A faculty-led committee has been created to define the primary goals and objectives of the Collaborative Learning Environment and to address the major components and determine what resources and services are necessary to implement this environment for learning. With these resources and support, faculty will have the opportunity to re-examine curriculum issues and instructional methods that will allow them to focus on student-centered learning and adapt to the changing needs of students. The 12 faculty members on the committee represent the various colleges and schools at Clemson. DCIT has also established a project team to provide faculty with assistance and support as defined by the committee. The committee had its first meeting Oct. 1.

If you would like more information on the Collaborative Learning Environment or would like to follow the progress of the committee, a Web page is available at www.clemson.edu/collab. A listing of faculty members and the DCIT project team are accessible from this site. Please contact the faculty member representing your college for input. All comments and suggestions are welcomed.

Contributed By:
Carla Rathbone
bone@clemson.edu
## CLE Class Schedule - First Quarter 1998

### January 1998

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mon., Jan. 26</td>
<td>11:00-12:00</td>
<td>Eudora Email and using Email Class Lists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3:00- 4:00</td>
<td>Smart Classrooms 101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tues., Jan. 27</td>
<td>2:00- 3:00</td>
<td>Eudora Email and using Email Class Lists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed., Jan. 28</td>
<td>11:00-12:00</td>
<td>PowerPoint in an Hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1:00- 2:00</td>
<td>Exploring the CU Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurs., Jan. 29</td>
<td>9:00-10:00</td>
<td>Smart Classrooms 101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2:00- 4:30</td>
<td>Open Session – Scanning images/slides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri., Jan. 30</td>
<td>2:00- 3:30</td>
<td>Web Page Development using Netscape Gold</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### February 1998

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mon., Feb. 2</td>
<td>9:00-11:00</td>
<td>Open Session – Scanning Text and Slides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1:00- 2:00</td>
<td>Automating your Gradebook with MS Excel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tues., Feb. 3</td>
<td>3:00- 4:00</td>
<td>Web Page Development using Netscape Gold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed., Feb. 4</td>
<td>11:00-12:00</td>
<td>Set your Web Page in Motion with Animated GIFs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurs., Feb. 5</td>
<td>2:00- 3:00</td>
<td>Adobe Acrobat Basics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri., Feb. 6</td>
<td>2:00- 3:30</td>
<td>Basic HTML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon., Feb. 9</td>
<td>9:00-11:00</td>
<td>Open Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2:00- 3:00</td>
<td>Windows 95: Tips &amp; Tricks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tues., Feb. 10</td>
<td>3:00- 4:00</td>
<td>Networking Tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed., Feb. 11</td>
<td>11:00-12:00</td>
<td>Incorporating Multimedia in PowerPoint Presentations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurs., Feb. 12</td>
<td>9:00- 4:00</td>
<td>CLE Open House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri., Feb. 13</td>
<td>2:00- 3:30</td>
<td>Why Technology in the Classroom – Dr. Chris Peters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon., Feb. 16</td>
<td>9:00-11:00</td>
<td>Open Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tues., Feb. 17</td>
<td>2:00- 3:00</td>
<td>Beginning Photoshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed., Feb. 18</td>
<td>10:30-12:00</td>
<td>PowerPoint: Advanced Features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurs., Feb. 19</td>
<td>2:00- 3:00</td>
<td>Video with Adobe Premiere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri., Feb. 20</td>
<td>9:00-10:00</td>
<td>Smart Classrooms 101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2:00- 3:30</td>
<td>Using the Internet as a Teaching Tool, Dr. Susan Hilligos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sat., Feb. 21</td>
<td>9:00-12:00</td>
<td>Saturday Morning Studio (Topic TBA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon., Feb. 23</td>
<td>9:00-11:00</td>
<td>Open Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tues., Feb. 24</td>
<td>3:00- 4:00</td>
<td>MS Office Tips &amp; Tricks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed., Feb. 25</td>
<td>11:00-12:00</td>
<td>Recording CDs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurs., Feb. 26</td>
<td>2:00- 3:00</td>
<td>HyperStudio Basics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri., Feb. 27</td>
<td>11:00-12:00</td>
<td>Digitizing and Editing Sound Files</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2:00- 4:00</td>
<td>Mini-Grant Multimedia Presentations - ATC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C. E. L. Schedule continued:

**March 1998**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mon., Mar. 2</td>
<td>9:00-11:00</td>
<td>Open Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tues., Mar. 3</td>
<td>2:00-3:00</td>
<td>Automating your Gradebook using MS Excel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed., Mar. 4</td>
<td>11:00-12:00</td>
<td>Set your Web Page in Motion with Animated GIFs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurs., Mar. 5</td>
<td>3:00-4:00</td>
<td>Basic HTML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri., Mar. 6</td>
<td>2:00-3:30</td>
<td>Web Page Design – Carol Ryan and Dave Dryden Publications and Marketing Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon., Mar. 9</td>
<td>9:00-11:00</td>
<td>Open Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tues., Mar. 10</td>
<td>3:00-4:00</td>
<td>Windows 95: Tips &amp; Tricks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed., Mar. 11</td>
<td>11:00-12:00</td>
<td>Beginning Photoshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurs., Mar. 12</td>
<td>2:00-3:00</td>
<td>MS Office Tips &amp; Tricks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri., Mar. 13</td>
<td>11:00-12:00</td>
<td>Video with Adobe Premiere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2:00-4:00</td>
<td>Battle of the Web Editors (Speakers TBA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-W., Mar. 16-18</td>
<td>Times TBA</td>
<td>Creating Multimedia: A Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Th-Fri., Mar. 19-20</td>
<td>Spring Break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon., Mar. 23</td>
<td>9:00-11:00</td>
<td>Open Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tues., Mar. 24</td>
<td>2:00-3:00</td>
<td>Recording CDs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed., Mar. 25</td>
<td>11:00-12:00</td>
<td>Shocked! (Using Shockwave)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurs., Mar. 26</td>
<td>Open Date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri., Mar. 27</td>
<td>11:00-12:00</td>
<td>HyperStudio Basics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2:00-4:00</td>
<td>Guest Speaker (TBA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sat., Mar. 28</td>
<td>9:00-12:00</td>
<td>Saturday Morning Studio (Topic TBA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon., Mar. 30</td>
<td>9:00-11:00</td>
<td>Open Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tues., Mar. 31</td>
<td>2:00-3:30</td>
<td>PowerPoint: Advanced Features</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Faculty Senate Research Committee discussed the concept put forth by Dr. Shah that an indirect incentive return policy be established so that consistent treatment is the end result at each College to ensure that each academic level, including the principal investigator, receive a portion of this return.

Of the forty percent return (40%) to the colleges [the other 60% is "added" to the University operating budget], an initial recommendation put forth was that a 15/15/10 split be distributed to the Dean, Department Chair, and PI, respectively. That suggestion, however, was put forth to open discussions that would be used to help the University Research Council come to a mutual satisfactory distribution of these funds.

The Senate Research Committee agreed that the PI should be guaranteed a known portion of the indirect funds generated by the PI. However, there was concern expressed regarding the relatively small return to the PI and the relatively high percentages returned to administrative units.

In addition,

a) there was concern regarding the use of the 60% return that is "added" to the University operating budget. The Research Committee is requesting that Dr. Shah provide a breakdown of the distribution of these overhead funds at the University, College, and Departmental levels.

b) the Research Committee is also requesting copies or summaries of the indirect policy statements that have been generated between the University and granting agencies.

c) the Research Committee expressed an interest in the establishment of Research Councils for each College. These councils would work with the Deans of the respective Colleges with regards to the utilization of overhead return funds. A main concern expressed is that indirect returns generated by faculty may not be used to maintain infrastructure associated with the research programs of the faculty generating the indirect funds.

The Research Committee supports Dr. Shah's efforts and will do all it can to cooperate in the maintenance and enhancement of the research endeavors at the University.

The meeting was terminated after we discussed the need for the University to "reach out" to the Trustees and to gain support for the research commitments of the faculty and University. We discussed the need to invite the Trustees to the University to get a better understanding of "research" at the institution.

Our next meeting will be an open discussion with Chuck Toney, Public Information Director, regarding avenues to highlight to the public the research programs of faculty at the University.
January 13, 1998
From: Faculty Senate Scholastic Policies Committee  \( \text{Chair} \)
Subject: Evaluation of teaching

We propose these categories as essential for documentation of effective teaching:
1. Statement of teaching philosophy
2. Evaluation of course materials, learning objectives, and exams by peers and/or supervisors.
3. In-class visitation by peers and/or supervisors.
4. Student evaluation
5. Additional criteria as appropriate to discipline.

This committee has worked to devise a new list of questions for student evaluation of teaching that could be used university-wide. Departments and/or colleges could use their own forms in addition to the required form.

This committee's suggestions for required questions are on the page 2 of this handout. Results of these questions would be made available to administrators as part of their evaluation of faculty. Question 12 is required by the CHE and must be asked as shown.

Optional questions are on page 3. The evaluation form would have answer bubbles for twelve optional questions. Although the responses would show on the form, only the instructor would have the questions. Optional questions would NOT be required and if used would be confidential. The questions on page 3 are suggestions. the instructor could write his/her questions for this section.
Questionnaire for Student Evaluation of Instructors

The course and instructor
1. The course was well organized.
2. The instructor treated students with respect.
3. The instructor’s grading procedures gave a fair evaluation of my understanding of the material.
4. The instructor was willing to accommodate student questions outside of class.
5. The instructor’s teaching methods helped me understand the course material.
6. The instructor was enthusiastic about teaching.
7. The examination questions reflected the content and emphasis of the course.
8. The amount of material the instructor attempted to cover was appropriate.
9. The textbook was beneficial in this course.
10. The instructor’s expectations in this course were made clear to students.
11. The instructor motivates students.

Responses for questions 1-11.

Strongly disagree Disagree No opinion Agree Strongly Agree

12. Please indicate your satisfaction with the availability of the instructor outside the classroom by choosing one response from the scale below. (In selecting your rating, consider the instructor’s availability via established office hours, appointments, and other opportunities for face-to-face interaction as well as via telephone, email, fax and other means.

Responses for question 12

Very Dissatisfied Satisfied Very Satisfied

Dissatisfied

Student information
13. I have confidence that the results of this evaluation will be taken seriously.
14. I have put considerable effort into this course.
15. I am satisfied with my accomplishments in this course.

Responses for questions 13-15.

Strongly disagree Disagree No opinion Agree Strongly Agree

16. I expect to earn an A, B, C, D, F, or P in this course.
17. This was a required course for me. (yes or no)
18. I am majoring in the area in which this course is being taught. (yes or no)

Open-ended questions
What are the strengths of the course and/or instructor?
What are the weaknesses of the course and/or instructor?
What suggestions do you have to improve this course?
optional open-ended question written by instructor/department/college
12 optional questions chosen from the list below or written by the instructor may be used if desired.

**Classroom teaching performance**
- The instructor used real world problems or case studies to explain topics effectively.
- The instructor encouraged classroom discussion.
- Regular attendance was necessary in order to learn and understand course material.
- The instructor effectively demonstrated skills to be learned.
- Within time limits of the course, the instructor covered course topics in sufficient depth.
- The instructor’s teaching made you want to improve your course-related skills.
- The instructor’s citation of personal experiences increased your understanding of the subject matter.
- The instructor’s use of examples of his/her own research facilitated students’ learning.
- The instructor encouraged creative approaches to problems and projects.
- The instructor provided notes or other handouts which facilitated learning of course material.
- The instructor’s inclusion of student presentations was beneficial to the course.
- The instructor demonstrated a thorough knowledge of course topics.
- Overall, this course is among the best I have ever taken.
- Overall, this instructor is among the best teachers I have known.

**Assignments, projects, papers, and textbooks.**
- The amount of time required to complete assignments was appropriate to your course load.
- Assignments were related to course objectives.
- Reading assignments facilitated understanding of lectures.
- Non-textbook readings increased your understanding of course material.
- Papers and reports were graded promptly and returned with adequate feedback.
- The instructor guided but did not dictate students’ work on projects.

**Pace and schedule of class work.**
- There was sufficient opportunity for students to ask questions during class periods.
- The instructor was willing to pause and review difficult points.

**Relations with students.**
- The instructor seemed to care about whether students learned course material.
- The instructor encouraged students to ask questions and comment on class activities.
- The instructor was receptive to student viewpoints.
- The instructor recognized that students differ in abilities, interests, and obligations.

**Laboratory, studio or recitation**
- The laboratory (recitation or studio) sessions contributed significantly to your learning of course material.
- The laboratory (or recitation) presented material which added to that presented in lectures.
- The laboratory (recitation or studio) instructor effectively explained difficult aspects of lecture material.
- Laboratory (recitation or studio) work was correlated with lecture content.
- The laboratory (recitation or studio) instructor was receptive to different approaches to problem solution.

**Team-taught courses**
- The team teachers coordinated their instructional efforts.
- Evaluation of student learning was effectively coordinated by the team teachers.

**Additional class and class environment items/audio-visual aids**
- The room in which class was held was of adequate size for the class.
- The size of the class was appropriate to the nature of the course objectives.
- It was not difficult to hear the instructor or other speakers.
- Classroom lighting was adequate.
- The temperature of the classroom was comfortable.
- The instructor made adequate use of audio and visual aid equipment.
Faculty Senate
Welfare Committee
January 13, 1998
Report to Faculty Senate
Members:
Subhash Anand
Francis Eubanks
Elham Makram
John Leininger

The Welfare Committee met to discuss 3 issues submitted to the committee for review. Below is an outline of the issues being addressed.

1. Revisiting a previously approved Faculty Senate Resolution on the enactment of the President’s Commission on the Status of Black Faculty and Staff.

2. Addressing the issues of summer school class size and enrollment requirements. These issues deal with the loads for the summer as they are compared to the fall and spring semesters and the limiting factors that this is placing on the summer school programs with heavy laboratory loads or course offering that would be filled with graduate assistants.

3. Determining the grouping of colleges for selecting the Centennial Professorship candidates. This is the first time the position is open since the reorganization of the University.

A fourth issue which has been submitted since our last committee meeting, raises the concern about the lack of coverage by Workmen Compensation for 9 month employees if they come in to cover activities during the summer when they are not on the payroll.

Any input you might have towards these issues may be directed to John Leininger (ljohn@clemson.edu).
Report from the Policy Committee

January 13, 1998

The Policy Committee met on December 11, 1997. The following matters were discussed, and the indicated actions were taken.

1. Evaluation of Administrators: A Manual revision, based on the University of Rhode Island procedure, was approved by the Committee, and will be presented under New Business. The salient features of the proposed policy include evaluations of Chairs after two years, and every third year thereafter. Deans, every fourth year, the Provost every fifth year. The evaluations would be carried out using a Clemson form. There is also provision for direct input by individual faculty members. After considerable discussion concerning the nature of the form for evaluation, no agreement was reached. Two forms, one based on the Penn State document, and one submitted by Senator Hare are included for consideration under New Business.

2. The proposed Research Data Access and Retention Policy was discussed briefly. We will meet with Issac Wallace, Records manager in the library to insure that there is no conflict with existing policies.

3. Proposed changes in the Scholarships and Awards Committee. The general feeling of the Policy Committee is that we do not feel that this Committee should be chaired by an administrator. We will meet with Dr. Ruth Hayes, Chair of Scholarships and Awards Committee at a future meeting.

4. A Manual revision concerning "Reappointment of Department Chairs" was briefly discussed. No action was taken, pending revision of the procedures for the evaluation of administrators.

5. The Policy Committee began consideration of the ad hoc Committee report on the "Periodic Review." Several Committee members expressed considerable reservations concerning changes in the current tenure, promotion and reappointment procedures. We will continue consideration of this document at the January meeting.

The Policy Committee meets at 3:30 P.M. on (usually) the third Tuesday of each month. Our next meeting will be Tuesday, January 20th, presumably in the library conference room (LL3).
The Agriculture and Natural Resources Subcommittee of the Clemson University Board of Trustees met at 1:00 pm on Tuesday, January 6, 1998 in the State Development Board Conference Room on the 17th floor of the Affinity (AT&T) Building. Trustees present were Chair Patti McAbee, Vice Chair Louis Lynn, Tom McTeer, Bill Smith, and W. G. DesChamps and Executive Secretary Thornton Kirby. President Constantine W. Curris also attended this meeting.

Dr. John Kelly, VP for PSA, presented information on: PSA Goals with a video and brochures; Food Safety Program; Extension Director Position to be filled soon; Legislative process with zero-base budgeting; progress on Southern Living Project; SC Botanical Garden has over 100,000 visitors per year; the need for webmasters; possibility of digital TV linkages; Dr. Kelly was elected to the ADEC Board.

Dr. Stassen Thompson presented two land management items that were approved: Duke Power R-O-W request in Pendleton and deed to a water line near the Animal Diagnostic Laboratory in Columbia.
Minutes from the Finance Committee of the Clemson University Board of Trustees
January 5, 1998
Jack Peck

The following items were discussed:

1. Renovations on Martin Hall and Redfern were approved
2. The Software for Administrative Systems was reported on:
   a. PeopleSoft Systems has been purchased for $1,100,000
   b. The total budget for the system is $6,000,000
   c. The production target date for human resources (payroll/personnel) and general ledger is 1/99.
3. The recent audit report of Clemson University is pending and will be made public soon.
4. Reporting of scholarship monies has been changed to recognize fee waivers. This should bring our reported scholarship total to about $11,000,000.
5. Performance funding is continuing to be a hot topic in the state.
   a. Clemson University is doing well with the current methodology
   b. Mission Resource Requirements evaluation is helping CU
   c. Last year additional state funding for higher education totaled about $18,000,000. 25% of this amount was distributed using the performance funding methods.
   d. This year 75% of about $36,000,000 of additional funding will be distributed with performance funding methods.
   e. CHE gave CU $55,000 to improve Performance Measures
6. Public Service was supposed to get $2,000,000 for 4 years. Last year we got $1,500,000 of non-recurring funds for Public Service.
7. Credit card use for fee payments.
   a. has resulted in much earlier collections and much reduced line length for fee payment.
   b. Cost CU about $425,000 to the credit card companies
   c. Some people are using credit cards for financing
   d. CU could probably get a lower percentage rate from the credit card companies but currently all credits card arrangements come under the state contract. The state contract was actually intended for much smaller amounts of financing.
8. Third party financing of tuition for families is now being investigated.
9. The Fort Hill Mansion/Museum Renovation
   a. The mansion is in need of many repairs.
   b. The total amount of money requested by the University Facilities Campus Planning Group is $1,200,000.
   c. After some questioning, it appeared that about 30% of the money was not well justified and had been estimated by somewhat arbitrary methods.
   d. The Board didn’t take any votes but seemed to support the renovation.
   e. The schedule for project initiation is early spring 1998.
**Director, Office of Teaching Effectiveness and Innovation**

**Position:** Tenured Associate/Full Professor; 12 month, full-time position

**Qualifications:** Earned doctorate with demonstrated excellence in higher education teaching and a scholarly record appropriate to rank; Exceptional teaching innovation, leadership, communication, and organizational skills; must be able to work effectively with the broad constituency and range of disciplines found in the campus community; must be knowledgeable about practical applications, current literature and thinking about the process of student learning and development of exemplary skills for teaching excellence. Preference to candidates with administrative experience and experience in faculty development.

**Responsibilities:** Provide leadership for the establishment of a new center designed to promote excellence in teaching and pedagogical research; Create within the center a supportive environment in which faculty can develop and enhance teaching skills that emphasize the process of student learning, teaching innovation, and life-long learning. Specifically, the Director will develop/conduct programs, workshops, discussion groups, individual mentoring, practical support for course design, development and evaluation, and establish a clearinghouse for other related campus activities. Manage operating budget for Center. Teach one course per year related to activities supported by the Center without regard to home discipline. Work with Faculty Development Fellows and the Faculty Development Advisory Committee to develop new and varied programs.

The Director must actively and enthusiastically promote a culture of learning and teaching excellence on campus, taking responsibility for communicating with other programs nationally to ensure that the Center continues to evolve.

**Salary:** Commensurate with experience and rank

**Deadline:** The position will remain open until filled. The Search Committee will begin its review of applications immediately.

**Procedures:** Please send credentials including 1) a letter of application, 2) vita, 3) graduate transcripts, and 4) at least three letters of recommendation written for this position to: Dr. Kathy Neal Headley, Search Committee Chair, 409E Tillman Hall, Clemson University, Clemson, South Carolina, 29634-0708. Telephone: 864/656-5104.

*Clemson University is a non-discriminatory/affirmative action/equal access employer which specifically invites women and minorities to apply.*
14 January 1998

To: Houser Professor Rajendra Singh  
From: Robert A. Waller, Editorial Consultant for the Faculty Manual

Re: Consultative Committee of Endowed Chairs and Titled Professors

At yesterday afternoon's regular meeting of the Faculty Senate the proposal from the Policy Committee for the establishment of a consultative Committee of Endowed Chairs and Titled Professors (memorandum of December 11, 1997) was thoroughly discussed in terms of advantages and disadvantages. Ultimately, the full Senate voted not to recommend the proposal as an addition to the Faculty Manual.

On behalf of Faculty Senate President Fran McGuire I transmit this official action for your information as the principal proponent of the additional committee.

C.C.: Academic Vice President and Provost Steffen H. Rogers  
Faculty Senate President Francis A. McGuire  
Policy Committee Chair John W. Huffman  
Mesdames Betty M. Moore and Cathy T. Sturkie
14 January 1998

To: Academic Vice President and Provost Steffen H. Rogers

From: Robert A. Waller, Editorial Consultant for the Faculty Manual

Re: Non-Voting Additions to the Academic Council

At yesterday afternoon’s meeting of the Faculty Senate the addition to the Faculty Manual reproduced below was approved by the requisite majority for immediate implementation.

Experience suggests that the operation of the Academic Council (page 39 of the August 1997 Faculty Manual) would be enhanced by the inclusion of academic/administrative representatives in non-voting capacities from both the undergraduate and graduate realms of our academic enterprise.

It is proposed that the non-voting roster of the membership of the Academic Council be amended to include the following:

Graduate School Dean

Senior Vice Provost for Undergraduate Students

The presence of these individuals with their day-to-day familiarity with the relevant issues would facilitate the consideration, review, and coordination of matters pertaining to campus educational policy.

As a matter of internal administration, it is my recommendation that this matter not be referred to the Educational Policy Committee of the Board of Trustees. Your approval is hereby requested.

C.c.: Faculty Senate President Francis A. McGuire

Acting Graduate Dean Debra B. Jackson

Senior Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Studies Jerome V. Reel, Jr.

Policy Committee Chair John W. Huffman

Mesdames Betty M. Moore and Cathy T. Sturkie
To: Academic Vice President and Provost Steffen H. Rogers

From: Robert A. Waller, Editorial Consultant for the Faculty Manual

Re: Modification of Procedures for Evaluation of Administrators

On behalf of Faculty Senate President Fran McGuire I transmit for your review and endorsement to the Board of Trustees this major policy change in the institution's approach to the evaluation of academic affairs administrators. These changes were approved by the requisite majority for implementation (assuming Board approval) beginning AY 1998-1999.

The following changes need to be reflected in the Faculty Manual on page 11 of Section L., "Review of Academic Administrators" as follows (new language underscored, deleted language bracketed):

No change in paragraph 1.

Paragraph 2 would be changed: "In the normal performance of their duties, administrators are subject to evaluations of their performances. [by their supervisors. To ensure the accuracy of these evaluations, the performances of department chairs, academic deans, and the Provost shall be subject to formal reviews at regular intervals.] Such evaluations shall employ the standard Clemson University form for the evaluation of administrators 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 30 days shall be provided. The affected faculty or constituent group is defined as follows: a) all tenured and tenure-track members of a department, b) all continuing members of the appropriate college faculty for academic deans, and c) all members of the University faculty for the Provost.

"Each administrator evaluation committee shall consist of 3-5 members. Three members shall be selected from a slate of nominees or volunteers generated from the administrator’s constituent group by the Faculty Senate Advisory Committee. The administrator shall have the option to choose an additional member of the committee from the constituent group. In addition, the immediate supervisor shall also have the option to choose an additional member of the committee from the constituent group. This committee procedure shall not preclude any faculty member in the constituent group from providing his/her advice directly to the evalu-"
ating officer. In all instances the administrator evaluation committee will provide a written summary of the faculty opinion as solicited by the approved Clemson University form.

In the present third paragraph, the opening sentence would be modified to read as follows: "Before the end of a department chair's second [and fifth] year in office and every third [fifth] 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 the conducting of the formal reviews. When the review process has been completed, the dean shall make a report to the Provost."

The present final paragraph would read: "Likewise, the Provost shall review the performance of deans[,] before the end of the dean's fourth year in office and every fourth year thereafter, consulting with department chairs and directors as well as with representative faculty through the administrator evaluation system [, where feasible]. Likewise, the President of the University shall review the performance of the Provost[,] before the end of the Provost's fifth year in office and every fifth year thereafter, consulting with the academic deans and with representative department chairs and faculty through the administrator evaluation system [, where feasible]."

An added final paragraph would read: "In all instances the evaluation materials shall be treated with the strictest confidence with only those in the review hierarchy entitled to access."

The evaluation form approved by the Senate need not become a formal part of the Faculty Manual since it may be subject to change based on experience, but it could be included as an appendix at the conclusion of the Manual following the present Appendix F on the "Appointment of Academic Administrator."

c.c.: President Constantine W. Curris
Faculty Senate President Francis A. McGuire
Policy Committee Chair John W. Huffman
Mesdames Betty M. Moore and Cathy T. Sturkie
FORM FOR THE EVALUATION OF ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATORS
CLEMSON UNIVERSITY

Faculty of

As mandated by the Faculty Manual, a review of is underway. As part of this process, the input of all personnel in your administrative unit is sought. Therefore, please take the time to fill out this questionnaire, and feel free to use additional sheets if necessary. Your responses will remain anonymous.

Please check your position in the unit (optional).

_____ Professor
_____ Associate Professor
_____ Assistant Professor

_____ Instructor
_____ Staff
_____ Other:________________________

1. Please rate on each of the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration of academic programs</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension and outreach activities</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeking external funding</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni and constituent relations</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human resources</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General administrative support</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Please rate on each of the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Leadership Areas</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Standards</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy for the Unit</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouragement of effective teaching</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouragement of research</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for the mission of the Unit</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handling of promotion and tenure matters</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Leadership Areas</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication and listening skills</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedication/Commitment</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative style</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegation and follow through</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict resolution</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness/Equity</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy for support staff</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>U</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. What are the strengths of this administrator?

4. What are the weaknesses of this administrator?

5. What specific recommendations do you have to improve the performance of

6. On a scale of 5 (high) and 1 (low), how would you rate in terms of overall effectiveness?

7. On a scale of 5 (high) and 1 (low) indicate your level of enthusiasm for the continuance/reappointment of

   5  4  3  2  1  U
January 6, 1998

To: Francis A. McGuire, President
   Faculty Senate

From: Pam Draper

Re: Report on the Media Advisory Board

As the Faculty Senate representative to the Media Advisory Board, I have attended three meetings, all of which were concerned primarily with budget.

At the July meetings, the budgets for *The Tiger*, TAPS, CCN, *Chronicle*, *Reveille*, and WSBF were determined. Additionally, the Board agreed to set aside money for the annual awards banquet and to build a media reserve fund in preparation for the move into the new Student Center. *The Tiger* will borrow from the Media Reserve Fund to pay off its debt and repay the amount of the loan by the fall of 1999. Salaries for an Assistant Director for Print Media and Publications and a Student Media grad assistant were also be funded.

In November, each of the media organizations reported on its activities. Because of a difference in student activity fee anticipated and collected, the media budgets had to be cut and the amounts of the cut for each organization were determined. The Board also forwarded a proposal through George Smith and Joy Smith to Almeda Jacks to make changes in the membership of the Media Advisory Board.
Minutes
Faculty Senate Meeting
February 10, 1998

1. Call to Order President Francis A. McGuire called the meeting to order at 2:39 p.m.

2. Approval of Minutes The January 13, 1998 Faculty Senate Minutes were approved as written.

3. a. Presentation of Slate of Officers The Slate of Officers from the Faculty Senate Advisory Committee was presented by President McGuire:

Vice President/President-Elect:
Robert Campbell (Business & Public Affairs)
Horace Skipper (Agriculture, Forestry, & Life Sciences)

Secretary:
Elizabeth Dale (Architecture, Arts, & Humanities)
JoAnne Deeken (Library)

The floor was opened for additional nominations. There being none, motion was made and seconded to close nominations. Vote to close nominations was taken and passed.

b. Oral Statements from Nominees Oral statements were presented to the Senate by/for each candidate seeking both offices.

4. “Free Speech” Karl Dieter, Professor of Chemistry, commented on student ratings forms and their mandatory use in faculty evaluations which may be required under the provisions of Performance Based funding. Dr. Dieter closed by listing action items for the Faculty Senate and the Provost to pursue (Attachment A).

5. Committee Reports

a. Research Committee - Senator Ed Pivorun, Chair, reminded Senators of the Open Forum scheduled for 3:00 p.m., February 13, 1998 in Vickery Hall to discuss the implementation of a University-wide policy for minimum distribution of indirect return to principal investigators and the departments. Senator Pivorun then submitted the Report dated February, 1998 (Attachment B).

b. Scholastic Policies Committee - Chair Nancy Ferguson requested a Sense of the Senate to approve in principle the criteria contained within the guidelines for teaching evaluation (Attachment C). Following much discussion, a Sense of the Senate was taken to move the document forward and it passed. This document will be forwarded with recommendations and will come back to the Senate for final approval. Senator Ferguson then asked for a Sense of the Senate regarding Recommended Changes to Withdrawal Policy (Attachment D). Much discussion followed. Sense was taken and passed regarding the one week time period for withdrawal from class without record. The Sense was that most senators are uncomfortable with unlimited “w’s”.

d. **Finance Committee** - Senator Robert Campbell noted that this Committee will meet on Tuesday at 3:30 p.m. in 414 Brackett Hall; that the end of the term is approaching; and that developments will be reported. This Committee will work with the Welfare Committee on issues related to summer school. Senator Campbell reported that the Accountability Committee will pursue how much PSA money is going into salaries of employees in the College of Agriculture, Forestry, & Life Sciences.

e. **Policy Committee** - Senator John Huffman submitted the January 29th Report (Attachment F) and announced the next meeting will be Tuesday at 3:30 p.m..

**University Committees and Commissions**

a. **ad hoc Committee on GPA's** - Senator Mary LaForge asked for a Sense of the Senate regarding the current policy on GPA's and how they are computed relating to repeating a course. The Sense was that Senators are happy with the current policy.

6. **President's Report**  
   President McGuire:

   a. noted receipt of a thank you note from the Huffman's for their framed resolution from the Faculty Senate;

   b. referred to *Performance Funding for Beginners, A Primer on South Carolina's New System*, by Thornton Kirby, Executive Secretary to the Board of Trustees, and noted that it will be shared via e-mail with all faculty and staff (Attachment G);

   c. encouraged Senators to participate in sessions testing the Faculty Activity System;

   d. stated that the Board of Trustees approved the revised implementing concepts which contained Faculty Senate changes;

   e. announced that Lawrence Gressette, Chair of the Clemson University Board of Trustees, met with the lead senators and President McGuire and Vice President/President-Elect Pat Smart, which proved to be a very good meeting.

7. **Old Business**

   a. Senator Huffman explained and moved for acceptance a Faculty Manual amended Grievance procedure. Vote to accept was taken and passed (Attachment H).

   b. Two-thirds vote to bring the Amended Modification of Procedures for Evaluation of Administrators to the floor was taken and passed. Senator Huffman moved adoption of this policy which was seconded. Vote on modification was taken and passed (Attachment I).

8. **New Business**

   a. The Faculty Senate elected members to the Centennial Professorship Selection Committee by secret ballot. Elected were: David Van Lear, Arlene Privette, Madelynn Oglesby, and Chris Sieverdes.
b. Senator Huffman explained the title and description of the Senior Research Fellow and moved to table which was seconded. Vote to table was taken and passed (Attachment J).

c. The title of Post Doctoral Research Fellow was explained by Senator Huffman, who then moved acceptance. Vote was taken and passed (Attachment K).

d. Senator Huffman presented and moved acceptance of the amended Reappointment of Department Chairs/School Directors. Vote to accept was taken and passed (Attachment L).

e. Senator Jack Peck recommended that a suggestion be made to the Provost to remind administrators of the proper procedure regarding evaluations, specifically, that an independent evaluation of faculty by the T&P Committee and the Department Chair be rendered according to instructions contained within the Faculty Manual. President McGuire agreed to convey this request to the Provost.

9. Adjournment The meeting was adjourned by President McGuire at 4:30 p.m.

Kathy Neal Headley, Secretary

Cathy Toth-Sturkie, Administrative Assistant

Absent: P. Skewes, H. Skipper (V. Shelburne for), R. Sutton, H. Wheeler, K. Brooks (M. Cranston for), F. Eubanks, E. Makram
Free Speech Comments (R. Karl Dieter, Professor of Chemistry)

I wish to briefly comment on Student Rating Forms (i.e., student evaluations) and their mandatory use in faculty evaluations which will be required under the provisions of Performance Based funding. From my service as Chemistry TPR Chair for the past two years, I have become deeply concerned about the use and misuse of these forms. I do not believe that there is a significant level of understanding among faculty or administrators of what these forms measure and what they do not measure, and the ways in which they can be misused. They are misused when faculty teaching effectiveness is judged solely or largely from this data base, when student written comments are selectively offered by faculty or cited by administrators, and when other data (e.g., faculty peer review) at odds with student ratings are ignored or diminished in value.

Student rating forms gather information for course improvement and for evaluation of faculty teaching effectiveness. Research indicates that broad general questions are more useful for evaluation while specific questions are more useful for instructor feedback. Student comments are highly problematic for evaluation because a very small percentage of the class responds in this manner and the resulting comments tend to be highly prejudicial in both a positive and negative sense. I promise my sophomore organic classes that 85% of the exam will be copied verbatim from the assigned homework, and indicate the origin of the questions on the exam. Nevertheless, around 10% of those students providing written commentary will say that the exams are unfair because they are more difficult than the textbook problems. A PROBLEM CANNOT BE HARDER THAN ITSELF. No administrator has ever refuted the inherent flaw of student comments illustrated by this example. Human perceptions are rarely based upon facts, rigorous reasoning, and critical analysis. More often than not, it is determined by human wants and desires. By their words and by their silence administrators have said to me, "Karl, I don't care how many problems there are with student ratings, I believe they are the most important measure of teaching effectiveness and I'm going to conduct my evaluation largely on these forms." What is the appropriate response to negative decisions made on the basis of demonstrably false information? Should the University be sued for basing a decision upon libel? Should students be expelled for making false statements on official University forms?

I call upon the Faculty Senate to:

1. Determine precisely what is and is not required by the commission on Higher Education.
2. List the components of teaching effectiveness (e.g., scholarly rigor, intellectual standards, student motivation, student coaching, etc.) that should be considered in evaluations.
3. Draft a Statement of Principles and a Code of Practices that will govern the use of student rating data. For example, it might include restricted access, at the discretion of the faculty member, to the student comments section of the survey.
4. Develop a procedural format that requires accountability of administrators in Faculty Personnel decisions. Administrators at all level should give specific reasons for their decisions, citing the relevant data, and its' weighted value upon which the decision was rendered.

Dr. Rogers, I call upon the Provost to:

1. Provide the Faculty Senate with a clear statement of the relative weight that you intend to place on the various data (e.g., peer reviews, student ratings, etc.) provided to document teaching effectiveness.
2. Provide an indication of how you will use the student ratings.
3. Offer suggestions on how you can provide accountability for your decisions to the faculty peer review groups, Department Chairs, and Deans.

I urge the faculty Senate to take this matter very seriously. It has important ramifications not only for fairness in faculty personnel decisions, but it can also have a dramatic impact upon the very quality of the University. The University is not a maker of widgets, and the level of performance required, educational standards, and level of difficulty should be set by the faculty and not the customers. The danger of this manufacturing image is that education may well be the only industry where the customer wants less for his
money (less material, less work, less rigor, less difficulty). Like priests and ministers, and unlike makers of widgets, professors have a duty and obligation to ask of students things they may not wish to do and to tell them things they may not want to hear. Please take this task very seriously, and produce tools, formats, and procedures that will give students significant input, be fair to the faculty, and hold administrators accountable for their decisions. Thank you.
Recommendations for Use of Student Ratings

Students provide raw data and the interpretation of this data constitutes the evaluation process. Since there are no agreed upon definitions of effective teaching, this interpretation process is unduly subject to the biases and prejudices of the interpreter. For these reasons the following recommendations are made.

1. The form should be titled "Student Ratings" instead of "Evaluations" since the students are providing data and someone else is going to interpret them and make an evaluation.

2. The ratings form should specifically state how it is going to be used (evaluations, feedback, diagnostic, for faculty improvement, etc.) and what groups (Chairs, Deans, Provost, etc.) will have access to it.

4. There should be a Statement of Principle or a Code of Practice which spells out how the data is to be used and ways in which it should not be used. For example such a code might indicate that student ratings and faculty peer review are to be given comparable weight in the evaluation process.

5. Student ratings should never be used alone for purposes of personnel decisions (e.g., promotion, tenure, pay raises, etc.). This is going to be problematic for annual evaluations, since it is unlikely that classroom visitations for every faculty member (particularly tenured) will occur every year.

6. The form will undoubtedly contain questions designed for evaluations and questions designed to elicit information for improvement. Cashin (IDEA Paper No. 22, "Student Ratings of Teaching: Recommendations for Use", Center for Faculty Evaluation and Development, Kansas State University, January 1990) recommends that open ended questions should only be used for improvement and not for evaluation. Therefore the numerical summary of the evaluation questions would be provided to Department Heads, Deans, and the Provost for evaluation but student comments would only be provided to the instructor for self assessment unless the instructor chooses to provide them.

7. There are clearly error bars on the numerical summaries. Cashin suggests that the averaged numbers be treated as $3.8 \pm 0.3$ and that a scale of 1-5 or 1-7 be used.

8. The data must be interpreted by someone (Chair, Dean, Provost). Student motivation has a high correlation with positive ratings, and should be included in the interpretation process. If the class consists only of students taking it as an elective the scores will likely be high and if the course is mandatory the scores are likely to be low. This is one bias that correlates well with student ratings.

9. There appears to be a bias across academic fields with qualitative fields generally receiving higher scores than quantitative fields. How will the evaluators treat this difference?

10. A routing form should allow the faculty member to sign off that they accept or do not accept the evaluation of teaching made by the Department Head, Dean, or Provost. This is the only safeguard to ensure that evaluators (Chairs, Deans, etc.) make a good faith effort to abide by the Code of Practice or Statement of Principles. Evaluators should provide a narrative statement showing what portions and how much of their decision is based upon the various supporting data (e.g., student ratings, faculty peer review, faculty teaching philosophy, student motivation, etc.).

11. After our procedure and forms are finalized the entire package should be validated by an expert in the field of "student ratings" and evaluations of faculty teaching effectiveness. It must also be noted that there is "no agreed upon definition of effective teaching nor any single, all-embracing criterion" (Cashin).

R. Karl Dieter
Professor of Chemistry
FACULTY SENATE RESEARCH COMMITTEE REPORT
February 1998

Ed Pivorun, Chair
Raj Singh
Michael Morris
Ted Taylor
Horace Skipper
Hap Wheeler
Gerald Christenbury

A) Chuck Toney, Public Information Director, Architecture, Humanities and Academic Affairs met with the Research Committee to discuss how the University can better communicate the research efforts of the faculty to the outside world.

Chuck provided us with the following list of personnel that represent and develop publicity for the Colleges and University:

Chuck Toney: College of Architecture, Arts and Humanities; Provost
Debbie Delhouse: College of Agriculture, Forestry and Life Sciences
Sandy Dees Baker: College of Engineering and Sciences; Division of Research
Greg Wilson: College of Business and Public Affairs; College of Health, Education and Human development
Glenn Hare: Performing Arts, Brooks Center; Lee Hall; Student News
Robin Denny: Director of News Services
Beth Jarrad: Editor Inside Clemson; Inside Now; Inside Fax

The Committee suggested that there needs to be a more aggressive approach to getting the message out about Clemson's research capabilities and programs. Chuck informed us that sometimes it is very difficult to get a story that is of interest to the University out because it may not be of interest to the lay public.

This discussion with Chuck led to a meeting of the four Public Information Directors, who deal with faculty involved in research, with Cathy Sams, chief public affairs officer, and Robin DeLoach, director of News Services, to discuss the concerns of the FacSen Research Committee.

Chuck informed me that they hope to report to the entire Senate in the near future on plans to publicize research at Clemson. Some of the suggestions made by the Research Committee will be incorporated into that plan.

Dr Shah plans to distribute a monthly "report" or "newsletter" on research at the University.

There some concerns expressed by the Research Committee when we were informed that a "Marketing Plan" has (or is) been(ing) formulated by the University. We will be asking Kathy Sams to attend a meeting of the Research Committee to discuss this plan and the role of faculty in the development of this plan.

B) The Faculty Senate Research Committee discussed the establishment of a special faculty rank entitled Senior Research Professor. Dr Shah was present to explain the need for the establishment of this special rank. The Senate Policy Committee had already approved the title Senior Research Fellow and are opposed to the title Senior Research Professor.

Dr Shah clarified his position on the establishment of this special faculty rank:

a) would build up the research expertise on campus
b) would not be a tenure track position and could not be converted to a tenure track position.
c) the salary would be obtained from outside funding
d) would add flexibility in recruiting senior faculty
e) would aid in the development of a research network by attracting researchers to the campus with contacts and experience.

f) would have a home department and the overhead would be returned to the department.

g) would be subjected to a yearly renewal process. Departmental faculty dissatisfaction would result in termination.

h) the University would not impose a person on a department-departmental approval would be required-the department has the final voice in hiring/firing. The recommendation of the home department to invite a faculty member to accept the research professorship would be subject to approval by the Dean.

Dr Shah believes that the title Senior Research Professor is preferable to the title Senior Research Fellow. A researcher would be able to sell themselves to a granting agency more readily if his/her title designated that they were a university research professor rather than a postdoc or research fellow or associate.

The majority of the Senate Research Committee (Senators Pivorun, Singh, Taylor, Wheeler) concur. However Senator Skipper expressed concerns that were based on discussions with some members of the CAFLS faculty. Skip suggested that a poll of the faculty be undertaken to address the “problem” of the title. Discussions with the faculty of the Biological Sciences suggested that the title be designated as Visiting Research Professor; however there was major opposition to the title Research Professor.

Subsequent conversations with Dr Shah indicate that he is willing to have an open forum to discuss the concept and the problems that have arisen with the designated title, Research Professor.

C) Dr Shah also discussed the concept of developing Institutes/Centers of Excellence. These centers would allow for faculty with collective strengths to more effectively market their research capabilities to outside funding sources.

All members of these centers will have a departmental home and all credit would go back to the individual PI's department/college. Interdisciplinary efforts will not compete with departments and colleges.
The Faculty Senate Scholastic Policies Committee proposes the following guidelines for teaching evaluation:

To document effective teaching, several criteria must be used including:

1. A statement by the faculty member describing their methodology
2. Evaluation of course materials, learning objectives, and exams by peers and/or supervisors.
3. In-class visitation by peers and/or supervisors.
4. Student evaluation.
5. Additional criteria as appropriate to discipline.

A proposed questionnaire for student evaluation follows. We recommend that this evaluation instrument be validated and adopted university-wide.
Questionnaire for Student Evaluation of Instructors

**The course and instructor**

1. The course was well organized.
2. The instructor treated students with respect.
3. The instructor’s grading procedures gave a fair evaluation of my understanding of the material.
4. The instructor’s teaching methods helped me understand the course material.
5. The instructor was enthusiastic about teaching.
6. The examination questions reflected the content and emphasis of the course.
7. The instructor’s expectations in this course were made clear to students.
8. The instructor motivates students.
9. I would like to take another course with this instructor.

**Responses for questions 1-9.**

1: Strongly disagree   2: Disagree   3: No opinion   4: Agree   5: Strongly Agree

10. Please indicate your satisfaction with the availability of the instructor outside the classroom by choosing one response from the scale below. (In selecting your rating, consider the instructor’s availability via established office hours, appointments, and other opportunities for face-to-face interaction as well as via telephone, email, fax and other means.

**Responses for question 10**

1: Very Dissatisfied   2: Dissatisfied   3: Satisfied   4: Very Satisfied

Dissatisfied

**Student information**

11. I am satisfied with my accomplishments in this course. (yes or no)
12. This was a required course for me. (yes or no)
13. I am majoring in the area in which this course is being taught. (yes or no)
14. I expect to receive an A, B, C, D, F, or P in this course.

**Open-ended questions**

What are the strengths of the course and/or instructor?
What are the weaknesses of the course and/or instructor?
What suggestions do you have to improve this course?
optional open-ended question written by instructor/department/college
12 optional questions chosen from the list below or written by the instructor may be used if desired.

**Classroom teaching performance**
- The instructor used real world problems or case studies to explain topics effectively.
- The instructor encouraged classroom discussion.
- Regular attendance was necessary in order to learn and understand course material.
- The instructor effectively demonstrated skills to be learned.
- Within time limits of the course, the instructor covered course topics in sufficient depth.
- The instructor's teaching made you want to improve your course-related skills.
- The instructor's citation of personal experiences increased your understanding of the subject matter.
- The instructor's use of examples of his/her own research facilitated students' learning.
- The instructor encouraged creative approaches to problems and projects.
- The instructor encouraged students to share information with others and contribute to class learning.
- The instructor used students comments and questions to assess needs for additional lecture.
- The instructor provided notes or other handouts which facilitated learning of course material.
- The instructor demonstrated a thorough knowledge of course topics.
- Overall, this course is among the best I have ever taken.
- Overall, this instructor is among the best teachers I have known.

**Assignments, projects, papers, and textbooks.**
- The textbook was beneficial in this course.
- The amount of time required to complete assignments was appropriate to your course load.
- Assignments were related to course objectives.
- Reading assignments facilitated understanding of lectures.
- Non-textbook readings increased your understanding of course material.
- Papers and reports were graded promptly and returned with adequate feedback.
- The instructor guided but did not dictate students' work on projects.

**Face and schedule of class work.**
- The amount of material the instructor attempted to cover was appropriate.
- There was sufficient opportunity for students to ask questions during class periods.
- The instructor was willing to pause and review difficult points.

**Relations with students.**
- The instructor seemed to care about whether students learned course material.
- The instructor encouraged students to ask questions and comment on class activities.
- The instructor was receptive to student viewpoints.
- The instructor recognized that students differ in abilities, interests, and obligations.

**Laboratory, studio or recitation**
- The laboratory (recitation or studio) sessions contributed significantly to your learning of course material.
- The laboratory (or recitation) presented material which added to that presented in lectures.
- The laboratory (recitation or studio) instructor effectively explained difficult aspects of lecture material.
- Laboratory (recitation or studio) work was correlated with lecture content.
- The laboratory (recitation or studio) instructor was receptive to different approaches to problem solution.

**Team-taught courses**
- The team teachers coordinated their instructional efforts.
- Evaluation of student learning was effectively coordinated by the team teachers.

**Additional class and class environment items/audio-visual aids**
- The room in which class was held was of adequate size for the class.
- The size of the class was appropriate to the nature of the course objectives.
- It was not difficult to hear the instructor or other speakers.
- Classroom lighting was adequate.
- The temperature of the classroom was comfortable.
- The instructor made adequate use of audio and visual aid equipment.
MEMO TO: Steffen Rogers
Provost

FROM: Dan Wueste, Chair
Ad hoc Withdrawal Policy Committee

REF: Recommended Changes to Withdrawal Policy

DATE: January 22, 1998

During the Fall 1997 Semester, you appointed an ad hoc committee to review the University's current withdrawal policy which encompasses the drop/add period. Committee members were: Dan Wueste (Chair), Nancy Ferguson (faculty), Linda Stephens (faculty), George Carter (Undergraduate Academic Services), Meghan Graves (student), Matt Wyche (student), Debra Sparacino (Records and Registration) and Calvin Becker (Records and Registration).

The committee met on November 11 and 24, 1997, January 21, 1998 and February 18, 1998. Issues related to the current policy were discussed and benchmarking institutions were surveyed regarding their policies. Input was also gathered from students and faculty through Student Government, the Faculty Senate, and the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee.

After review of the current policy and discussion of issues related to it, our committee recommends that the University adopt the following policy regarding drops, adds and withdrawals:

Adding classes:

At the beginning of each regular fall or spring semester, students will have one week in which to add classes. Proportionate time periods will apply during summer sessions.

Dropping classes:

At the beginning of each regular fall or spring semester, students will have one week in which to drop classes or change sections without receiving W grades. Courses dropped after the first week of classes and through the end of the eighth week of the semester will be recorded with W grades. Courses dropped after the first week of classes and through the end of the eighth week of the semester will be recorded with W grades. Courses dropped after the first week of classes and through the end of the eighth week of the semester will be recorded with W grades. Courses dropped after the first week of classes and through the end of the eighth week of the semester will be recorded with W grades. (There will be no limit on the number of W grades allowed per student.) After the eighth week, final grades will be recorded in all courses and no drops will be allowed except in extraordinary circumstances of documented medical or other verified, unforeseen situations of personal or family hardship. Proportionate time periods will apply during summer sessions. A grade of F will be recorded for each course in which a student ceases attendance or violates the class attendance policy after the last day to drop or withdraw without receiving final grades. Any variance from these restrictions must be approved by the provost or the provost's designee and must be requested within 90 calendar days (exclusive of summer vacation) from the date printed on the grade report. The student must document the circumstances supporting the request.
Withdrawing from the University:

At the beginning of each regular fall or spring semester, students will have one week in which to withdraw from the University without receiving W grades. Students who withdraw from the University after the first week of classes and through the end of the eighth week will have W grades recorded. (There will be no limit on the number of W grades allowed per student.) After the eighth week, no withdrawals will be allowed except in extraordinary circumstances of documented medical or other verified, unforeseen situations of personal or family hardship. Proportionate time periods will apply during summer sessions. A grade of F will be recorded for each course in which a student ceases attendance or violates the class attendance policy after the last day to withdraw without final grades. Any variance from these restrictions must be approved by the provost or the provost’s designee and must be requested within 90 calendar days (exclusive of summer vacation) from the date printed on the grade report. The student must document the circumstances supporting the request.

Rationale:

- The current policy allows four weeks for students to drop without record. Consequently, a very large number of drops occur too late in the term for other students to enroll in the classes. This committee believes that many students decide after the first or second class meeting (after obtaining and reviewing the class syllabus) to drop a course without record; however, human nature leads them to wait until the deadline date four weeks later to actually drop the course. This committee’s recommended policy would make the last day to add and the last day to drop without record the same – at the end of the first week of classes. Since the registration system allows academic departments to add students at their discretion during the second week of classes, departments could control and utilize any seats dropped at the end of the first week to make registration corrections, section changes, or to help students who need courses for graduation, etc.

- Some faculty have criticized the current policy because the four week period to drop without record encourages students to take courses without “committing” to them until more than a month into the semester. This period of “unstable” enrollment also makes it difficult to assign group projects and to assign and retrieve lab equipment. This committee’s recommended policy would shorten the drop-without-record period from four weeks to one week.

- For many of the same reasons, some faculty believe that allowing students to drop until the end of the 10th week of the semester is too late. These faculty feel that they spend a lot of time and energy on many students who drop when two-thirds of the semester is over. This committee’s recommendation would move back the last day to drop without receiving final grades by two weeks to one week after mid-term. The committee believes that, if faculty observe the current policy that requires them to advise students of their mid-term grades this should allow students sufficient time to make a decision to drop.

- The 14 hour limit on “W” hours is confusing to students. Many students who wish to drop courses because they are failing become emotionally distraught when they learn that they have exhausted their “W” hours and that an “F” grade will be recorded for the course. The limits are particularly burdensome to transfer students who already have the lowest priority in scheduling their classes and struggle with course availability and issues related to course evaluations.
• The 14 hour limit on "W" hours is confusing to faculty. Many faculty object to assigning "F" grades to students who discontinue attendance in their classes but cannot officially drop the courses because they have used up their 14 "W" hours. The students, according to these faculty, haven't earned "F's". This results in missing grades at the end of the semester and messy academic records for the students.

• Regarding the issue of limits on W hours, the committee believes that students should be allowed to decide for themselves how many W's on their own records would be acceptable. It was agreed that we should be allowing students to learn to make responsible decisions as adults and, if they do not, they must learn to deal with the consequences. The committee believes that most students do not want multiple W's on their records. Thus, shortening the drop-without-record period is likely to have the welcome result that students will be more committed to their classes during the W period. There are other reasons for dropping the limit on W hours. The reasons students have for exceeding the current limits are so varied (personal and family illnesses, work schedules, etc.) that it is very difficult to administer exceptions fairly and consistently. Students who find themselves in these situations are typically under emotional duress and being forced to take F grades (if their W hour limits are exhausted) compounds the problem.

/CDC

C: Calvin Becker
   George Carter
   Nancy Ferguson
   Meghan Graves
   Debra Sparacino
   Linda Stephens
   Matt Wyche
Faculty Senate
Welfare Committee
February 10, 1998
Report to Faculty Senate
Members:
Subhash Anand
Francis Eubanks
Elham Makram
John Leininger

The Welfare Committee has addressed the following issues:

1. Determining the grouping of colleges for selecting the Centennial Professorship candidates. This is the first time the position is open since the reorganization of the University.

The number breakdown is as follows:

Agriculture, Forestry and Life Sciences ............ 242 (approx. 22 are ext.)
Library .......................................................... 25
Group Total ........................................ 267

Architecture, Arts, and Humanities ............... 196
Business and Public Affairs ......................... 128
Group Total ........................................ 324

Engineering and Science ............................. 259
Health, Education and Human Development ........ 95
Group Total ........................................ 354

Total ............................................... 945

Rotation:
1998 AAH BPA
2000 E&S HEHD
2002 AFLS Library

2. After contacting the HR department, we have been told that 9 month employees are covered by Workmen's Compensation during the summer (when they are not on the payroll), as long as the activity they were performing when injured would normally be part of their job during a standard semester. We have not been able to get in writing neither the interpretation of this policy nor what the compensation would cover. We will continue to follow up on these issues.

3. Other topics presented to the committee deal with tuition waiver for employees children, and possible changes in sick days/annual leave day accounting changes. There is not enough detail to report on either of these topics to date.

Any input you might have towards these issues may be directed to John Leininger (ljohn@clemson.edu).
Report from the Policy Committee

January 29, 1998

The Policy Committee met on January 20, 1998. The following matters were discussed, and the indicated actions were taken.

1. The proposed Research Data Access and Retention Policy: The Committee Chair discussed this with Issac Wallace, Records Manager in the Library, and decided to refer it back to the Research Committee. An e-mail has been sent to Ed Pivorun to that effect. Both Issac Wallace and Stan smith raised the question of retention of grade books by faculty. It turns out that the 1996-1997 senate passed a Manual change establishing such a policy. It was decided to leave the current policy unchanged.

2. Proposed changes in the Scholarships and Awards Committee: This has been put on hold, since there are many more pressing matters.

3. A Manual revision concerning "Reappointment of Department Chairs:" The draft proposal was discussed, and revised. To be considered under new business.

4. Evaluation of Administrators: The revised form was discussed, and some minor changes were suggested. This will be considered under new business.

5. The Policy Committee continued consideration of the ad hoc Committee report on the "Periodic Review." It was concluded that the best approach will be to revise the current tenure and promotion procedures to incorporate some of the changes proposed in the document. We will continue consideration of this document at the February meeting.

6. The proposed "Research Professor" policy received from the Provost, with an accompanying proposed Manual revision, was discussed. Some of the members of the Committee felt that this was a "Trojan Horse" designed to increase the teaching loads of non-research faculty. There were also some misgivings expressed concerning yet another method of employing non-tenure eligible faculty members. The Committee recommended a change in title to "Senior Research Fellow." On Wednesday the 21st, the Committee Chair received a request from Provost Rogers for a meeting. The meeting was held on Monday the 26th, with the Senate President present. It was agreed that the "Senior Research Fellow" policy would be withdrawn, and that the research faculty ranks could come to the Senate floor, but not as a Policy Committee resolution.

The Policy Committee meets at 3:30 P.M. on (usually) the third Tuesday of each month. Our next meeting will be Tuesday, February 17th in the library conference room (LL3).
Performance Funding for Beginners
A Primer on South Carolina's New System

By
J. Thornton Kirby
Executive Secretary to the Board of Trustees
Clemson University

By virtue of my training as a lawyer, I often feel compelled to issue disclaimers. In keeping with that compulsion, I want to state that the title of this article is not intended to insult readers. On the contrary, it is intended to convey the purpose of the document—to provide basic education about a new funding system for higher education. In point of fact, I myself am a beginner in performance funding, having served as Clemson University's liaison to the Commission on Higher Education for seven short months. (Fortunately for us all, no one in South Carolina pretends to be an expert on this subject. As a result, legislators, policy makers, and higher education administrators are all very receptive to suggestions that might make our new system more successful.) With this rather satisfying disclaimer under my belt, I'll commence.

Background

In 1996, the South Carolina General Assembly reacted to concerns about accountability in higher education by adopting a sweeping bill that changed the basis for funding public colleges and universities in this state. The legislation, known in higher education circles as "Act 359," became effective on July 1, 1996. Simply stated, Act 359 abolished the traditional enrollment-based funding methodology in favor of a performance-based system. Although a few other states have flirted with performance-based funding for higher education, no other state has pursued this concept as far—or as fast—as South Carolina. At the end of a three-year phase-in period, one hundred percent (100%) of state appropriations for higher education will be distributed through the new methodology.

The Concept of Performance Funding

In South Carolina, public colleges and universities have traditionally been funded on the basis of their enrollment. In other words, the more students an institution enrolls, the more money the institution receives from the state. As the public outcry for accountability in government has increased, enrollment-based funding systems have come under increasing scrutiny. Conceptually, a funding system based on enrollment is hard to defend. Although enrollment figures reflect the size of an institution (and presumably the amount of money required to support it), enrollment does not take into account programmatic costs, which vary depending on the type of degrees offered. For example, a liberal arts college generally has a much less expensive infrastructure than a research university, since classrooms generally cost less than research laboratories. This
is a simplistic example, but it illustrates one of the flaws inherent in an enrollment-based funding system.

Performance-based funding, on the other hand, appropriates money according to institutional behavior. The methodology rewards desired behavior and punishes unwanted behavior by increasing or decreasing funding. In South Carolina, performance is judged by measuring 37 factors, called "performance indicators." The 37 performance indicators are displayed on a uniform scorecard, and the institutions with the highest scores receive the most money. Not surprisingly, every institution strives to conform to the objectives set forth by the state.

Oversight and Administration of the New System

Any new system with such wide impact requires intensive oversight during implementation. The General Assembly has delegated responsibility for implementation and administration of performance funding to the Commission on Higher Education, more commonly known as the CHE. The CHE has the unenviable task of developing explicit measures for each of the 37 performance indicators set forth in Act 359, most of which are open to varying interpretations. For example, one of the indicators required by Act 359 is the average SAT score of entering freshmen. Money magazine measures SAT scores by taking the middle 50th percentile of all SAT scores (discarding the top and bottom quarters to get a more accurate picture of the average student). Another valid method is to take the average of all SAT scores. The CHE has decided to track the percentage of students who score above the national average. Compared to our peers, Clemson should fare well on any of these measures. Our performance, however, will vary depending on the way SAT scores are measured. On other indicators, the particular measurement used may have an adverse impact on Clemson.

How the System Works

Because of the diversity among South Carolina's 33 public institutions, the CHE has subdivided them into four sectors. Clemson is in the Research Sector, along with USC-Columbia and the Medical University of South Carolina. The other three sectors are the Teaching University Sector (four-year colleges), the Regional Campuses Sector (two-year colleges), and the Technical Colleges Sector. These groupings are important because the each institution's score depends in large part upon the performance of other institutions within the same sector.

On each indicator, an institution can theoretically receive 6 points. The actual score is determined by comparing year-end results to two performance targets (called "benchmarks"), one of which is set by the CHE (the "sector benchmark") and the other of which is set by the institution (the "institutional benchmark"). Scoring is governed by the CHE's Performance Rating Criteria, set forth below.
Performance Rating Criteria

6 Exemplary Performance: Performance substantially exceeds institutional and sector benchmarks and represents extraordinary effort. (This is a “bonus” rating beyond the five point scale.)

5 Exceeds Goals: Performance is above institutional benchmarks.

4 Meets Goals: Performance meets institutional benchmarks.

3 Satisfactory Progress: Performance falls below institutional benchmarks, but represents progress towards goals.

2 Needs Improvement: Performance falls below institutional benchmarks.

1 Non-compliance: Performance falls substantially below institutional benchmarks.

0 Non-compliance following a probationary period during which the institution continues to show no effort to improve.

Establishing Proper Benchmarks

After reviewing the Performance Rating Criteria, even a casual observer will realize the importance of establishing proper benchmarks. If benchmarks are set too high, scores (and consequently funding) will be low. If benchmarks are not high enough, the new system will not achieve its purpose—encouraging better performance by the state’s public institutions. The conclusion? Setting the right benchmark is critical to success in South Carolina’s performance funding system.

Sector benchmarks are established by the CHE, and they convey the state’s official desires for future performance. In setting the sector benchmarks, the CHE takes into account current performance by each institution in the sector, the average performance of all institutions in the sector, and the difficulties associated with changing institutional performance.

Institutional benchmarks are set by the schools and are subject to approval by the CHE. If the CHE does not feel a particular benchmark is sufficiently aggressive, the CHE can refuse to approve it. In such cases the institution must revise its benchmarks until approval is given. The process of setting institutional benchmarks is the most important aspect of performance funding. In order to obtain maximum funding from the state, an institution needs to set aggressive benchmarks that can not only be attained, but also exceeded. Meeting the benchmark results in a score of 4, whereas exceeding it results in a score of 5. Unrealistically aggressive benchmarks set the institution up for failure—if the target is not met, the score will likely be a 3. Since each point is worth
tens of thousands (or perhaps hundreds of thousands) of dollars, sacrificing points because of unrealistic goal setting is very costly.

What are the Performance Indicators to be Measured?

The 37 performance indicators will be phased in over three years. They address numerous issues, including (a) the institution's mission statement, (b) its average class size, (c) average faculty compensation, (d) average number of credit hours taught by the faculty, (e) average SAT score and GPA of the entering freshman class, (f) the ratio of administrative costs to academic costs, (g) general overhead costs per student, (h) the in-state student percentage, (i) the minority student percentage, (j) graduation rate, and (k) availability of faculty to students outside the classroom.

These are just a few of the 37 indicators, but they represent the type of factors to be considered. On each indicator, the CHE indicates the direction to be pursued (in other words, for average SAT score the CHE wants performance to increase) as well as the target to be achieved by the sector (for SAT score, the research sector benchmark is to have 75% of all students scoring above the national average).

The Outlook for Clemson Under Performance Funding

1. Clemson expects to fare well under any system that objectively measures quality and performance. Money magazine rates Clemson as one of the best buys in the nation, and the best in South Carolina. Although Money magazine and the CHE use different rating systems to measure quality, we are confident Clemson will receive high marks.

2. Clemson leads the state in several areas:

   Our entering freshman classes have consistently had the highest average SAT scores in the state.

   Clemson has the lowest general overhead cost per student in the research sector.

   Clemson's graduates earn the fewest additional credit hours over the number required for graduation of any research university. (In other words, our graduates are on track for their majors and don't take many unnecessary classes. Because the state funds a large percentage of higher education, the new system values efficiency and encourages students to take only the courses required for graduation.)

3. Clemson needs to make progress in several areas:

   Minority enrollment at Clemson is lower than at other research universities. Although Clemson's retention rate for minority students is almost exactly the same as the rate for other students (81% for black students compared to 83% for
white students), we do need to work to increase the minority percentage of our student body.

Research grants have been declining in recent years, due largely to the retirement of an unusually large number of senior faculty members several years ago. We have been hiring new faculty members, but their research grants have not yet grown to the level of their predecessors.

Graduation rates are down slightly over the past three years, but this phenomenon is occurring across the country. As the economy improves, a fair number of students who could not find work after high school (and for whom college was a second choice) leave school to enter the work force. This does not represent a large percentage of our students, but the number is significant enough to cause a slight downturn in our graduation rates.

4. Clemson's success in the future depends on a team approach to performance funding. It is difficult to affect performance in many areas, particularly those involving every aspect of the university. Average class size and the percentages of our budget devoted to certain areas depend on many factors that cannot be controlled by a single person, not even the President. In order to control the average class size, for example, the Provost, the Deans, the Registrar, and the faculty must all work together to achieve common objectives. Since universities are traditionally decentralized, this poses a major challenge for all of higher education. The schools who manage change most effectively will receive the most funding.

Attachments:

2. Phase-in schedule for funding and performance indicators
3. Listing of Public Institutions by sector
4. One page overview, entitled “The Bottom Line”

(A) The General Assembly has determined that the critical success factors, in priority order, for academic quality in the several institutions of higher learning in this State are as follows:

1. Mission Focus;
2. Quality of Faculty;
3. Classroom Quality;
4. Institutional Cooperation and Collaboration;
5. Administrative Efficiency;
6. Entrance Requirements;
7. Graduates’ Achievements;
8. User-friendliness of the Institution;
9. Research Funding.

(B) The General Assembly has determined that whether or not an institution embodies these critical success factors can be measured by the following performance indicators as reflected under the critical success factors below:

1. Mission Focus
   
   (a) expenditure of funds to achieve institutional mission;
   
   (b) curricula offered to achieve mission;
   
   (c) approval of a mission statement;
   
   (d) adoption of a strategic plan to support the mission statement;
   
   (e) attainment of goals of the strategic plan.

2. Quality of Faculty
   
   (a) academic and other credentials of professors and instructors;
   
   (b) performance review system for faculty to include student and peer evaluations;
   
   (c) post-tenure review for tenured faculty;
(d) compensation of faculty;
(e) availability of faculty to students outside the classroom;
(f) community and public service activities of faculty for which no extra compensation is paid.

(3) Instructional Quality
(a) class sizes and student/teacher ratios;
(b) number of credit hours taught by faculty;
(c) ratio of full-time faculty as compared to other full-time employees;
(d) accreditation of degree-granting programs;
(e) institutional emphasis on quality teacher education and reform.

(4) Institutional Cooperation and Collaboration
(a) sharing and use of technology, programs, equipment, supplies, and source matter experts within the institution, with other institutions, and with the business community;
(b) cooperation and collaboration with private industry.

(5) Administrative Efficiency
(a) percentage of administrative costs as compared to academic costs;
(b) use of best management practices;
(c) elimination of unjustified duplication of and waste in administrative and academic programs;
(d) amount of general overhead costs.

(6) Entrance Requirements
(a) SAT and ACT scores of student body;
(b) high school class standing, grade point averages, and activities of student body;
(c) post-secondary nonacademic achievements of student body;
(d) priority on enrolling in-state residents.

(7) Graduates' Achievements
(a) graduation rate;
(b) employment rate for graduates;
(c) employer feedback on graduates who were employed or not employed;
(d) scores of graduates on post-undergraduate professional, graduate, or employment-related examinations and certification tests;
(e) number of graduates who continued their education;
(f) credit hours earned of graduates.

(8) User-Friendliness of Institution
(a) transferability of credits to and from the institution;
(b) continuing education programs for graduates and others;
(c) accessibility to the institution of all citizens of the State.

(9) Research Funding
(a) financial support for reform in teacher education;
(b) amount of public and private sector grants.

(C) The commission, when using the critical success factors for the purpose of funding recommendations for institutions of higher learning, is required to use objective, measurable criteria.

(D) Critical success factors developed and used for the purpose of funding recommendations shall be those which are directly related to the missions of the particular type of institution as outlined in Section 59-103-15(B) and not those factors which are not relevant to the success factors of the particular type of institution.

HISTORY: 1996 Act No. 359, § 4, eff July 1, 1996.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funds Affected:</strong> 25% of new appropriations over base year 1996</td>
<td><strong>Funds Affected:</strong> 75% of new appropriations over base year 1996</td>
<td><strong>Funds Affected:</strong> 100% of all appropriations for higher education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance Indicators to be Considered</strong></td>
<td><strong>Performance Indicators to be Considered</strong></td>
<td><strong>Performance Indicators to be Considered</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Compensation of Faculty</td>
<td>2. Compensation of Faculty</td>
<td>2. Compensation of Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Class size and student/teacher ratios</td>
<td>3. Class size and student/teacher ratios</td>
<td>3. Class size and student/teacher ratios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Number of credit hours taught by faculty</td>
<td>4. Number of credit hours taught by faculty</td>
<td>4. Number of credit hours taught by faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Ratio of full-time faculty compared to other full-time employees</td>
<td>5. Ratio of full-time faculty compared to other full-time employees</td>
<td>5. Ratio of full-time faculty compared to other full-time employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Percentage of degree-granting programs accredited</td>
<td>6. Percentage of degree-granting programs accredited</td>
<td>6. Percentage of degree-granting programs accredited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Percentage of administrative costs compared to academic costs</td>
<td>7. Percentage of administrative costs compared to academic costs</td>
<td>7. Percentage of administrative costs compared to academic costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. SAT scores of student body</td>
<td>9. SAT scores of student body</td>
<td>9. SAT scores of student body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. In-state student percentage</td>
<td>10. In-state student percentage</td>
<td>10. In-state student percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Average number of credit hours earned by graduates</td>
<td>12. Average number of credit hours earned by graduates</td>
<td>12. Average number of credit hours earned by graduates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Accessibility of the institution to all citizens of the state, as measured by:</td>
<td>13. Accessibility of the institution to all citizens of the state, as measured by:</td>
<td>13. Accessibility of the institution to all citizens of the state, as measured by:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Percentage of other race students</td>
<td>• percentage of other race students</td>
<td>• percentage of other race students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• credit hours generated through distance learning</td>
<td>• credit hours generated through distance learning</td>
<td>• credit hours generated through distance learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• in-state, undergraduate tuition and required fees are not more than XX% of S.C. personal per capita income</td>
<td>• in-state, undergraduate tuition and required fees are not more than XX% of S.C. personal per capita income</td>
<td>• in-state, undergraduate tuition and required fees are not more than XX% of S.C. personal per capita income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Expenditure of funds to achieve institutional mission</td>
<td>15. Expenditure of funds to achieve institutional mission</td>
<td>15. Expenditure of funds to achieve institutional mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Adoption of a strategic plan to support the mission statement</td>
<td>17. Adoption of a strategic plan to support the mission statement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Performance review system for faculty to include student and peer evaluations</td>
<td>18. Performance review system for faculty to include student and peer evaluations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Availability of faculty to students outside the classroom</td>
<td>19. Availability of faculty to students outside the classroom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Use of best management practices</td>
<td>20. Use of best management practices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Elimination of unjustified duplication and waste in administrative and academic programs</td>
<td>21. Elimination of unjustified duplication and waste in administrative and academic programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. High school standing, grade point averages, and activities of student body</td>
<td>22. High school standing, grade point averages, and activities of student body</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Post-secondary non-academic achievement of student body</td>
<td>23. Post-secondary non-academic achievement of student body</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Graduation rate</td>
<td>24. Graduation rate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Transferability of credits to and from the institution</td>
<td>25. Transferability of credits to and from the institution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Attainment of goals of the strategic plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Academic and other credentials of professors and instructors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Post-tenure review for tenured faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Community or public service activities of faculty for which no extra compensation is paid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Institutional emphasis on quality teacher education and reform</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Sharing of technology and expertise within the institution, with other institutions, and with the business community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Cooperation and collaboration with private industry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Employment rate for graduates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Employer feedback on graduates who were employed or not employed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Number of graduates who continue their education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Continuing education programs for graduates and others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Institutions by Sector

Research Sector
Clemson University
USC - Columbia
Medical University of S.C.

Teaching University Sector
The Citadel
Coastal Carolina University
College of Charleston
Francis Marion University
Lander University
S.C. State University
USC - Aiken
USC - Spartanburg
Winthrop University

Regional Campuses Sector
USC - Beaufort
USC - Lancaster
USC - Salkehatchie
USC - Sumter
USC - Union

Technical Colleges Sector
Aiken
Central Carolina
Chesterfield - Marlboro
Denmark
Florence - Darlington
Greenville
Horry - Georgetown
Midlands
Orangeburg - Calhoun
Piedmont
Spartanburg
TC of the Lowcountry
Tri-County
Trident
Williamsburg
York
The Bottom Line

Measuring Performance of All Institutions

Each public institution will be graded on its performance compared to two goals: (1) an institutional benchmark and (2) a sector benchmark. The institutional benchmark will be established by the institution itself with approval by the CHE, and the sector benchmark will be established by the CHE.

Five points will be awarded to institutions that exceed their own benchmarks, with an additional “bonus” point to be awarded to institutions that exceed both their own benchmark and their sector benchmark. Funding will ultimately be distributed based on each institution’s total score, so the establishment of appropriate benchmarks is critical.

Measuring Performance of Research Sector Institutions—Clemson, USC, and MUSC

The research sector benchmarks proposed by the CHE staff were loosely based on the average performance of Clemson and USC. After numerous requests for adoption of the recommendations of the Research Sector Committee, it now appears likely that research sector benchmarks will be based on each institution’s aspirational peers. While this benchmarking against peer institutions lessens the competition between Clemson, USC, and MUSC, it does not entirely eliminate competition. Clemson, USC, and MUSC will be competing with each other on the basis of how rapidly they are advancing on their respective aspirational peer groups.

Scoring versus Funding

- Clemson’s performance under the new model will be expressed as a numerical score. This score will be based on whether we meet or exceed our institutional and sector benchmarks as subjectively determined by the CHE.

- Clemson’s funding under the new model will be based not on our score in the abstract, but on our score as compared to the scores of USC and MUSC.

- Clemson will not necessarily receive more funding by improving its performance; Clemson will only receive more funding if its performance improves at a rate faster than that of USC and MUSC.
at issue. Rather, the issues are whether or not some unfair or improper influence so colored or affected the judgment of the faculty or administrator that the decision reached would have been different had not such improper or unfair influence existed and/or whether substantially improper or unfair implementation of departmental, college, or University policies or procedures has occurred. Thus, so long as the appropriate policies and procedures were followed the only issues are the existence of improper or unfair influences and the extent of their influence upon the decision involved. The complainant has the burden of proof in establishing that such influence existed and that its presence dictated the nature of the decision reached.

iii. Within fifteen days of the final hearing, the Panel shall submit its findings and recommendations to the Provost along with appropriate documents and records. In the event the Provost has been recused from a decision making capacity, the findings and recommendations shall be submitted to the President. Simultaneously, a copy of the Panel’s findings and recommendations shall be forwarded to the grievant, and the respondent.

g. Upon receipt of the Hearing Panel’s recommendation, the Provost shall review the matter, requesting any persons involved to provide additional information as needed. The Provost shall render a final decision no later than fifteen days after the receipt of the Panel’s recommendation. The decision and findings of the Provost, including the rationale for the decision, together with the report of the Hearing Panel, shall be transmitted in writing to the faculty member, the Hearing Panel, and all named parties.
AMENDED MODIFICATION
OF
PROCEDURES FOR EVALUATION OF ADMINISTRATORS

Page 11, Section L. of the Faculty Manual, "Review of Academic Administrators",

"Before the end of a department chair's second [and fourth] year in office and every fourth [third] year thereafter, the appropriate dean shall conduct a formal review of that chair's performance."

"Likewise, the Provost shall review the performance of deans [,] before the end of the dean's fifth [fourth] year in office and every fifth [fourth] year thereafter, ...".

Passed unanimously by the
Faculty Senate
Executive/Advisory Committee
February 3, 1998
20 January 1998

To: Policy Committee Chair John W. Huffman
Thru: Faculty Senate President Francis A. McGuire
From: Robert A. Waller, Editorial Consultant for the
Faculty Manual

Re: Addition of Academic Title "Senior Research Fellow" and Change in "Research Associate" to "Post Doctoral Research Fellow"

Pages 16 ff. in the current Faculty Manual outline the qualifications for the regular and special faculty ranks. Among the special ranks, provision is made for a "Research Associate (with Faculty Rank)" for those engaged in a special research function (page 17).

Given the importance now being attached to attracting research dollars, it is suggested that a more prestigious title be associated with those who engage exclusively in externally funded research projects with an expected permanent commitment to the institution. Such a change would be consistent with the practices of such peer institutions as North Carolina State University.

To effect this change, the following language would be inserted following "Lecturers" and before "Research Associate" on page 17:

Senior Research Fellow. The title of Senior Research Fellow may be granted to experienced persons engaged full time in research who are supported exclusively from external research funds or foundation accounts. Such appointments will be contingent on the availability of a specific source of funds and may be limited to the duration of a particular grant. Senior Research Fellow is not a tenurable position.

Consistent with this change, the title and description for "Research Associate (with Faculty Rank)" would be replaced with the following to denote a special category for the "post doc" experience. To wit:

This Agenda item was tabled.
Post Doctoral Research Fellow. This title denotes an appointment for special research functions, typically in connection with externally funded research projects. The individuals appointed shall have the general qualifications for regular faculty. The term of appointment normally shall not exceed one year. Limited renewals are possible.

In this manner the institution would facilitate the attraction of two types of specialists - research professors with the potential for a long-term commitment and post doctorates in a learning mode - whose sole contribution would be toward the research mission of the University. If further particulars are needed about this position, please contact Chief Research Officer Y. T. Shah or Provost Steffen Rogers.

c.c.: Academic Vice President and Provost Steffen H. Rogers
Chief Research Officer Y. T. Shah
Research Committee Chair Edward B. Pivorun
1997-98 Policy Committee members
Mesdames Betty M. Moore and Cathy T. Sturkie
1 September 1997

To: Policy Committee Chair John W. Huffman
Thru: Faculty Senate President Francis A. McGuire
From: Robert A. Waller, Editorial Consultant for the
Faculty Manual
Re: Reappointment of Department Chairs/School Directors

In two places the August 1997 Faculty Manual makes provision for the reappointment of department chairs/school directors. Among the many duties assigned the collegiate dean is to "periodically review and evaluate the performances of the department chairs and school directors" (p. 8). The concluding paragraph in the description of the department chairs notes: "Department chairs serve at the pleasure of their respective school directors and collegiate deans, who formally evaluate the performance in office of chairs reporting to them before the end of the second year in office and every third year thereafter" (p. 9). [Underlined language reflects the Faculty Senate action of January 13, 1998 concerning modification of procedures for evaluation of administrators.]

It has been customary at Clemson for the College Dean to consult with the Provost about departmental leadership before renewing an appointment. Provision for such administrative courtesy is noteworthy by its absence in the current Faculty Manual. Research into previous manuals reveals that there was a point in time (1960) when the appointment and reappointment of "heads of teaching and research departments" were presented to the Board of Trustees as "the final approving authority" (p. 28). In 1985 and thereafter the present language was adopted and has remained institutional policy with the unstated expectation that consultation would occur between the dean and the provost.

The time has come to codify that requirement of consultation. Toward that end, the following modifications to the Manual are proposed:
A. To the manyfold duties of the Provost outlined on page 7, paragraph 1, line 7 insert the following:

    counsels with college deans concerning faculty
evaluation and reappointment of department chairs/
school directors;

B. To the litany of obligations incurred by college deans add the following on page 8, line 12:

    periodically review and evaluate the performances
of the department chairs and school directors as
outlined in the policy for evaluation of adminis-
trators in concert with the Provost concerning re-
appointment recommendations;

C. To the paragraph concerning the department chair’s tenure in office on page 9, paragraph 2, line 3 insert this sentence:

    In making recommendations for reappointment, deans
will transmit the results of the faculty evalua-
tion and confer with the Provost before renewing
the appointment.

In this fashion the chief academic officer of the University would be assured of input (rather than relying upon custom) into this important decision-making process occurring at the college level affecting departmental and school operations.

c.c.: Academic Vice President and Provost Steffen H. Rogers
Collegiate Deans and Dean of Libraries
1997-98 Policy Committee Members
Mesdames Betty M. Moore and Cathy T. Sturkie
MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
MARCH 10, 1998

1. **Call to Order**  President Francis A. McGuire called the meeting to order at 2:40 p.m.

2. **Approval of Minutes**  The February 10, 1998 Faculty Senate Minutes were approved as distributed, as were the General Faculty and Staff Minutes dated December 15, 1997.

3. a. **Election of Officers**  The Advisory Committee brought forward its slate of candidates for Vice President/President-Elect and Secretary. The floor was opened for additional nominations. There being none, elections were held by secret ballot and simple majority. Horace Skipper was elected Vice President/President-Elect and Elizabeth Dale was elected Secretary.

4. **“Free Speech”**  Joseph F. Boykin, Jr., Dean of the Clemson University Libraries, provided information on the Libraries’ materials budget. This five-year budget plan will “stop the bleeding” and develop a solid base of permanent funding for the Libraries.

   Kendra Worley, representing Student Government, invited and encouraged faculty to participate in the Campus Sweep to be held on April 17th.

5. **Special Order of the Day**  Doris R. Helms explained the Faculty Activity System (FAS) as an online system for faculty to report all teaching, research, and service activities for the purpose of record-keeping, evaluation, and personal workload management. Discussion followed (Attachment A).

6. Senator Sid Gauthreaux moved to modify the agenda to address two items listed under New Business (Draft Post Tenure Review Policy and the Budget Accountability Report). Motion was seconded. There being no discussion, vote to modify agenda was taken and passed unanimously.

   **Draft Post Tenure Review Policy** - Senator Huffman shared an abridged version of the CHE requirements to begin the discussion of the Post Tenure Review Policy (Attachment B). Much discussion was held as input and information to the Policy Committee. Senator Huffman extended an invitation to senators to the next Policy Committee on March 24th at 3:00 p.m.

   **Report from the Budget Accountability Committee** - R. Gordon Halfacre, Chair, began by noting appreciation of the Committee members and resource persons who contributed to the meetings throughout the year and then submitted and explained this Committee’s Report which indicates improvements over last year’s salary study (Attachment C).

7. **Committee Reports**

   a. **Research Committee** - Senator Ed Pivorun, Chair, stated that this Committee met to discuss the faculty overhead return policy and that most faculty are in agreement with it. Final decisions will be made by Chief Research Officer Y. T. Shah with input from faculty and the Research Council.
b. **Scholastic Policies Committee** - Chair Nancy Ferguson stated that there was no report.


d. **Finance Committee** - The Annual Report dated March 10, 1998 from this Committee was submitted by Senator Jack Peck (Attachment E).

e. **Policy Committee** - Senator John Huffman noted that action items will be addressed under New Business.

**University Committees and Commissions**

a. **Performance Funding** - Ronald J. Thurston, Chair, stated that this Committee was formed at the request of the Board of Trustees to study the latest performance funding criteria mandated by the state legislature and provide recommendations. Dr. Thurston announced that the final report will be submitted for acceptance at the April Senate meeting and will then proceed to the Board of Trustees.

b. **Faculty Development Center Committee** - Senator Kathy Neal Headley informed the Senate that this Committee is in the search process for the Director and that the review of applicants will begin on March 13th.

c. **University Committees** - Vice President/President-Elect Pat Smart stated that this Committee has been working to reduce the number of University committees and the number of faculty serving on each and submitted a draft overview which will be submitted to the Academic Council for action (Attachment F).

8. **President’s Report**

a. Secretary Headley announced that both the Selection Committee and the Faculty Senate Executive/Advisory Committee unanimously recommended Alumni Distinguished Professor R. Gordon Halfacre as the first Clemson University Ombudsman to the Provost for approval and appointment and that the offer has been made by the Provost and accepted by Dr. Halfacre.

President McGuire:

b. made reference to South Carolina Bill 4718 regarding tenure (Attachment G) and stated that he will recommend to President-Elect Smart to appoint Horace Skipper to convene a committee to determine if a response to this Bill is necessary and if so, how to respond. The Provost noted that it would be difficult to hire good faculty under this Bill; that this is a serious Bill; and that our lobbyists are working to defeat it. President McGuire stated that the response is for the good of the citizens of the state, not just faculty.

c. referred to Budget Recommendations passed by the South Carolina House of Representatives and suggested senators share this information with colleagues (Attachment H).

9. **Old Business**

a. Senate Alternate Myles Wallace made a motion to remove from the table the item regarding the Senior Research Fellow title. Motion was seconded. Required two-thirds vote to remove from table was taken and failed.
10. **New Business**

   a. The Proposal to the Board of Trustees for a Faculty Representative to the Board was submitted by President McGuire on behalf of the Executive/Advisory Committee. Vote to accept proposal was taken and passed unanimously (Attachment I).

   b. Resolution of Thanks and Appreciation to the Board of Trustees from the Executive/Advisory Committee was submitted by President McGuire. Vote to accept resolution was taken and passed unanimously (FS98-3-1 P) (Attachment J).

   c. Resolution of Thanks and Appreciation to President Curris was presented from the Executive/Advisory Committee by President McGuire. Vote to accept resolution was taken and passed unanimously (FS98-3-2 P) (Attachment K).

   d. A Faculty Manual and Faculty Constitution Change regarding the Nomination Pool for Senate Officers was submitted by Senator Huffman from the Policy Committee. Vote to accept was taken and passed unanimously with required two-thirds vote (Attachment L).

   e. Annual Spring Reception to honor new and retiring senators will be held on Tuesday, April 14, 1998 from 4:30-6:30 p.m. in the Madren Center

   f. President McGuire reminded senators that Faculty Senate elections are to be held during the month of March and reported to the Faculty Senate Office.

11. **Adjournment** The meeting was adjourned by President McGuire at 4:35 p.m.

---

Absent: P. Skewes, (V. Shelburne for), H. Wheeler, M. LaForge (P. Smith for), J. Leininger (M. Wallace for), S. Anand, E. Hare (G. Lickfield for)
1. Eliminate any use of "one-time" funds to support the acquisition of serial publications, including electronic licenses.

2. Maintain existing serial subscription base by annually increasing the materials budget by the amount of annual increase in cost.

3. Annually increasing the subscription base funding over the maintenance level by 3% of the total subscription budget to allow for acquisition of critical new journals and new electronic subscription resources.

4. Increasing the funding available for the purchase of books to at least $500,000 by 2002/2003 with the ultimate goal of reaching an annual budget for book acquisitions of $1,000,000 by 2007 from both state and private funding.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Private Funds</th>
<th>Sal. Sav</th>
<th>Carry Forw</th>
<th>Funds Available</th>
<th>Req. for Serials</th>
<th>Proj. Ser. Inc.</th>
<th>Books</th>
<th>Funds Required</th>
<th>Cumulative Recurring Funds</th>
<th>Provost Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>97/98</td>
<td>$2,010,000</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ (425,613)</td>
<td>$ 425,613</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98/99</td>
<td>$2,035,000</td>
<td>$103,869</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,268,869</td>
<td>$2,514,882</td>
<td>$2,265,299</td>
<td></td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$ 425,613</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99/00</td>
<td>$2,070,000</td>
<td>$103,869</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,564,481</td>
<td>$2,874,807</td>
<td>$2,765,593</td>
<td></td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>$ 510,328</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000/01</td>
<td>$2,348,299</td>
<td>$103,869</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,074,807</td>
<td>$3,326,767</td>
<td>$316,229</td>
<td></td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>$ 511,990</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001/02</td>
<td>$2,970,939</td>
<td>103,868</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,586,767</td>
<td>$3,757,767</td>
<td>$361,254</td>
<td></td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>$ 570,994</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002/03</td>
<td>$3,482,899</td>
<td>103,868</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,157,767</td>
<td>$4,296,248</td>
<td>$413,354</td>
<td></td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>$ 638,487</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

State: $2,010,000 97/98, $2,035,000 98/99, $2,348,299 2000/01, $2,970,939 2001/02, $3,482,899 2002/03
Private Funds: $103,869 97/98, $103,869 98/99, $103,868 2000/01, $103,868 2001/02, $103,868 2002/03
Sal. Sav: $60,000 97/98, 50,000 98/99, 0 2000/01, 0 2001/02, 0 2002/03
Carry Forw: $70,000 97/98, $250,000 98/99, 0 2000/01, 0 2001/02, 0 2002/03
Books: $100,000 97/98, $100,000 98/99, $200,000 2000/01, $300,000 2001/02, $400,000 2002/03
Funds Required: $ (425,613) 97/98, $ 425,613 98/99, $ 935,939 2000/01, $ 1,447,899 2001/02, $ 2,018,893 2002/03
Provost Funding: $ 100,000 (one time funds, $50,000 from Technology Fee), $ 25,000 (permanent funds to match Faculty Senate funding and to allow for us not to have to cancel any journal requested to be saved)
Welcome to the Clemson University Faculty Activity System (FAS). FAS makes it possible for faculty to systematically report all teaching, research, and service activities for the purpose of record-keeping, evaluation, and personal workload management. FAS also provides administrators with workload information that can be used to monitor changes, assess outcomes, and set goals for departments, colleges, and the University.

Individual workload is reported as credit hour equivalents (CrHrEq). It is expected that a full time equivalent (FTE) faculty member who is fully engaged can convert his/her normal workload into 12 CrHrEq per semester. Of these 12 CrHrEq, at least 9 CrHrEq are associated with a combination of teaching, funded research, and public-service outreach, as defined by our land-grant mission. The additional 3 CrHrEq are devoted to unfunded research and scholarship, professional development, student advising, and university or community service.

Each individual, in consultation with his/her department chair, sets CrHrEq goals and expectations for 11 Activity Areas. Associated with each of these Activity Areas are several reporting forms designed to make data entry fast and simple.

The first six Activity Areas include activities for which an average of 9 CrHrEq is expected. This does not mean that activities reported in other activity areas cannot substitute for a portion of this 9 CrHrEq. If a department chair, in consultation with a faculty member, decides that concentrated activity in an area (such as advising or a special committee assignment critical to the department/university), would normally provide full or partial “release” form a course assignment, research expectation or regular duties, then the appropriate CrHrEq can be assigned to this activity. This is noted in the free-text explanations associated with the Activity Goals and Accomplishments. Note that distribution of effort among the 9 CrHrEq may be different for each faculty member—some teaching more while others are involved in more administrative or research activities.

To begin, select Summary form the navigation bar at the top of this screen.

Enter comments about this system.

For problems or questions regarding this web Email DCIT Web Development Services.
Screen prints of Faculty Activity System:

**CLEMSON Faculty Activity System**

Select one of the activity areas below to enter your goal, see a list of your activities, enter your actual ChEhLq for this activity area. Numbers will be reflected on this page after entered.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Area</th>
<th>Goal ChEhLq</th>
<th>Number of Activities</th>
<th>Actual ChEhLq</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coursework</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Activities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Assignments</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsored Research</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Public Service</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarianship</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship and Non-Sponsored Research</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Student Adv/
Honors and Graduate Committees     | 0           | 0                    | 0             |
| Committees                                | 0           | 0                    | 0             |
| Professional and Personal Public Service  | 0           | 0                    | 0             |
| Professional and Personal Development     | 0           | 0                    | 0             |
| Honors and Awards                         | 0           | 0                    | 0             |

Enter comments about this system

For problems or questions regarding this web Email DCIT Web Development Services.

**Listing of Activity Areas and Activity Forms**

**Coursework**
- Course Analysis

**Instructional Activities**
- Continuing Education
- Short Courses and Institutes
- Pedagogical innovations

**Administrative Assignments**
- Department Chair
- Faculty Senate President
- Director of Academic Programs (Honors, etc.)
- University Ombudsman
- Administrative Assignments

**Sponsored Research**
- Funded Research Grant
- Publications
- Presentations/performances/exhibits
- Patents
- Research Proposal

**University Public Service**
Cooperative Extension Service Project
Public Service (non PSA Project)

Librarianship
Librarian Services

Scholarship and Non-Sponsored Research
Publications
Presentations/performances/exhibits
Patents
Scholarship/Research

Student Advising, Honors and Graduate Committees
Undergraduate Advising/Coordinator
Graduate Thesis/Dissertation Committee
Graduate Advising/Coordinator
Honors Advising
Honors Thesis Committee

Committees
Department Committees
College Committees
University Committees
Professional Committees
Public Service Committees
Other Committees

Professional and Personal Public Service
Editorship
Consulting
Personal Public Service
Professional Service

Professional and Personal Development
Leave/Sabbatical
Personal development activities
Professional development activities

Honors and Awards
Honors and Awards
Coursework

On this page is all the information concerning activities in the activity area above. The information is divided into sections:

1. **Courses** - the list of courses scheduled this semester.
2. **New** - Please see your scheduling coordinator to add courses.
3. **Goal CrHrEq** - Goals for the courses and estimated CrHrEq goal.
4. **Actual CrHrEq** - Actual CrHrEq for courses and any explanation.

No courses have been scheduled.

**New Courses**

Please see your scheduling coordinator if any of your courses are missing from the listing above. No courses may be added through the Faculty Activity System.

**Goals**

**Accomplishments**
Course Analysis

Term: 199708
Course: PL PA 803 001
Percent taught: 50
Contact Hours: 1
Credits: 3
Enrollment: 6
Student Credit Hours: 18
Location: ON Campus
Overload Compensation: No

Explanation:

[Textarea for explanation]

Save  Cancel
Instructional Activities

On this page is all the information concerning activities in the activity area above. The information is divided into four sections:

1. **Activities** - the list of activities that have been entered by this individual
2. **New** - forms that can be used to add activities to this area
3. **Goal CrHrEq** - Goals for this activity area and the estimated CrHrEq goal
4. **Actual CrHrEq** - Actual CrHrEq for this activity area and any explanation

### Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No activities for this area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### New Activities

**Activity Type**
- Continuing Education Programs
- Short Courses and Institutes
- Pedagogical Innovations

### Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CrHrEq</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Accomplishments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CrHrEq</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

[Save] [Cancel]
Enter comments about Clemson University Faculty Workload Analysis

For problems or questions regarding this web Email DCIT Web Development Services
Brief description of instructional activity

Web link to further information

Status: Initiated this semester

Major category of instructional activity: Major revision of curriculum

If OTHER, explain here:

Digital/electronic component: No

Enter comments about Clemson University Faculty Workload Analysis:

For problems or questions regarding this web, Email DCIT Web Development Services.
### Administrative Assignments

On this page is all the information concerning activities in the activity area above. The information is divided into four sections:

1. **Activities** - the list of activities that have been entered by this individual
2. **New** - forms that can be used to add activities to this area
3. **Goal CnHrEq** - Goals for this activity area and the estimated CnHrEq goal
4. **Actual CnHrEq** - Actual CnHrEq for this activity area and any explanation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No activities for this area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CnHrEq</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Accomplishments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CnHrEq</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Major activities and accomplishments this semester

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>First year as Chair</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department size</td>
<td>Less than 25 faculty &amp; staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Enter comments about Clemson University Faculty Workload Analysis

For problems or questions regarding this web Email DCTT Web Development Services.
Clemson University Faculty Activity System

Goals - Summary - Report - Home - Help

Department of Academic Program (Honors, etc.)

Save | Delete | Cancel

Description of academic program

Web link to further information

Enter comments about Clemson University Faculty Workload Analysis

For problems or questions regarding this web Email DCIT Web Development Services.

Clemson University Faculty Activity System

University Ombudsmen

Save | Delete | Cancel

Major activities and accomplishments this semester

Web link to further information

Enter comments about Clemson University Faculty Workload Analysis

For problems or questions regarding this web Email DCIT Web Development Services.
Sponsored Research

On this page is all the information concerning activities in the activity area above. The information is divided into four sections:

1. Activities - the list of activities that have been entered by this individual
2. New - forms that can be used to add activities to this area
3. Goal CrHrEq - Goals for this activity area and the estimated CrHrEq goal
4. Actual CrHrEq - Actual CrHrEq for this activity area and any explanation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Type</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No activities for this area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**New Activities**

Activity Type:
- Funded Research Grant
- Publications
- Presentations/performances/exhibits
- Patents
- Research Proposal

**Goals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CrHrEQ</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Accomplishments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CrHrEQ</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Major activities and accomplishments this semester

Web link to further information

Status

Work includes K-12 teacher reform

Source of funding

If OTHER, explain here

Digital/electronic component

External salary funding (sponsored)

Salary used as cost sharing

Team Members

WESTC

W. Westcott III

Primary

Salary

Enter comments about Clemson University Faculty Workload Analysis
**Goals/objectives & description**

**Web link to further information**

**Status**
- Submitted for review
- Not awarded
- In preparation

**Work includes K-12 teacher reform**
- Yes
- No

**Source of funding**
- Federal

**Digital/electronic component**
- Yes
- No

**External salary funding (sponsored)**
- Yes
- No

**Salary used as cost sharing**
- Yes
- No

**Team Members**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID or Email Address</th>
<th>CU Employee Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WESTC</td>
<td>Yes S Westcott III</td>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Enter comments about Clemson University Faculty Workload Analysis
Enter comments about Clemson University Faculty Workload Analysis

For problems or questions regarding this web Email DCIT Web Development Services.
**CLEMSON Faculty Activity System**

### Brief description of discovery

```

```

### Web link to further information

```

```

### Status

- Producing annual income for University

### Category of patent

- Patent held by University

### If OTHER, explain here

```

```

### Patent number

```

```

### Digital/electronic component

- No

**University Campus Directory (User Lookup)**

- Wesley J. Westcott III
- Primary

**Enter comments about Clemson University Faculty Workload Analysis**

For problems or questions regarding this web Email DCIT Web Development Services.
On this page is all the information concerning activities in the activity area above. The information is divided into four sections:

1. **Activities** - the list of activities that have been entered by this individual
2. **New** - forms that can be used to add activities to this area
3. **Goal CRHEq** - Goals for this activity area and the estimated CRHEq goal
4. **Actual CRHEq** - Actual CRHEq for this activity area and any explanation

**Activities**

No activities for this area

**New Activities**

**Cooperative Extension Service Project**
**Public Service (non PSA Project)**

**Goals**

**Accomplishments**

CRHEq: $\text{CRHEq}$

Save | Cancel
Initiative [initiative numbers will be loaded here]

Project title [project numbers will be loaded here]

If OTHER, explain here

Digital/electronic component No

Enter comments about Clemson University Faculty Workload Analysis

For problems or questions regarding this web Email DCIT Web Development Services.
Enter comments about Clemson University Faculty Workload Analysis

For problems or questions regarding this web Email DCCIT Web Development Services.
On this page is all the information concerning activities in the activity area above. The information is divided into four sections:

1. **Activities** - the list of activities that have been entered by this individual
2. **New** - forms that can be used to add activities to this area
3. **Goal C/Hr/Eq** - Goals for this activity area and the estimated C/Hr/Eq goal
4. **Actual C/Hr/Eq** - Actual C/Hr/Eq for this activity area and any explanation

### Activities

No activities for this area

### New Activity Forms

### Goals

### Accomplishments
Brief Description of Duty/Assignment/Project

Web link to further information

Status

Continued from last semester
One-time assignment

Service Category

Digital/electronic component

Acquisitions/Collection Development
No

Other comments about Clemson University Faculty Workload Analysis

For problems or questions regarding this web Email DCT Web Development Services
Scholarship and Non-Sponsored Research

On this page is all the information concerning activities in the activity area above. The information is divided into four sections:

1. Activities - the list of activities that have been entered by this individual
2. New - forms that can be used to add activities to this area
3. Goal CrHrEq - Goals for this activity area and the estimated CrHrEq goal
4. Actual CrHrEq - Actual CrHrEq for this activity area and any explanation

Activities

No activities for this area

New Activities

Publications

Presentations/performances/exhibits

Patents

Scholarship/Research

Goals

Accomplishments

CrHrEq Comment

Save Load
Clemson Faculty Activity System

Citation

Web link to further information

Status: Published
Refereed or peer reviewed: Yes
Category of publication: Academic/research journal
If OTHER, explain here:
University Technical Contribution Number:
Digital/electronic component: No

Team Members:
ID or Email Address: WESTC
CU Employee Name: S Westcott III
Role: Primary

Enter comments about Clemson University Faculty Workload Analysis

For problems or questions regarding this web email DCTT Web Development Services.
### Clemson Faculty Activity System

**Title and/or brief description of presentation**

**Web link to further information**

**Status**
- Presented

**Refereed or peer reviewed**
- Yes

**Category of presentation**
- Invited presentation

**Digital/electronic component**
- No

**Information for WESTC University Campus Directory (User ID Lookup)**

- Yes

Enter comments about Clemson University Faculty Workload Analysis

For problems or questions regarding this web Email DCIT Web Development Services
### Faculty Activity System

**Enter comments about Clemson University Faculty Workload Analysis**

For problems or questions regarding this web, Email DCIT Web Development Services.

---

**Clemson University**

**Faculty Activity System**

**Goals - Summary - Report - Home - Help**

---

#### Brief description of discovery

---

#### Web link to further information

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Producing annual income for University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category of patent</td>
<td>Patent held by University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If OTHER, explain here</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patent number</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital/electronic component</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**University Campus Directory (User Lookup)**

---

Enter comments about Clemson University Faculty Workload Analysis.

For problems or questions regarding this web, Email DCIT Web Development Services.
Scholarship/Research

| Save | Delete | Cancel |

Major activities and accomplishments this semester

Web link to further information

Status

- Project initiated this semester

Work includes K-12 teacher reform

- Yes
- No

Internal source of funding

- Education & General

Digital/electronic component

- No

Team Members

| Clemson University Directory (User ID Lookup) | Add Team Member | Save | Delete | Cancel |

Enter comments about Clemson University Faculty Workload Analysis

For problems or questions regarding this web Email CIT Web Development Services
On this page is all the information concerning activities in the activity area above. The information is divided into:

1. Activities - the list of activities that have been entered by this individual
2. New - forms that can be used to add activities to this area
3. Goal CrHrEq - Goals for this activity area and the estimated CrHrEq goal
4. Actual CrHrEq - Actual CrHrEq for this activity area and any explanation

### No activities for this area

### New Activities

- Undergraduate Advising/Coordinator
- Graduate Thesis/Dissertation Committees
- Graduate Advising/Coordinator
- Honors Advising
- Honors Thesis Committee

### Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CrHrEq</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Accomplishments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CrHrEq</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Name of student and brief description of program

Web link to further information

Status

Graduated this semester

Degree level

Masters (Non-thesis option)

If OTHER, explain here

Student Major Code

Team Members

ID or Email Address  CU Employee Name  Role

WESTC  Yes  S Westcott III  Primary

Enter comments about Clemson University Faculty Workload Analysis

For problems or questions regarding this web Email DCT Web Development Services.
Graduate Advising Coordinator:

**Brief description of advising workload**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Web link to further information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General category of advising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If OTHER, explain here</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For comments about Clemson University Faculty Workload Analysis

For problems or questions regarding this web form, contact DIT Web Development Services.
Brief description of advising workload

Web link to further information

Status: Initiated this semester

General category of advising: Assigned advisor for honors program

If OTHER, explain here: 

For problems or questions regarding this web Email DCIT Web Development Services
### Name of student and brief description of program

![Image of text box for input]

### Web link to further information

![Image of text box for input]

### Student Major Code

![Image of text box for input]

#### Team Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Email Address</th>
<th>Full Employee Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WESTC</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>S Westcott III</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*University Campus Directory (User ID Lookup)*

**Add Team Member**

**Enter comments about Clemson University Faculty Workload Analysis**

For problems or questions regarding this web Email DCT Web Development Services.
Committees

On this page is all the information concerning activities in the activity area above. The information is divided into four sections:

1. Activities - the list of activities that have been entered by this individual
2. New - forms that can be used to add activities to this area
3. Goal CrHrEq - Goals for this activity area and the estimated CrHrEq goal
4. Actual CrHrEq - Actual CrHrEq for this activity area and any explanation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Type</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No activities for this area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

New Activities

Activity Type:
- Department Committees
- College Committees
- University Committees
- Professional Committees
- Public Service Committees
- Other Committees

Goals

CrHrEq | Comment |
|-------|---------|

Accomplishments

CrHrEq | Comment |
|-------|---------|
Title of committee or description of activities

Web link to further information

Status

Elected (Yes) or appointed (No)

Digital/electronic component

Team Members

Enter comments about Clemson University Faculty Workload Analysis

For problems or questions regarding this web Email DCIT Web Development Services.
## Clemson University Faculty Activity System

### College/Department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title of committee or description of activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Web link to further information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Status

- Status: Initiated this semester

- Elected (Yes) or appointed (No):
  - Yes
  - No

- Digital/electronic component:
  - Yes
  - No

### Team Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID or Email Address</th>
<th>Full Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WESTC</td>
<td>S Westcott III</td>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

University Campus Directory (Use End Lookup)

Add Team Member

Enter comments about Clemson University Faculty Workload Analysis

For problems or questions regarding this web page, email DCTT Web Development Services.
Title of committee or description of activities

Web link to further information

Status
Initiated this semester

Elected (Yes) or appointed (No)
Yes  No

Digital/electronic component
No

Team Members:

WESTC  Yes  S Westcott III  Primary

Enter comments about Clemson University Faculty Workload Analysis

For problems or questions regarding this web Email DCIT Web Development Services.
Title of committee or description of activities

Web link to further information

Status
- Initiated this semester

Elected (Yes) or appointed (No)
- Yes
- No

Digital/electronic component
- No

Team Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Westcott</td>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Enter comments about Clemson University Faculty Workload Analysis

For problems or questions regarding this web Email DCT Web Development Services.
Title of committee or description of activities

Web link to further information

Status

Elected (Yes) or appointed (No)  Yes  No

Digital/electronic component  No

Team Members:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employee Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S Westcott III</td>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Enter comments about Clemson University Faculty Workload Analysis

For problems or questions regarding this web Email DCT Web Development Services.
Title of committee or description of activities

Web link to further information

Status: Initiated this semester

Elected (Yes) or appointed (No): Yes

Digital/electronic component: No

Team Members:

- WESTC
  - Yes
  - S Westcott III
  - Primary

University Campus Directory (Usearch Lookup)

Enter comments about Clemson University Faculty Workload Analysis

For problems or questions regarding this web Email ICT Web Development Services.
Professional and Personal Public Service

On this page is all the information concerning activities in the activity area above. The information is divided into four sections:

1. Activities - the list of activities that have been entered by this individual
2. New - forms that can be used to add activities to this area
3. Goal CrHiEq - Goals for this activity area and the estimated CrHiEq goal
4. Actual CrHiEq - Actual CrHiEq for this activity area and any explanation

**Activities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Type</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No activities for this area

**New Activities**

Activity Type:
- Editorship
- Consulting
- Personal Public Service Project
- Professional Service

**Goals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CrHiEq</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CrHiEq</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Accomplishments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CrHiEq</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CrHiEq</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Brief description of public service

Web link to further information

Status:
- Initiated this semester
- Continuing from last semester
- Completed this semester

Team Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID or Email Address</th>
<th>Full Employee Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WESTC</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>S Westcott III</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

University Campus Directory (Userid Lookup)

Add Team Member

Save  Delete  Cancel

Enter comments about Clemson University Faculty Workload Analysis

For problems or questions regarding this web Email DCT Web Development Services.
The page contains a form from the Faculty Activity System of Clemson University. The form includes fields for describing responsibilities, providing a web link for further information, and detailing the status, whether the position is elected or appointed, and whether it involves a digital/electronic component.

**Team Members**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID or Email Address</th>
<th>Off Employee Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WESTC</td>
<td>S Westcott III</td>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The status of the position is indicated as 'initiated this semester'. The form also allows for the addition of team members through a link to the University Campus Directory (User and Lookup) and an option to add a team member. The form contains a save, delete, and cancel button.

At the bottom, there is a note to enter comments about Clemson University Faculty Workload Analysis and a reminder to email ICT Web Development Services for any problems or questions regarding the web.
On this page is all the information concerning activities in the activity area above. The information is divided into four sections:

1. **Activities** - the list of activities that have been entered by this individual
2. **New** - forms that can be used to add activities to this area
3. **Goal ChHrEq** - Goals for this activity area and the estimated ChHrEq goal
4. **Actual ChHrEq** - Actual ChHrEq for this activity area and any explanation

### Activities

No activities for this area.

### New Activities

**Activity Type**

- Leave/Sabbatical
- Personal Development Activities
- Professional Development Activities

### Goals

**ChHrEq** & **Comment**

### Accomplishments

**ChHrEq** & **Comment**
Enter comments about Clemson University Faculty Workload Analysis

For problems or questions regarding this web Email DCT-Web Development Services
Clemson University Faculty Activity System

Goals • Summary • Report • Home • Help

Personal development activities

Save  Delete  Cancel

Personal development goals and achievements

Web link to further information

Digital/electronic component  No  

Save  Delete  Cancel

Enter comments about Clemson University Faculty Workload Analysis

For problems or questions regarding this web Email DCIT Web Development Services.
Professional development activities

Professional development goals and achievements

Web link to further information

Status: First five years in career

Major category of professional development: Development of major new expertise

If OTHER, explain here:

Digital/electronic component: No

Enter comments about Clemson University Faculty Workload Analysis

For problems or questions regarding this web Email DCIT Web Development Services.
On this page is all the information concerning activities in the activity area above. The information is divided into four sections:

1. Activities - the list of activities that have been entered by this individual
2. New - forms that can be used to add activities to this area
Enter comments about Clemson University Faculty Workload Analysis

For problems or questions regarding this web Email DCIT Web Development Services.
To: Policy Committee Chair John W. Huffman
Thru: Faculty Senate President Francis A. McGuire
From: Robert A. Waller, Editorial Consultant for the Faculty Manual
Re: Policy Statement on Post-Tenure Review

Among the issues facing higher education in South Carolina are the adjustments necessary to accommodate the legislative mandate for greater accountability in the evaluation of tenured faculty members. Specifically, the CHE and the General Assembly guidelines require among the "Quality Indicators" that the quality of the faculty be assured through a "performance review system for faculty to include student and peer evaluations" and to provide for "post-tenure review for tenured faculty." These requirements become operative as part of the new formula for funding higher education in South Carolina.

By this April we are required to have a post-tenure review process in place which incorporates the state's "Best Practices for Post-Tenure Review." Nine months from now our review process will be evaluated in comparison with the "Best Practices" document and we will be given a formula grade with 12 points at stake in the funding formula. Our goal is to meet the criteria by covering the 12 essential points in our procedures.

The subject of post-tenure review has been twice reviewed by the Faculty Senate: "Report on Post-Tenure Review" submitted by the Faculty Senate Select Committee on Tenure and unanimously accepted by the Senate on 2/13/96 and just last December 4th with the acceptance of the report on "The Periodic Review" submitted by the ad hoc Committee chaired by Senator Rajendra Singh.

Based on these studies and accumulated experience, the Policy Committee has crafted the accompanying statement of policy to be reviewed, adopted, and implemented. The principal discussion of tenure in the August 1997 Faculty Manual occurs on pages 25-26. It is proposed that a new section H. labeled "Post-Tenure Review" be inserted on page 26 and that the remaining sections be relettered.

David Fleming of the Office of Institutional Research and Thornton Kirby of the President's Office serve as this institution's liaison with CHE for the implementation of these performance indicators. Questions about the need for this action and the conditions being imposed should be directed to them.

c.c.: Vice President and Provost Steffen H. Rogers
       Director David B. Fleming
       Executive Secretary J. Thornton Kirby
       1997-98 Policy Committee members
       Mesdames Betty M. Moore and Cathy T. Sturkie
POST TENURE REVIEW

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

Scope: All faculty members holding a tenured faculty position shall be subject to post-tenure review.

Guidelines: The faculty of each academic unit shall prepare written guidelines (approved by a majority of the faculty, the respective Dean, and the Provost) providing details of the post-tenure review process. Although the details may vary from one academic unit to another or from one college to another within the University, such guidelines must be consistent with the following principles:

a) The primary basis for post-tenure review is the individual's contributions in the areas of research and/or scholarship, and teaching, and service.

b) Guidelines must be flexible enough to accommodate faculty members with different professional responsibilities.

c) Post-tenure review shall not infringe upon the accepted standards of academic freedom. Furthermore, sex, age, ethnicity, and other factors unrelated to an individual's professional qualifications shall not be considered in the review process.

d) The chairperson of the academic department and the dean of the college must not be involved directly in the peer review process at the departmental level.

Procedure: The following procedures must be used for Post-Tenure Review:

1. All tenured faculty will be peer reviewed every six years. The year or years in which a faculty member is on sabbatical, unpaid leave, and/or extended sick leave shall not be counted in the review period. Departments will devise a schedule of staggered reviews of tenured faculty within each rank. Reviews will be conducted in order of seniority, beginning with those who have the most longevity at Clemson University.
2. The tenured and tenure-track faculty of each department will each year elect a PTR committee separate from the regular personnel committee(s) according to departmental bylaws. The faculty members subject to PTR in a particular year will not be eligible for membership on the committee. Only tenured faculty are eligible for election. The size of the committee may vary from one academic unit to another; however, the committee must have a minimum of three members. In cases in which the department does not have enough tenured faculty to constitute a PTR Committee, the departmental Peer Review Committee will elect outside faculty from other departments who are qualified to serve on the PTR committee. The committee will elect the chairperson.

3. The faculty undergoing post-tenure review must provide, at a minimum, the following documents to the PTR committee and the Department Chair:
   a) a recent copy of the CV,
   b) a summary of teaching evaluations for the last 5 years,
   c) names and addresses of 6 peers external to the department or institution as appropriate to the role and function of the faculty member,
   d) a plan for continued professional growth,
   e) detailed information about the outcomes of any sabbatical leave awarded during the six-year post-tenure review period,
   f) and any other documents relevant to the review.

4. The chair of the academic unit must provide the committee with copies of the faculty member’s annual performance reviews covering five years accumulated since the initial tenure review or since the last post-tenure review.

5. The PTR committee shall obtain at least four letters from peers external to the department or the institution as appropriate to the role and function of the faculty member, at least two of which must come from the list submitted by the faculty member.

6. The PTR committee will provide a written report to the faculty member. The faculty member should be given at least two weeks time to provide a response to the committee. Both the committee’s initial report and the response of the faculty member will be given to the Dean of the academic unit. The Department Chair will submit an independent and written report to the faculty member and s/he will have two weeks time to provide a response. The original Chair’s report and the faculty member’s response will be submitted to the College Dean. The Dean will write his/her own report copying the faculty member, the PTR committee, and the Chair and submit all materials to the Provost who establishes the final rating (see Outcomes). If the Provost files a report explaining the rating to the faculty member, the PTR committee, the Chair, and the Dean. A disclaimer to the Provost’s finding can be filed.
Outcome: The following rating system will be used in all stages of the review by the PTR Committee, the Chair, the Dean, and the Provost:

a) Excellent: The faculty members in this category shall be recognized by a special pay raise in the first year in which funds are available. The increase would be equal to that given faculty members promoted into the rank as associate or full professors.
b) Satisfactory: No special award will be given.
c) Unsatisfactory: Leading to remediation (see below).

If the ratings by the Chairperson, Dean, and Provost differ markedly from the rating of the PTR committee, each must supply documented evidence explaining the difference. In cases involving a rating of "Unsatisfactory," the burden of proving unsatisfactory performance is on the University. To receive an "Unsatisfactory" as the final rating from the Provost, both the PTR committee and the Chair must so recommend.

Remediation: Individuals who receive a rating of unsatisfactory must be given a period of remediation to correct deficiencies detailed in the PTR reports. The Chairperson will provide a list of specific goals and measurable outcomes the faculty member should achieve in the next three years. The University will provide reasonable resources (as identified in the PTR reports) to meet the deficiencies. The Chairperson will meet at least twice annually with the faculty member to review the progress. After three years the faculty member will be reviewed again. If the faculty member has achieved satisfactory performance based on recommendations from the PTR committee, the Chair, the Dean, and the Provost, then the faculty member may be placed in the Satisfactory category. If after three years performance is still not satisfactory, the faculty member will be placed in the category "Sanctions" defined below:

Sanctions: If a sanction is recommended, the review is then complete. An unsatisfactory rating in any subsequent year will lead to Dismissal for Unsatisfactory Professional Performance as defined below.

Dismissal for Unsatisfactory Professional Performance: If dismissal for unsatisfactory professional performance is recommended, the case will be subject to the rules and regulations outlined in the Faculty Manual (p. 28).
March 10, 1998

Memorandum

TO: Clemson University Faculty Senate
FROM: Faculty Senate Accountability Committee
SUBJECT: 1997 Cooperative Salary Study

Attached you will find a copy of the Faculty Senate Accountability Committee's report of the 1997 salary increases for permanent full-time employees of Clemson University. A report of the findings of this committee will be presented to the Faculty Senate at their March 10, 1998 meeting.

Please note on the first page of the report the explanations provided to define groups, categories, and transaction codes that were used to formulate the analyses offered in the attached pages.

Members of the committee and the support resources used to compile this information are listed below:

Members
Gordon Halfacre, Chair
Robert Campbell
Debbie Calhoun
Brett Dalton
Jim Davis
Scott Ludlow
Fran McGuire
Steffen Rogers

Support Resources
David Fleming
Thornton Kirby
Kaye Lawson
Dick Simmons
Improvements over the 1996 Pilot Study

✓ Revisited categorization of employees
✓ Added detail of increases (general, miscellaneous pay adjustments, performance and promotion)
✓ Removed temporary increases from base salaries to increase validity
✓ Added additional budget center reports to clarify increase responsibility
1997 Cooperative Salary Study

**ALL (%) and ($)***

- Average salary increase divided by the total number of employees in a group and category.

**RECEIVING (%) AND ($)***

- Average salary increase divided by the total number of employees in a group and category who received an increase.
Average Percent Increase of All Employees Receiving Increases Across Selected Budget Centers
December 1996 - October 1997
Average Percent and Dollar Salary Increases by Budget Center
1997

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Centers</th>
<th>Administration</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Pay Adjust</td>
<td>Part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, Forestry and Life</td>
<td>2.61%</td>
<td>2.54%</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td>$2,019 $1,941</td>
<td>$64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture, Arts and Humanities</td>
<td>4.20%</td>
<td>4.20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$2,919 $2,916</td>
<td>$1,598 $1,339</td>
<td>$22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>3.17%</td>
<td>2.59%</td>
<td>0.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$3,000 $2,256</td>
<td>$69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and Public Affairs</td>
<td>2.98%</td>
<td>2.99%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$2,337 $2,334</td>
<td>$2,639 $1,779</td>
<td>$558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Financial Officer</td>
<td>3.83%</td>
<td>1.25%</td>
<td>2.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$3,480 $976</td>
<td>$2,498</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division of Computing and Information Technology</td>
<td>4.65%</td>
<td>2.66%</td>
<td>1.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering and Science</td>
<td>3.28%</td>
<td>2.82%</td>
<td>0.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$2,553 $2,218</td>
<td>$303</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health, Education and Human</td>
<td>2.89%</td>
<td>2.88%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>$1,897 $1,694</td>
<td>$2,023 $1,414</td>
<td>$446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>3.51%</td>
<td>3.51%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$2,469 $2,467</td>
<td>$2,399 $861</td>
<td>$1,215 $320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provost and VP for Academic Affairs</td>
<td>2.77%</td>
<td>2.40%</td>
<td>0.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$2,157 $1,775</td>
<td>$284 $97</td>
<td>$1,447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>3.16%</td>
<td>3.15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$3,267 $3,256</td>
<td>$1,360 $744</td>
<td>$316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSA</td>
<td>3.46%</td>
<td>2.54%</td>
<td>0.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$2,441 $1,685</td>
<td>$552 $166</td>
<td>$2,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary to the Board</td>
<td>3.16%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$1,316 $861</td>
<td>$429</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
<td>2.29%</td>
<td>1.87%</td>
<td>0.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$1,927 $1,472</td>
<td>$450</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Administration and</td>
<td>2.32%</td>
<td>1.47%</td>
<td>0.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement</td>
<td>$1,381 $720</td>
<td>$678</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Grand Totals</td>
<td>3.19%</td>
<td>2.68%</td>
<td>0.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$2,380 $1,918</td>
<td>$117 $263</td>
<td>$2,088</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Total of all employees with the exception of coaches, unclassified staff and conversions (9 to 12, 12 to 9).
** Administration: Categories 1, 2, and 3; Faculty: Category 6; and Staff: Categories 4 (Classified), 5, 8, and 9.
### Average Percent Increase for All Employees in a Group and Category
(Academic Colleges, PSA, and Library)

**December 1996 - October 1997**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>Agriculture, Forestry and Life Sciences</th>
<th>PSA</th>
<th>Architecture, Arts and Humanities</th>
<th>Health, Education and Human Development</th>
<th>Engineering and Science</th>
<th>Business and Public Affairs</th>
<th>Library</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>PSA</td>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>Academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATION - LEVEL 1</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>2.97%</td>
<td>3.25%</td>
<td>2.25%</td>
<td>2.19%</td>
<td>3.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATION - LEVEL 2</td>
<td>2.71%</td>
<td>3.14%</td>
<td>5.12%</td>
<td>2.66%</td>
<td>3.49%</td>
<td>3.27%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT - LEVEL 1</td>
<td>2.27%</td>
<td>3.66%</td>
<td>2.53%</td>
<td>3.92%</td>
<td>5.98%</td>
<td>2.41%</td>
<td>3.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Classified</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>2.83%</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>4.38%</td>
<td>4.34%</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td>1.25%</td>
<td>3.73%</td>
<td>2.64%</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
<td>8.44%</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT - LEVEL 2</td>
<td>3.55%</td>
<td>3.48%</td>
<td>3.53%</td>
<td>4.34%</td>
<td>3.24%</td>
<td>2.90%</td>
<td>5.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>FACULTY</td>
<td>3.22%</td>
<td>3.17%</td>
<td>3.87%</td>
<td>4.32%</td>
<td>4.84%</td>
<td>4.07%</td>
<td>4.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>3.38%</td>
<td>3.62%</td>
<td>3.23%</td>
<td>5.09%</td>
<td>5.95%</td>
<td>4.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not Tenured</td>
<td>1.61%</td>
<td>0.78%</td>
<td>5.25%</td>
<td>3.29%</td>
<td>4.43%</td>
<td>3.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>COACH</td>
<td>2.05%</td>
<td>7.50%</td>
<td>2.93%</td>
<td>0.88%</td>
<td>0.66%</td>
<td>3.28%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY - LEVEL 1</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY - LEVEL 2</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>4.40%</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>3.92%</td>
<td>5.43%</td>
<td>10.70%</td>
<td>7.99%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Does not include conversions.
## Average Dollar Increase for All Employees in Group and Category (Academic Colleges, PSA and Library)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Agriculture, Forestry and Life Sciences</th>
<th>PSA</th>
<th>PSA</th>
<th>Architecture, Arts and Humanities</th>
<th>Health, Education and Human Development</th>
<th>Engineering and Science</th>
<th>Business and Public Affairs</th>
<th>Library</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>PSA</td>
<td>PSA</td>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>Auxiliary</td>
<td>Academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATION - LEVEL 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATION - LEVEL 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT - LEVEL 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT - LEVEL 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>831</td>
<td>1,357</td>
<td>894</td>
<td>1,472</td>
<td>2,547</td>
<td>744</td>
<td>1,544</td>
<td>1,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 FACULTY</td>
<td></td>
<td>880</td>
<td>1,198</td>
<td>785</td>
<td>1,660</td>
<td>1,505</td>
<td>781</td>
<td>1,544</td>
<td>1,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 COACH</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY - LEVEL 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>610</td>
<td>1,371</td>
<td>1,333</td>
<td>1,096</td>
<td>4,111</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY - LEVEL 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>247</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Does not include conversions.
# Average Percent Increase of All Employees in a Group and Category

(Academic, PSA and Administrative Units Only)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Level 4</th>
<th>Level 5</th>
<th>Level 6</th>
<th>Level 7</th>
<th>Level 8</th>
<th>Level 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.61%</td>
<td>1.74%</td>
<td>1.49%</td>
<td>1.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.37%</td>
<td>1.24%</td>
<td>6.20%</td>
<td>2.63%</td>
<td>2.77%</td>
<td>0.95%</td>
<td>1.81%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LEVEL 1</td>
<td>3.26%</td>
<td>2.39%</td>
<td>0.11%</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LEVEL 2</td>
<td>3.37%</td>
<td>3.10%</td>
<td>0.15%</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT - LEVEL 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.90%</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>0.44%</td>
<td>1.04%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.66%</td>
<td>2.43%</td>
<td>0.48%</td>
<td>0.71%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.69%</td>
<td>2.38%</td>
<td>0.04%</td>
<td>0.72%</td>
<td>0.39%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT - LEVEL 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.64%</td>
<td>2.46%</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
<td>0.48%</td>
<td>0.64%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.48%</td>
<td>2.47%</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
<td>0.46%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FACULTY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.20%</td>
<td>2.98%</td>
<td>0.06%</td>
<td>0.70%</td>
<td>0.37%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.58%</td>
<td>3.20%</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
<td>0.85%</td>
<td>0.49%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.99%</td>
<td>2.97%</td>
<td>0.78%</td>
<td>0.16%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.21%</td>
<td>1.93%</td>
<td>0.07%</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
<td>0.17%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY</strong></td>
<td>LEVEL 1</td>
<td>4.65%</td>
<td>2.49%</td>
<td>0.56%</td>
<td>1.54%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LEVEL 2</td>
<td>4.76%</td>
<td>2.39%</td>
<td>0.07%</td>
<td>0.70%</td>
<td>1.59%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Does not include conversions.
### Average Percent Increase of Those Receiving Increases in a Group and Category
*(Academic, PSA, and Administrative Units Only)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>Academic</th>
<th>PSA</th>
<th>Administrative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Misc</td>
<td>Pay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Misc</td>
<td>Pay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Misc</td>
<td>Pay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATION -</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEVEL 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.51%</td>
<td>2.52%</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATION -</td>
<td></td>
<td>93</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEVEL 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.48%</td>
<td>3.23%</td>
<td>1.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Misc</td>
<td>Pay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEVEL 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified</td>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT -</td>
<td></td>
<td>658</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEVEL 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.68%</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>3.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACULTY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Misc</td>
<td>Pay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td></td>
<td>583</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Tenured</td>
<td></td>
<td>135</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Tenure Track</td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer/Research Associate</td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COACH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Misc</td>
<td>Pay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY -</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEVEL 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.65%</td>
<td>2.49%</td>
<td>2.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY -</td>
<td></td>
<td>170</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEVEL 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.96%</td>
<td>2.49%</td>
<td>6.24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Does not include conversions.
Group Codes *

1 Academic - departments with academic affiliation
2 PSA - departments with primary funding from PSA budgets
3 Administrative - departments serving as a primary administrative function
4 Athletics - departments with primary athletic function
5 Auxiliaries - departments identified as self-supporting units

* A group code was assigned to each employee based on the home department appearing on the personnel record of the individual at the time of data retrieval.

Category Codes *

1 General Administrative - Presidential and Vice Presidential positions
2 Academic Administration - Level 1 -- Academic Dean, Associate Dean, Assistant Dean positions
3 Academic Administration - Level 2 -- Department Chair, School Director, Assistant to Dean positions
4 Administrative Support - Level 1 -- Managers with primary supervisory responsibility (classified and unclassified)
5 Administrative Support - Level 2 -- Support positions without primary supervisory responsibility (classified only)
6 Faculty -- Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, Instructor, Research Associate, Lecturer positions with primary teaching and/or research responsibilities
7 Coaches -- Athletic area coaches as determined by state title codes
8 Information Technology - Level 1 -- Managers with primary supervisory responsibility in the information technology area (classified only)
9 Information Technology - Level 2 -- Support positions without primary supervisory responsibility in the information technology area (classified only)

* A category code was assigned to each employee based on the state title code of the employee. Some exceptions were noted where job responsibility did not coincide with job title. These exceptions were coded manually.

Transaction Codes *

General Increases
206 Statewide Grade Adjustment
207 Cost of Living Adjustment

Miscellaneous Pay Adjustments
202 Unclassified Pay Adjustment
208 Source of Funds Change
209 Pay Base Change
211 Sabbatical 1/2
212 Sabbatical Full
213 Extended Leave Without Pay
214 Return from Leave
216 Leave Without Pay
217 Demotion
223 Special Increase
295 Other
299 Miscellaneous

Performance Increases
200 Performance Based Pay
201 Classified Performance Review

Promotional Increases
203 Promotion
204 Transfer
205 Reclassification
219 Additional Skills
220 Additional Knowledge
221 Remove Additional Duties

* Transaction Codes with associated transactions were collected from the Job History tables of Clemson's data warehouse. The above groupings of transactions were used to examine details of increases.
# University Summary

**December 1996 - October 1997**

## Average Percent Increase for All Employees in Group and Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>Academic</th>
<th>PSC</th>
<th>Administrative</th>
<th>Athletics</th>
<th>Auxiliaries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE</td>
<td>3.20%</td>
<td>1.75%</td>
<td>1.45%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATION - LEVEL 1</td>
<td>2.51%</td>
<td>2.99%</td>
<td>0.13%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td>ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATION - LEVEL 1 - 9 to 12 Month Conversion</td>
<td>12.78%</td>
<td>5.34%</td>
<td>7.40%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATION - LEVEL 2</td>
<td>3.75%</td>
<td>3.15%</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
<td>0.15%</td>
<td>0.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a</td>
<td>ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATION - LEVEL 2 - 9 to 12 Month Conversion</td>
<td>10.29%</td>
<td>5.34%</td>
<td>7.40%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT - LEVEL 1</td>
<td>4.03%</td>
<td>2.56%</td>
<td>0.44%</td>
<td>1.04%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td>ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT - LEVEL 1 - 9 to 12 Month Conversion</td>
<td>10.59%</td>
<td>5.34%</td>
<td>7.40%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>FACILITY</td>
<td>4.91%</td>
<td>2.08%</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
<td>0.70%</td>
<td>0.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a</td>
<td>FACILITY - 9 to 12 Month Conversion</td>
<td>13.52%</td>
<td>5.34%</td>
<td>7.40%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY - LEVEL 1</td>
<td>4.85%</td>
<td>2.49%</td>
<td>0.56%</td>
<td>1.51%</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>COACH</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>2.49%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY - LEVEL 2</td>
<td>4.70%</td>
<td>2.35%</td>
<td>0.07%</td>
<td>0.70%</td>
<td>1.54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Percent Increases

- **General**: 2.50%
- **Misc. Pay**: 2.49%
- **Adjust**: 1.54%
- **Perform**: 4.09%
- **Promo**: 2.49%
- **Summary**: 4.70%
- **General**: 2.50%
- **Misc. Pay**: 2.49%
- **Adjust**: 1.54%
- **Perform**: 4.09%
- **Promo**: 2.49%
- **Summary**: 4.70%
- **General**: 2.50%
- **Misc. Pay**: 2.49%
- **Adjust**: 1.54%
- **Perform**: 4.09%
- **Promo**: 2.49%
- **Summary**: 4.70%

**Conversion Months**

- **1 to 3 Months**: 2.50%
- **3 to 6 Months**: 2.49%
- **6 to 9 Months**: 2.49%
- **9 to 12 Months**: 2.49%
### Average Percent Increase of All Employees in a Budget Center

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Academic</th>
<th>PSA</th>
<th>Administrative</th>
<th>Athletics</th>
<th>Auxiliaries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 ACAD. ADMINISTRATION - LEVEL 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 ACAD. ADMINISTRATION - LEVEL 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT - LEVEL 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT - LEVEL 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 FACULTY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 COACH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY - LEVEL 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY - LEVEL 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The table contains detailed breakdowns of percent increases across various categories and levels, highlighting differences in increases for different roles and positions.
## Average Percent Increase of All Employees in Budget Center

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>General</th>
<th>Misc Pay</th>
<th>Adjust</th>
<th>Perform</th>
<th>promo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>2.63%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATION - LEVEL 1</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATION - LEVEL 2</td>
<td>3.14%</td>
<td>2.65%</td>
<td>0.32%</td>
<td>0.61%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATION - LEVEL 2</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
<td>2.43%</td>
<td>0.48%</td>
<td>0.73%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATION - LEVEL 2</td>
<td>2.85%</td>
<td>2.49%</td>
<td>0.32%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT - LEVEL 1</td>
<td>0.73%</td>
<td>2.42%</td>
<td>0.49%</td>
<td>0.17%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT - LEVEL 1</td>
<td>3.60%</td>
<td>2.47%</td>
<td>0.04%</td>
<td>0.46%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT - LEVEL 1</td>
<td>1.38%</td>
<td>2.32%</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT - LEVEL 1</td>
<td>3.23%</td>
<td>2.87%</td>
<td>1.15%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT - LEVEL 1</td>
<td>5.20%</td>
<td>3.52%</td>
<td>1.87%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT - LEVEL 1</td>
<td>7.60%</td>
<td>2.37%</td>
<td>4.95%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>FACULTY - 9 to 12 Month Conversion</td>
<td>3.87%</td>
<td>2.32%</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>FACULTY - 9 to 12 Month Conversion</td>
<td>3.23%</td>
<td>2.87%</td>
<td>1.15%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>FACULTY - 9 to 12 Month Conversion</td>
<td>5.20%</td>
<td>3.52%</td>
<td>1.87%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>FACULTY - 9 to 12 Month Conversion</td>
<td>7.60%</td>
<td>2.37%</td>
<td>4.95%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>FACULTY - 9 to 12 Month Conversion</td>
<td>3.87%</td>
<td>2.32%</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>FACULTY - 9 to 12 Month Conversion</td>
<td>3.23%</td>
<td>2.87%</td>
<td>1.15%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>FACULTY - 9 to 12 Month Conversion</td>
<td>5.20%</td>
<td>3.52%</td>
<td>1.87%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>FACULTY - 9 to 12 Month Conversion</td>
<td>7.60%</td>
<td>2.37%</td>
<td>4.95%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>FACULTY - 9 to 12 Month Conversion</td>
<td>3.87%</td>
<td>2.32%</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>FACULTY - 9 to 12 Month Conversion</td>
<td>3.23%</td>
<td>2.87%</td>
<td>1.15%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>FACULTY - 9 to 12 Month Conversion</td>
<td>5.20%</td>
<td>3.52%</td>
<td>1.87%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>FACULTY - 9 to 12 Month Conversion</td>
<td>7.60%</td>
<td>2.37%</td>
<td>4.95%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>FACULTY - 9 to 12 Month Conversion</td>
<td>3.87%</td>
<td>2.32%</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>FACULTY - 9 to 12 Month Conversion</td>
<td>3.23%</td>
<td>2.87%</td>
<td>1.15%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>FACULTY - 9 to 12 Month Conversion</td>
<td>5.20%</td>
<td>3.52%</td>
<td>1.87%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>FACULTY - 9 to 12 Month Conversion</td>
<td>7.60%</td>
<td>2.37%</td>
<td>4.95%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>FACULTY - 9 to 12 Month Conversion</td>
<td>3.87%</td>
<td>2.32%</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>FACULTY - 9 to 12 Month Conversion</td>
<td>3.23%</td>
<td>2.87%</td>
<td>1.15%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>FACULTY - 9 to 12 Month Conversion</td>
<td>5.20%</td>
<td>3.52%</td>
<td>1.87%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>FACULTY - 9 to 12 Month Conversion</td>
<td>7.60%</td>
<td>2.37%</td>
<td>4.95%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>FACULTY - 9 to 12 Month Conversion</td>
<td>3.87%</td>
<td>2.32%</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>FACULTY - 9 to 12 Month Conversion</td>
<td>3.23%</td>
<td>2.87%</td>
<td>1.15%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>FACULTY - 9 to 12 Month Conversion</td>
<td>5.20%</td>
<td>3.52%</td>
<td>1.87%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>FACULTY - 9 to 12 Month Conversion</td>
<td>7.60%</td>
<td>2.37%</td>
<td>4.95%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>FACULTY - 9 to 12 Month Conversion</td>
<td>3.87%</td>
<td>2.32%</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>FACULTY - 9 to 12 Month Conversion</td>
<td>3.23%</td>
<td>2.87%</td>
<td>1.15%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>FACULTY - 9 to 12 Month Conversion</td>
<td>5.20%</td>
<td>3.52%</td>
<td>1.87%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>FACULTY - 9 to 12 Month Conversion</td>
<td>7.60%</td>
<td>2.37%</td>
<td>4.95%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>FACULTY - 9 to 12 Month Conversion</td>
<td>3.87%</td>
<td>2.32%</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>FACULTY - 9 to 12 Month Conversion</td>
<td>3.23%</td>
<td>2.87%</td>
<td>1.15%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>FACULTY - 9 to 12 Month Conversion</td>
<td>5.20%</td>
<td>3.52%</td>
<td>1.87%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>FACULTY - 9 to 12 Month Conversion</td>
<td>7.60%</td>
<td>2.37%</td>
<td>4.95%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>Level</td>
<td>Academic PSA</td>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic PSA</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Percent Increase of All Employees in Budget Center
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>Academic</th>
<th>PSA</th>
<th>Administrative</th>
<th>Athletics</th>
<th>Auxiliaries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Gen</td>
<td>Hic Pay Adjust</td>
<td>Prom</td>
<td>Perform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATION - LEVEL 1</td>
<td>2.18%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATION - LEVEL 1 - 9 to 12 Month Conversion</td>
<td>2.18%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATION - LEVEL 2</td>
<td>2.26%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATION - LEVEL 2 - 12 to 9 Month Conversion</td>
<td>2.26%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT - LEVEL 1</td>
<td>2.41%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT - LEVEL 2</td>
<td>2.41%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT - LEVEL 1 - 9 to 12 Month Conversion</td>
<td>2.41%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT - LEVEL 2 - 12 to 9 Month Conversion</td>
<td>2.41%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>FACULTY</td>
<td>2.58%</td>
<td>0.24%</td>
<td>0.07%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>2.58%</td>
<td>0.24%</td>
<td>0.07%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Not Tenured</td>
<td>2.58%</td>
<td>0.24%</td>
<td>0.07%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Non-Tenure Track</td>
<td>2.58%</td>
<td>0.24%</td>
<td>0.07%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Lec/Research Associate</td>
<td>2.58%</td>
<td>0.24%</td>
<td>0.07%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>FACULTY - 9 to 12 Month Conversion</td>
<td>2.58%</td>
<td>0.24%</td>
<td>0.07%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>2.58%</td>
<td>0.24%</td>
<td>0.07%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>Not Tenured</td>
<td>2.58%</td>
<td>0.24%</td>
<td>0.07%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>FACULTY - 12 to 9 Month Conversion</td>
<td>2.58%</td>
<td>0.24%</td>
<td>0.07%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>2.58%</td>
<td>0.24%</td>
<td>0.07%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Not Tenured</td>
<td>2.58%</td>
<td>0.24%</td>
<td>0.07%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Non-Tenure Track</td>
<td>2.58%</td>
<td>0.24%</td>
<td>0.07%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>COACH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY - LEVEL 1</td>
<td>2.49%</td>
<td>7.99%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY - LEVEL 2</td>
<td>2.49%</td>
<td>7.99%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>PSA</td>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>Auxiliaries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATION - LEVEL 1</td>
<td>2.25%</td>
<td>2.39%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2A ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATION - LEVEL 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATION - LEVEL 2</td>
<td>3.40%</td>
<td>2.83%</td>
<td>0.34%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATION - LEVEL 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT - LEVEL 1</td>
<td>5.65%</td>
<td>2.58%</td>
<td>1.05%</td>
<td>2.22%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4A ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT - LEVEL 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT - LEVEL 2</td>
<td>3.24%</td>
<td>2.15%</td>
<td>0.24%</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 FACULTY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6A FACULTY - 9 to 12 Month Conversion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>4.07%</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>0.65%</td>
<td>0.55%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Tenured</td>
<td>4.78%</td>
<td>3.25%</td>
<td>0.37%</td>
<td>0.46%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Tenure Track</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
<td>2.80%</td>
<td>0.15%</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lectures &amp; Research Associate</td>
<td>3.55%</td>
<td>2.12%</td>
<td>0.24%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6b FACULTY - 12 to 9 Month Conversion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>3.55%</td>
<td>2.45%</td>
<td>1.01%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Tenured</td>
<td>3.50%</td>
<td>2.45%</td>
<td>1.01%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Tenure Track</td>
<td>3.50%</td>
<td>2.45%</td>
<td>1.01%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 COACH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY - LEVEL 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY - LEVEL 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Health, Education and Human Development

#### Average Percent Increase of All Employees in Budget Center

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>Academic</th>
<th>PSA</th>
<th>Administrative</th>
<th>Athletics</th>
<th>Auxiliaries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATION - LEVEL 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td>ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATION - LEVEL 1 - 9 to 12 Month Conversion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATION - LEVEL 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b</td>
<td>ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATION - LEVEL 2 - 12 to 9 Month Conversion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT - LEVEL 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td>ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT - LEVEL 1 - 9 to 12 Month Conversion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT - LEVEL 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a</td>
<td>ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT - LEVEL 2 - 9 to 12 Month Conversion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>FACULTY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6a</td>
<td>FACULTY - 9 to 12 Month Conversion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6b</td>
<td>FACULTY - 12 to 9 Month Conversion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>COACH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY - LEVEL 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY - LEVEL 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The table above contains data on average percent increases for various categories and levels within the Health, Education and Human Development budget center. Each category includes data for different types of employees and their corresponding percent increases in compensation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>Academic</th>
<th>PSH</th>
<th>Administrative</th>
<th>Athletics</th>
<th>Auxiliaries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATION - LEVEL 1</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td>9 to 12 Month Conversion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATION - LEVEL 2</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
<td>4.01%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b</td>
<td>12 to 9 Month Conversion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT - LEVEL 1</td>
<td>1.24%</td>
<td>2.40%</td>
<td>1.62%</td>
<td>1.02%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td>Classified</td>
<td>1.24%</td>
<td>2.40%</td>
<td>1.62%</td>
<td>1.02%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT - LEVEL 2</td>
<td>4.42%</td>
<td>2.40%</td>
<td>1.02%</td>
<td>0.89%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>FACULTY</td>
<td>2.20%</td>
<td>2.30%</td>
<td>0.79%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>2.20%</td>
<td>2.30%</td>
<td>0.79%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Tenured</td>
<td>0.21%</td>
<td>1.80%</td>
<td>7.77%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6a</td>
<td>Lecturer/Research Associate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FACULTY - 9 to 12 Month Conversion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Tenured</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6b</td>
<td>FACULTY - 12 to 9 Month Conversion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Tenured</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>COACH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY - LEVEL 1</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>2.49%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY - LEVEL 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Welfare Committee has been researching two issues for the Faculty Senate. Both issues are still open and we continue to seek input and information.

1. It has been established that any 9 month employee who comes into work during the summer (while not on the payroll) will be covered by Workmen’s Compensation if they are performing tasks normally associated with their 9 month work related duties. Just what this will cover is still up in the air.

2. The committee has been contacting our peer institutions to survey what type of benefit package is available for faculty to offer waivers for tuition for themselves, their spouse or their children. We will be making the results of this survey available at a future meeting.

Any input you might have towards these issues may be directed to John Leininger (ljohn@clemson.edu).
This year's Faculty Senate Finance Committee consisted of: Kerry Brooks (AAH); John Warner (BPA); Russ Sutton (AFLS); Jack Peck (E&S); and Robert L. Campbell (BPA, Chair).

1997-1998 was a transitional year for the Finance Committee. Some activities that took up much of the Committee's time in the past are no longer handled by Finance. Most notably, we are no longer responsible for the annual Salary Survey (which is now the responsibility of the joint Faculty Senate-Administration Budget Accountability Committee).

Of course, there are still plenty of things for the Finance Committee to do. Important aspects of Clemson University's spending patterns and budgetary decision making have still not been carefully analyzed by anyone, or accounted for in any public forum. Investigative work in this areas is extremely time-consuming, even when it gets the support of administrators who favor open reporting and informed management decisions.

We will therefore be passing some projects on to next year's Finance Committee, in the hope that it will be able to build on the foundations we laid:

1. We commenced an investigation of the uses of Public Service Activity (PSA) funds at the University. There are several distinct types of PSA funding, with different restrictions on the uses of each, and Federal and State contributions to each. After receiving a thorough tutorial in PSA funding, we still do not have answers to some key questions:

   a) What percentage of PSA funding goes to support faculty members on the Clemson campus and their activities, as opposed to supporting the activities of the Extension system, or the Regulatory departments? (There are two distinct PSA programs of research funding, but even the one designated as Extension clearly involves many faculty at the University).

   b) The majority of faculty members in the College of Agriculture, Forestry, and Life Sciences are not paid wholly out of PSA funds or Education and General funds, but partly from each source, in varying proportions. How much PSA money goes into faculty salaries in a given year? How do the proportions of E&G and PSA funding vary from one department to another, and on what basis? We have asked the Accountability Committee to break down base salaries for faculty members in AFLS (and in the Department of Parks, Recreation, and Tourism Management) by funding source in a future salary analysis, so that the information needed to answer these questions will be available.

   c) In the areas of the University that are eligible for PSA funding, how much is spent yearly from PSA sources for administrative and staff salaries?

   d) What cross-subsidies, if any, are there between activities funded by PSA and activities funded by E&G?

2. We evaluated a procedure called Program-Level Contribution Analysis, as described in a report by Alvin Swonger from the University of Rhode Island (which now uses this procedure for self-study purposes). PLCA seeks to identify revenues, direct costs, and indirect costs by program, rather than by department (in a department that has an undergraduate degree program and a graduate program, revenues and costs for service course teaching are distinguished from revenues and costs for the Bachelor's degree program, and from revenues and costs for the Master's or Doctoral program). Unlike standard approaches, Program-Level Contribution Analysis counts tuition and State tuition subsidies for each Student Credit Hour as revenue; it also seeks to allocate indirect costs to each academic program (for instance, the costs of space and utilities...
for the program, the costs of operating the library, of running Sikes Hall, of providing police and fire protection, etc.).

In our judgment, Program-Level Contribution Analysis can be done with "off the shelf" information—information already being routinely gathered by departments, or by the upper administration. We also believe that valuable management information can be derived from such an analysis.

However, there are three strong commitments that the upper administration needs to make so that the results of this type of analysis will not be misused:

a. All results of Program-Level Contribution Analysis must be presented in public and must be available to all Clemson University faculty members.

b. It must be clearly stated that allocations of administrative costs and other types of overhead to programs do not constitute an endorsement of the current levels of expenditure on administration. (In fact, any reduction in administrative costs University-wide will reduce the indirect costs for all academic programs.)

c. Any administrative judgments or decisions regarding academic programs must take program quality as well as costs and revenues into account.

Provided that these commitments are made, we recommend Program-Level Contribution Analysis to the next Finance Committee. It needs to be understood that doing this type of analysis for the first time will require a major commitment of time and effort from all Finance Committee members over the next academic year.

3. We sought direct access to the University’s data bases so we could evaluate whether the necessary information for salary analyses and other financial comparisons is present (for instance, we have learned that the current data base does not separately identify administrative salary supplements, nor does it give an accurate job description for each employee beyond the official State job title). Direct access would also allow us to assess how well the information in the data bases is being maintained. The Faculty Senate hired a graduate student in Computer Science who had the requisite expertise in data bases to do this work under the Finance Committee’s direction. However, conflicting directives and apprehension in some areas of the upper administration resulted in the student being denied authorization to access the data bases until the Fall Semester was nearly over (and he was about to graduate).

We recommend that the next Faculty Senate hire a graduate student from Computer Science to carry out the work that could not be done this year. As the new Peoplesoft data base is brought online, the information from a thorough investigation of the old data bases will help ensure that the new data bases are better designed and maintained. Clearly, however, an ironclad commitment from the upper administration to support this kind of work is required before the Faculty Senate should undertake to spend additional funds on it.

4. In collaboration with John Leininger, Chair of the Welfare Committee, we have investigated some ways in which the current system for funding Summer School courses makes distorted cost estimates and thus prevents courses that would generate positive net revenue from being taught. In addition, there are problems posed by graduate courses that need to be taught in the summer for programmatic reasons, but that would definitely show a loss under the current system. A copy of our thoughts on this issue is attached. We acknowledge the major contributions that Bill Dougan (Chair of the Economics Department) and John Warner made to this analysis. We will seek a meeting with Provost Rogers to discuss these issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert L. Campbell

Robert L. Campbell
Third, the cost of retirement varies. Retirement benefits are 9.752% of salary for those in the State retirement system, and 4.25% for those who are enrolled in a private annuity plan.

In addition, the University pays 0.59% of salary for Workers Compensation and 0.121% for unemployment insurance for all faculty.

In sum, the cost of benefits for Summer School instructors varies between 6.41% and 18.13%. It is always below the current 20% estimate, and if the University's new accounting and data base software do their jobs, there is no reason why the cost of benefits cannot be known accurately for each instructor.

3. Incentives to increase net revenue. A concern that underlay the move to our current Summer School system was that departments would treat Summer School courses as a perquisite for senior faculty, who would end up teaching high-cost, low-enrollment courses regardless of effects on revenue or programmatic requirements. The requirement that courses generate positive net revenue on a Department by Department basis already curbs any such tendencies. A further incentive to be economical in providing Summer courses would be the following: return to each Department a percentage of the positive net revenue generated by its Summer courses. The Dougan report suggests 50%, but other considerations might lead to the adoption of a different figure. In any case, the Department's share of the proceeds would augment its budget for the next Academic Year, and this would be a powerful incentive to teach Summer School courses that will make money.

So far, we have discussed ways in which costs can be gauged more accurately, and incentives for increasing net revenue can be put in place. There is, however, an additional concern, which pertains to Summer Graduate courses.

4. Summer Graduate courses. A few Summer School courses will not generate net revenue individually. They may even drag the Department's offerings into the red overall—yet there are serious consequences if they are not taught.

These are Graduate courses that are essential to Graduate programs. Examples are Summer internships for grad students (as in Applied Psychology) and required Graduate courses that are normally taught in the Summer (as in Graphic Communications). There are even Graduate courses that are taught by one department and are needed by students from other departments (for instance, the Introduction to Geographic Information Systems course taught by Planning and Landscape Architecture).

When summer Graduate courses are truly essential, provisions need to be made for these courses to be taught, even though they may cause the department's offerings to show a loss. (While the cost of a Summer Internship course can be absorbed by a department like Psychology that offers several low-cost, relatively high-enrollment undergraduate courses during the Summer terms, other departments are not able to offset their losses in this fashion.)

A deeper problem is how revenue from Graduate Student tuition is to be estimated. It is common for Graduate Student tuition to be subsidized much more deeply than undergraduate tuition; but then Graduate students on assistantship are generally providing needed services to the University at low cost. At present, Summer School tuition for Graduate Students on assistantship is reckoned around $450 total (not per course). This is such a low rate per student that Summer Graduate Courses are guaranteed to run at a loss. (There is another oddity in the system: First and Second Summer Sessions are
SOME PROBLEMS WITH THE ASSESSMENT OF COSTS FOR SUMMER SCHOOL COURSES

Given the basic requirement that Summer School courses generate positive net revenue for Clemson University, there are several improvements that can be made to the current system. Some have to do with estimating costs more accurately; some have to do with maximizing revenue; and some are needed so that essential Graduate courses are not squeezed out during the Summer sessions when they need to be taught.

The current system requires Summer School courses to generate positive net revenue for the University. (In practice, the requirement is that the courses offered by a given department should generate positive net revenue, not that each course should do so individually.)

Problems arise when positive net revenue is not measured accurately. Under the current system there are two sources of inaccuracy, both of which tend to overstate the costs, and prevent some courses from being taught when in fact they would make a positive contribution to net revenue.

1. The 26% tax. The University levies a 26% "tax" on top of the direct cost of teaching a summer school course (direct cost meaning salary plus benefits for the instructor) in determining whether the course will make money for the University.

This procedure makes no sense. The apparent reason for it is a concern that 26% of the proceeds of teaching Summer School courses should go to support the Library. But of course, the Library would still be operating in the Summer, and incurring costs, even if no Summer School courses were being taught at all. Moreover, the share of revenue for the Library will be larger if all courses that generate positive net revenue on a direct cost basis are taught. There is no point in canceling courses that generate positive net revenue, just because they do not generate the instructor's salary plus benefits, plus 26%. The current policy tends to decrease net revenue to the University as a whole, and to the Library in particular.

2. Inflated estimates of the cost of benefits. The University applies a "one size fits all" formula for benefits as a percentage of salary. This overstates the cost of benefits slightly for some faculty members, and profoundly for others. The direct cost of offering Summer School courses is once again being overestimated.

Currently 20% of the instructor's salary is added on as an estimate of the cost of benefits. But this 20% number is always wrong!

For one thing, there is no added cost of health benefits during the summer; all 9-month employees have health benefits for the Summer months deducted from their paychecks in mid-May.

Second, the cost of Social Security depends on the faculty member's 9-month salary. For those whose total salary has not yet reached $65,400, the University owes 7.65% of salary in Social Security taxes. Beyond $65,400, the University owes only 1.45% in Medicare taxes. In this regard, the cost of benefits as a percentage of salary actually falls after the instructor's 9-month salary exceeds a certain level.
covered, but Maymester is not. Graduate Students on assistantship have to pay full tuition for Maymester courses, for reasons that have gone unexplained.) There needs to be a University-level review of the way Graduate tuition is accounted for.
University Committees

1. Academic Council

Councils and subcommittees reporting to the Academic Council

2. Council on Undergraduate Studies

(This council will consist of three faculty members from each college and two from the library elected by the faculty. Two additional members will be appointed by the Faculty Senate and three by the Student Senate. The Council will be convened each year by the Senior Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies and elect a chair.)

Subcommittees: Undergraduate Curriculum
Admissions Committee
Continuing Enrollment Committee
Calhoun College
Scholarships and Awards
Financial Aid
Undergraduate Academic Grievances

3. Council on Graduate Studies

(This council will consist of two faculty members from each college and one from the library elected by the faculty. In addition, there will be one Faculty Senator and three graduate students. The Council will be convened each year by the Graduate Dean and elect a chair.)

Subcommittees: Graduate Curriculum
Graduate Admissions & Continuing Enrollment Appeals
Graduate Fellowships and Awards
Graduate Advisory
Graduate Student Academic Grievances
Councils, Commissions and Committees Reporting to the President

4. Athletic Council
5. President's Commission on the Status of Women
6. Honorary Degree and Naming Committee
7. The President's Cabinet
8. The Commission on Classified Staff Affairs

Committees Reporting to the VP for Academic Affairs and Provost

9. Computer Advisory Committee
10. Libraries Advisory Committee
11. University Assessment Committee
12. Innovation Fund Awards Committee

Committees Reporting to Chief Research Officer

13. Research Council

Subcommittees: Animal Research
               Institutional Biosafety
               Human Subjects
               Intellectual Property
               Research Grants
Committees whose duties are to be Reassigned

External Educational Programs Committee
(Duties to be assumed by the director of off-campus programs. Ad-hoc committees convened as needed.)

Academic Ceremony Committee
(Duties to be assumed by Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, Registrar, and Faculty Senate. Ad-hoc committee convened as needed.)

Special Advisory Committee on Names to Board of Trustees
(Combined with Honorary Degrees Committee.)

Facilities Planning Committee
(Duties assumed by Assistant Vice Provost for Academic Affairs. Ad-hoc committee convened as needed.)

Committee on Access and Accommodations for Individuals with Disabilities
(Duties to be assumed by appropriate offices and Faculty Senate.)

Group Insurance Committee
(Duties to be assumed by the Finance Committee of the Faculty Senate.)

Strategic Planning Committee
(Eliminated)

Alumni Distinguished Professors Committee
(Will cease to exist as a committee, but will meet at the discretion of the group.)

Faculty Development Committee
(Duties to be assumed by the Accountability and Finance Committees of the Faculty Senate.)
Operational Guidelines for Councils, Commissions and Committees

A. The University will convene the following Councils:

   a. Council on Undergraduate Studies
   b. Council in Graduate Studies
   c. Research Council
   d. Athletic Council

   Note: Council members serving on three or more council subcommittees in one semester may be granted appropriate release time not to exceed three credit hour(s) equivalents upon recommendation of the appropriate administrator. The Senior Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies, Dean of the Graduate School, Chief Research Officer and the Athletic Director respectively will recommend the level of release time for individual council members to the appropriate Academic Dean for final approval.

B. The University will convene the following Commissions:

   a. President’s Commission on the Status of Women
   b. The Commission on Classified Staff Affairs

C. The University will convene the following standing committees.

   a. Honorary Degrees and Naming Committee
   b. Computer Advisory Committee
   c. Library Advisory Committee
   d. University Assessment Committee
   e. Innovation Fund Awards Committee

Standing Committees will normally consist of three to five members never to exceed seven members. When a committee exceeds five members, representation must include membership from the five colleges and the Library.
Proposed Revision:

Committees Reporting to the Academic Council

Admissions Committee

This committee is responsible for reviewing and approving admissions standards recommended by the collegiate deans, suggesting admission policies at the undergraduate level to the Academic Council, reporting general statistics to the Academic Council and evaluating admissions appeals from freshmen and transfer applicants. The Director of Admissions (non-voting) will chair the committee.

The five faculty members appointed by the collegiate faculty and the faculty representative appointed by the Provost will hear admissions appeals. The Director of Admissions (non-voting) will chair the subcommittee hearing appeals.

Membership consists of the following:

Voting
- One faculty member from each of the five colleges elected by the collegiate faculty for a three-year staggered term,
- One faculty member appointed by the Provost,
- Chair (or a representative) of the Scholastic Policies Committee of the Faculty Senate,
- Chair (or a representative) of the Academic Policies Committee of the Student Senate
- Chair (or a representative) of the Student Minority Council

Non-voting
- Director of Admissions (Chair)
- Director of Housing
Proposed Revision:

Committees Reporting to the Academic Council

Continuing Enrollment Committee

This Committee is responsible for recommending continuing enrollment policies at the undergraduate level to the Academic Council, reviewing continuing enrollment appeals and reporting general statistics to the Academic Council. The Director of Undergraduate Academic Services (non-voting) will chair the committee.

The five faculty members appointed by the collegiate faculty and the faculty representative appointed by the Provost will hear continuing enrollment appeals. The Director of Undergraduate Academic Services (non-voting) will chair the subcommittee hearing continuing enrollment appeals.

Membership consists of the following:

Voting
- One faculty member from each of the five colleges elected by the collegiate faculty for a three-year staggered term,
- One faculty member appointed by the Provost,
- Chair (or a representative) of the Scholastic Policies Committee of the Faculty Senate,
- Chair (or a representative) of the Academic Policies Committee of the Student Senate
- Chair (or a representative) of the Student Minority Council

Non-voting
- Director of Undergraduate Academic Services (Chair)
- Director of Housing
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A BILL

TO AMEND TITLE 59, CODE OF LAWS OF SOUTH CAROLINA, 1976, RELATING TO EDUCATION, BY ADDING CHAPTER 151 SO AS TO FURTHER PROVIDE FOR THE MANNER IN WHICH AND CONDITIONS UNDER WHICH TENURE AT STATE-SUPPORTED INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER LEARNING IN SOUTH CAROLINA SHALL BE GRANTED.

Be it enacted by the General Assembly of the State of South Carolina:

SECTION 1. Title 59 of the 1976 Code is amended by adding:

"CHAPTER 151
Faculty Tenure

Section 59-151-10. (A) The General Assembly finds that the practice of granting tenure to members of the faculty of state-supported colleges and universities is a long-established practice that hampers the ability of these institutions to adjust to changing conditions and needs.

(B) In the existing academic job market, the complete abolition of tenure would place South Carolina institutions at an unacceptable disadvantage in recruiting and hiring highly qualified persons for their faculties.

(C) Tenure should be reserved for a core faculty with a long-term commitment to the educational mission of particular state-supported institutions and should be awarded only to those persons who have demonstrated records of excellence in teaching such as are worthy of being permanent members of the faculty.

(D) State-supported colleges and universities should have flexibility in developing alternative arrangements for employing faculty by contract where there is no implicit or explicit commitment to persons employed under such contracts being eligible for tenure.

Section 59-151-20. Beginning in 2006, no member of the faculty of any state-supported institution of higher education in South Carolina shall be granted tenure unless that person shall have:

(1) a minimum of ten years of experience teaching at the college or university level in the subject matter in which they hold a faculty appointment;

(2) a documented record of excellence in teaching as evidenced by evaluations of students, alumni, and colleagues.

Section 59-151-30. As of January 1, 2007, the total number of tenured faculty at each state-supported institution of higher education shall not exceed either one-third of the mean number of all full-time teaching faculty for the most recent five years of that institution, or one faculty member for each one hundred full-time equivalent students of the mean enrollment of that institution for the most recent five
years, whichever is lesser.

Section 59-151-40. Each institution shall develop explicit policies and procedures for awarding tenure and place written documentation of those procedures on file with the Commission on Higher Education by January 1, 2000. The university may incorporate into its policies plans to integrate research and service activities congruent with excellence in teaching outlined in Section 59-151-20.

Section 59-151-50. Any state-supported institution of higher education may contract with persons to serve on the faculty, providing that the terms of the contracts shall not exceed five years and contracts may be renewable with an annual review and rolling continuation or with incremental evaluation cycles selected by the university.

Section 59-151-60. No person holding a contract appointment on the faculty of a state-supported college or university shall acquire tenure automatically as a result of years of service.

Section 59-151-70. Each institution shall develop such policies for contract employment as are consistent with its mission, and such policies shall be a matter of public record.

Section 59-151-80. All tenured faculty of state-supported institutions of higher learning on the effective date of this chapter shall continue to hold their tenured status. If on January 1, 2007, in implementing the provisions of Section 59-151-30 an institution has too many tenured faculty, the institution shall come within the requirements of Section 59-151-30 through the process of attrition."

SECTION 2. This act takes effect upon approval by the Governor.

-----XX-----
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BUDGET RECOMMENDATIONS
FISCAL YEAR 1998-99

AS PASSED BY THE
SOUTH CAROLINA
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Prepared By: The Ways and Means Committee
South Carolina House of Representatives
734-3144
March 5, 1998
B U D G E T  O V E R V I E W

The House of Representatives allocated $5 billion in its 1998-99 Appropriation Bill.

"New" funding of $257 million in recurring money and $153 million in non-recurring money was used to continue funding top priorities: (1) Education, (2) Tax Relief, (3) Health/Social Services, (4) Law Enforcement/Corrections, and (5) State Employee Pay (2% effective October 1) and Benefits ($21 million towards the health insurance premium increase).

Key statewide legislation in the Appropriation Bill:

1. Our two major education bills - PASS & LIFE scholarships are included in this budget to insure their consideration this session.

2. The Video Poker legislation is a Part H and a temporary proviso in this budget and picks up the Governor's language as well as clearer enforcement wording. That leaves $2.6 million in revenue from pro-rated video poker machine licenses in the budget.

3. A temporary proviso continues the cut for the Unemployment Insurance Tax employers pay to the Unemployment Compensation Fund for an estimated savings to businesses of more than $50 million for 1999.

4. The Tax Relief Trust Fund is set up to fund tax rebates directly with a portion of the income tax. Tax relief automatically reduces the size of government by reducing the amount of revenue. However, historically, tax relief shows up as an appropriation in the budget, which in 1998-99 overstates the budget by $354 million. All homeowner property tax relief, as well as business inventory tax and manufacturer's depreciation reimbursement are included in this Tax Relief Trust Fund.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Appropriation</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Ed</td>
<td>147,478,072</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Ed</td>
<td>98,426,869</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>47,389,655</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Econ Dev</td>
<td>19,295,315</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crim Just</td>
<td>26,826,754</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exec/Trans/Reg</td>
<td>20,583,639</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Govt. Formula</td>
<td>32,717,119</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Relief</td>
<td>42,441,649</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Appropriated &quot;New&quot; Money</strong></td>
<td><strong>435,159,072</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sources:**
- General Fund: 257,026,043
- Capital Reserve Fund: 86,919,822
- Projected Surplus: 66,201,043
- EIA Growth: 25,022,164
- **Total New Money:** 435,169,072
- Minus Appropriations: 435,159,072
- Balance: 10,000
PUBLIC EDUCATION AND SPECIAL SCHOOLS

A total of $121.8 million was recommended for public education and special schools. Also, Education Improvement Act funding increased by $25,022,164 and now totals $454,425,528. In 1998-99, the Children's Educational Endowment is expected to generate $47,000,000 of which $32,255,000 will be available for school building purposes.

- Education Finance Act and related fringe funded at over $1.3 billion (increase of $39.1 million in FY 1998-99). Base Student Cost up 2.2% to $1,879.

- Full Day Kindergarten funded with increase of $17.9 million and is now fully implemented. (Total full day kindergarten funding now exceeds $49.8 million.

- PASS Legislation (recently approved by the House of Representatives) funded at $14.4 for the first year of implementation.

- South Carolina Teachers’ Salary exceeds southeastern average @ $34,565.

- State Minimum Teacher Salary Schedule extended from 17 to 20 Years.

- Bus Drivers Salary Increase funded at 2% beginning October 1, 1998.

- Instructional Materials (textbooks) funding increased by $4.4 million to $36.4 million.

- Technology funding in excess of $33.4 million was recommended. Included in this funding is $1.5 million for access to the South Carolina State Library’s Subscription Services Program.

- Increase High School Diploma Requirements (20 to 24 credits) funding (2nd of 4 year phase-in) was recommended with a $4.2 million increase.

- School Bus Replacement funding recommended with initial $4 million allocation.

- ADEPT funding increased by $1 million.

- Vocational Equipment funding increased by $500,000 to $8.5 million.

- Teacher Certification Fees will be limited to the initial $49 fee required for FBI/SLED screening. Any other certification fees collected by the Department of Education, after January 1, 1998, will have to reimbursed.
> **Math and Science Hub** funding (totaling $3.3 million) recommended with $1.5 million increase.

> **School District Performance Audit Pilot** with funding of $125,000 recommended.

> **Privatization of School Transportation Sites** increased and may be designated by the Budget and Control Board.

> **The Governor's School for the Arts and Humanities** was funded with an additional $3.6 million and **the Governor's School for Science and Math** was funded with an additional $3 million.

---

**HIGHER EDUCATION**

A total of $84.9 million was recommended for higher education, of which 44% funded annualizations from previous years. The Higher Education budget includes the following:

> **$19 million of recurring revenue for LIFE scholarships.** Close to 17,000 students will be eligible for either the $2,000 or $1,000 scholarship to a 4-year or 2-year SC institution, which requires a "B" and an SAT score of 1,000 for students attending 4-year institutions. As promised, LIFE was funded from base budget growth.

> **Tuition and fees at public higher education institutions in South Carolina are restricted** to the Higher Education Price Index, which was 3.1% in 1997. Institutions below the southeastern average of tuition and fees are exempted from this restriction.

> **$6 million recurring revenue for performance funding** along with $25 million in non-recurring for formula funding of capital needs for a total of $31 million, which funds annualizations from FY 1997-98. Also, $52,000 was provided for Employment Security Commission to track South Carolina graduates' performance and provide outcome date on performance.

> **$2 million for Tech Special Schools** in the base budget to offset annualizations from 1997-98.

> **$900,000** in recurring revenue to maintain the current level of grant awards by the Higher Education Tuition Grants Commission.

> **$25.4 million for Higher Education capital projects** including: $2.5 million for the USC arena; $3 million for Clemson’s Littlejohn Coliseum; $750,000 for the Citadel; $3 million for Charleston’s Health & Physical Education complex; $2.3 million for Coastal Carolina’s Humanities Building; $525,000 for Francis Marion for energy facility upgrade; $1.6 million for SC State’s Hodge Hall renovation; $3.5 million for USC’s School of Public Health;
$775,000 for Winthrop to purchase science equipment; $250,000 for roof repairs at Chesterfield-Marlboro TEC; $1.5 million for Tri-County TEC; and $5.7 million for Horry-Georgetown’s Library and Student Services building.

- **$800,000 to match endowment earnings** for scholarships.
- **$2.5 million in recurring** for EPSCoR and **$600,000 in supplemental funding** for SCAMP.
- The Small Business Development Center, the Institute for Public Affairs, and the USC Law Library received annualizations of $191,000, $500,000, and $400,000 respectively.
- **$48,000 additional scholarships** for veterinary and optometry students.
- SC STATE received **$500,000 to continue the accrediting process** for the Business School.
- SCETV’s Dept. of New Media received $258,000 to digitize ETV programs so the programs can be used on the new computer technology in public schools.
- The Motorcycle Safety Program was funded at $100,000 at Midlands TEC, which matches the $100,000 from the Department of Public Safety for a total of $200,000.
- **$650,000 for the Center for Advanced Fibers & Films research** was appropriated for match on federal and private grants.

### HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Eight health and human service agencies are recommended to receive a total increase of $38,459,346 in General, Supplemental and Capital Reserve Funds

- **Department of Health and Human Services** - a total of **$28,106,332** is recommended including:
  - Annualization of non-recurring funding received for the current year- **$15,437,281**;
  - Maintenance of the Medicaid program (match rate change, growth of eligibles, and pharmacy and equipment cost increases) - **$7,408,316**;
  - Nursing home rate adjustment- **$4,000,000**; and
  - Rural Health Clinics growth- **$1,135,735**.
These state funds will match $65,289,775 in federal funds. During FY 96-97, 519,505 persons received Medicaid services.

- **Vocational Rehabilitation**
  
  Purchase of rehabilitative services for 1,500 persons with disabilities for job preparation- $500,000

- **Department of Health and Environmental Control**
  
  Local health centers renovations- $1,000,000 non-recurring funds

- **Department of Mental Health**
  
  Continuation of Pharmaceutical Research Project- $500,000 non-recurring funds

- **Department of Disabilities and Special Needs**
  
  Annualization of non-recurring funds and matching funds for match rate change- $1,506,000

- **Department of Alcohol and Other Drug Abuse Services**
  
  Continuation of non-recurring funding for “The Bridge”- $300,000 non-recurring funds

- **Department of Social Services**
  
  Emotionally Disturbed Children, partial annualization- $5,500,000 non-recurring funds
  
  (DSS projected savings are being used to reduce $12,000,000 annualization by $6,500,000)

- **Commission for the Blind**
  
  Facility renovations for cafeteria and job demonstration site- $900,000 non-recurring funds

---

**ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, ENVIRONMENT AND NATURAL RESOURCES**

- A total of $17,185,000 was recommended for Economic Development, Environmental and Natural Resources. The recommended budget includes the following:

- **Department of Commerce**: $1,000,000 in recurring funds are appropriated to the Department of Commerce. $500,000 is for Employee Incentives for retention of Industrial
Recruiters. $500,000 is for Advertising for South Carolina in trade publications aimed at industry leaders.

- **Clemson-PSA:** $1,500,000 recurring funds is appropriated for Clemson-PSA for the Agri-Systems Productivity and Profitability Program, also known as the 2x4 Initiative.

- **South Carolina State Library:** The Library’s Subscription Services Program is funded with $1,500,000 recurring funds through Public Education’s EIA money.

- **Non-recurring funds were appropriated for the following items:**

  **In the Capital Reserve Fund:**
  - DHEC: Beach Renourishment (Horry) $2,000,000
  - DHEC: Water Quality Testing & Monitoring $1,000,000
  - State Library: Dillon Library $1,000,000
  - Coordinating Council: Lake Marion Regional Water Agency $1,000,000
  - Clemson-PSA: SLC Fire Ant Study $200,000
  - Clemson-PSA: Agriculture & Life Sciences Biotechnology Complex $4,000,000
  - PRT: Palmetto Trails $85,000
  - PRT: Conference Center- Columbia $2,000,000
  - PRT: Palmetto Youth Games $25,000
  - PRT: Senior Center Expansion & Building Renovation $25,000
  - PRT: Lexington Equestrian Center $200,000
  - PRT: Heritage Corridor $1,000,000

  **In the Supplemental Bill:**
  - Coordinating Council: Spartanburg Renaissance Project, Downtown Redevelopment $2,000,000
  - Clemson-PSA: Meat Inspection $150,000

---

**CRIMINAL JUSTICE**

- Total amount recommended for Criminal Justice agencies is $17.6 million

- Annualization of New Judges and Staff at $1,184,390 for the **Judicial Department**. Other annualizations include the tiered judges salary structure and judicial commitment at $636,027. Also, increase Judges expense allowance from $250 to $500 a month at $336,000, provide for court appointment funding at $235,517, and provide $500,000 for information technology, and $48,000 to judicial travel rotation.
SLED's recommendation includes $367,239 for forensic lab equipment and DNA database maintenance.

The Attorney General's Office recommendation includes $255,868 for the Medicaid Fraud Control Unit, Violence Against Women program, and Capital Litigation.

$500,000 was recommended to fund the annualization of Judicial Circuit and State Support for the Prosecution Coordination Commission.

Appellate Defense's recommendation includes $340,000 to annualize operating expenses.

Annualize Pay Plan FY 97-98 for the Department of Public Safety and the Department of Corrections.

$1.9 million recommended in operating funds for four 256-bed additions at the Department of Corrections. Also, $650,375 for the substance abuse treatment at Lee, $363,718 for Maintenance and $780,000 for Medical Contracts Inflation.

For the Department of Probation, Parole, and Pardon Services, $1,658,116 recommended for annualizing 51 existing agents supervising criminal offenders and $1 million for Restitution Collection.

Annualize FY 97-98 funding at the Department of Juvenile Justice to maintain current program effort at $5,262,594.

Part II requires all monies awarded the State (except investigative costs or costs of litigation awarded by court order or settlement) by judgement or settlement in actions brought by the Attorney General on behalf of the State be deposited in the General Fund of the State.

TRANSPORTATION/REGULATORY

The Transportation and Regulatory Subcommittee did not recommend any appropriated increases from the General Fund for the Agencies reporting to the Subcommittee. Increases given are a result of transfers from agencies' carry forward funds.

General Fund
Part II, Section 26 - State Accident Fund Interest
Remits to the General Fund interest earned and accrued on funds and revenues paid by state agencies. Distributes to the local entities interest earned and accrued on funds and revenues paid by the local entities. Fiscal Impact is estimated at $3,000,000 to the General Fund in FY 98-99.
Proviso 42.7 - Transfers $875,000 from Subfund 4129, Dual Party Relay, to the General Fund.

**Department of Insurance** - The Public Service Commission will transfer $125,000 from Subfund 4129, Dual Party Relay, to the Department of Insurance to fund seven new other funds FTE positions. The positions are needed to implement functions required by the Auto Insurance Bill (Act #154 of 1997).

**Department of Transportation** - The Public Service Commission will transfer $1,200,000 from Subfund 4129, Dual Party Relay, to the Department of Transportation for reimbursement of workers' compensation claims which apply to employees transferred to the Department of Public Safety.

The State Accident Fund will absorb $687,000 to buy out workers' compensation claims for DOT employees transferred from the Department of Highways and Public Safety as a result of restructuring.

Part II, Section 24 - “C” Funds Interest - Changes the distribution of earnings on county transportation funds from an formula based on a county’s annual distribution to a monthly formula based on a county’s month-end balances. The distributions of earnings and the calculation to determine the appropriate amounts shall not include those counties administering their own “C” Funds.

Part II, provides for a moratorium on corporate income taxes for qualifying businesses which meet certain conditions including, but not limited to, a county having an average annual unemployment rate at least twice the state average during the last two years.

---

**LEGISLATIVE, EXECUTIVE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT**

- $30.1 million for **property tax relief** for those with homes valued less than $100,000. The total relief is increased from $227.8 million to $240 million for FY 98-99. Provides 96% of property tax relief to be funded with recurring funds and $9.5 million from the FY 97-98 projected surplus. The $240 million will be place in the Property Tax Relief Trust Fund.

- $32.7 million for the **Local Government Funding Formula** funded from the projected FY 97-98 surplus. This provides a total of $206.5 million for the Local Government Fund.

- $23.5 million for a **2% base pay increase** for state employees effective October 1, 1997, and $1.6 million to annualize the FY 97-98 base pay increase for the Departments of Corrections and Public Safety.
$21 million for a health insurance rate increase of 16% in employer contributions to fund active and retired employees, public school employees, and new retiree growth.

$10.9 million for the 2nd of the 3rd phase to reduce manufacturing depreciation to provide for a total relief of $21.1 million. The funds are directed to the Tax Relief Trust Fund.

$7.3 million to maintain the General Reserve Fund at 3% of the prior year’s actual revenue for a total of $137.6 million.

$4.8 million to maintain the Capital Reserve Fund at 2% of the latest completed fiscal year’s actual revenue for a total reserve of $91.8 million.

$2.5 million for Debt Service to provide for a total debt service payment of $152.4. This is a decrease from a total debt service payment of $163 million in FY 97-98 which was funded with $13.1 million in nonrecurring funds from the Capital Reserve Fund.

$1.4 million for Homestead Exemption growth, for a total of $52.7 million to be placed in the Tax Relief Trust Fund.

Business Inventory Tax funds of $40.5 million funded in the base budget, property tax relief funds of $240 million, Homestead Exemption amounting to $52.7 million and Manufacturing Depreciation of $21.1 million are all placed in a Tax Relief Trust Fund totaling $354.3 million. The trust fund is separate and distinct from the State General Fund. A decrease in revenue of $52.4 million to the General Fund occurred as a result of the passage of a permanent provision in the bill to ban video poker.

$2,088,000 for the Election Commission for the 1998 General Election funded with Capital Reserve Funds.

$1,588,619 for Local Government Grants and Loans funded with Capital Reserve Funds.

$200,000 for the Korean War Memorial and $200,000 for the Southern Legislative Conference to be hosted in August 1998 with funds from the Capital Reserve Fund.

$1.5 million to reinstate the Capital Complex rent funds vetoed by the Governor for FY 97-98.

$530,622 for the Adjutant General to provide a 50% match for FEMA funds.

$200,000 for the Statewide Performance Audit and $35,000 for the Comptroller General to purchase software to test computer program changes for the year 2000.

$39,532 for an Investigator for the State Ethics Commission to assist with audits and investigations.
Base reductions of $2.6 million were made in the following agencies: $1.6 million in retirement supplements to state and school employees; $300,000 Legislative Printing; $200,000 State Reorganization Commission; $50,000 Administrative Law Judges; $50,000 B & C Board- Office of the Executive Director(TQM); and $400,000 Department of Revenue.

$100,000 for the Secretary of State to retain revenue for operating expenses and authorization to hire 4 FTEs with non-state funds for the Business Filings Division.
PROPOSAL

FACULTY REPRESENTATIVE TO
THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES

The Clemson University Faculty Senate requests approval for the selection of a Faculty Representative to the Board of Trustees using the process outlined below. We are requesting this individual be recognized as the official representative of the Faculty and be granted privileges beyond those accorded to visitors to Board meetings. This would include receipt of Minutes and Agendas of all Board and Committee meetings; an opportunity to be included on the Agenda upon request; and inclusion in the Annual Board Retreat.

Selection Procedures

A Faculty Representative to the Board of Trustees Screening Committee, composed of one Distinguished Alumni Professor from each College, one Library representative, and the President of the Faculty Senate, will solicit nominations for the Faculty Representative to the Board of Trustees in February, 1998, and every third year thereafter.

Any individual holding tenure at Clemson University will be eligible for nomination. The nomination period will run for fourteen days from the date of the Call for Nominations. Each nomination must include a complete vita and a statement of interest from the nominee.

The Faculty Manual Editorial Consultant will examine all nominations to verify the faculty status of each nominee. The names of all eligible nominees will be distributed to the members of the Screening Committee. The Committee will consider the nominations and forward no fewer than two names of recommended candidates to the Clemson University Board of Trustees.

The Board will select the Faculty Representative from the names submitted by the Screening Committee. The Faculty Representative will serve a three-year term commencing with the first Board meeting following selection.

February 26, 1998
Position Description For Faculty Representative
to the Clemson University Board of Trustees

The Faculty Representative to the Board is crucial to the establishment of improved communication between the Faculty and the Board. The Representative will serve as the primary conduit between the Board and the Faculty and as such will carry out the following duties and responsibilities:

A. Represent the Clemson University Faculty at Meetings of the Board of Trustees

The Representative will be elected by a vote of the faculty and will represent that constituency at all meetings of the Board. The Representative will inform the Board of faculty concerns and issues as they arise. The Representative will also serve as a resource to the Board upon request.

B. Communicate with the Faculty

The Representative will report to the faculty at the December and May General Faculty meetings. In addition, the Representative will attend all meetings of the Executive/Advisory Committee of the Faculty Senate. The Representative will keep the Faculty apprised of all faculty related matters coming before the Board. The Representative will also meet with other faculty groups as needed.

C. Gather Information from the Faculty

The Representative will be responsible for periodic gathering of data from faculty. The Representative will be responsible for developing and implementing effective strategies for acquiring needed information.

D. Consult with the Faculty Senate on Board Related Matters

The Faculty Senate President will continue to represent the Senate at Board meetings. In addition, Senate representatives will attend meetings of the Board of Trustees' Committees. The Representative should consult with these individuals on a regular basis.
RESOLUTION OF THANKS AND APPRECIATION

TO THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES

FS98-3-1 P

Whereas, The Board of Trustees requested Faculty Senate input on the Mission/Vision Statements and Implementing Concepts; and

Whereas, The Revised Implementing Concepts prepared by the Provost incorporated most, if not all, of the recommended changes by the Faculty Senate;

Resolved, That the Faculty Senate appreciates and thanks the Board of Trustees for this opportunity to respond to such an important University matter; and

Further Resolved, That the Faculty Senate is willing and eager to assist with identified approaches to initiate these concepts; and

Further Resolved, That the Faculty Senate encourages the Board of Trustees to continue to meet with representatives of the Faculty Senate for input that may prove helpful.

This resolution was passed unanimously by the Faculty Senate on March 10, 1998.
RESOLUTION OF THANKS AND APPRECIATION

TO PRESIDENT CURRIS

FS98-3-2 P

Whereas, The Faculty Senate has historically been concerned about discrepancies between raises received by administrators and those given to faculty; and

Whereas, President Curris has made a commitment to address these discrepancies; and

Whereas, The 1997 Salary Report compiled by the Budget Accountability Committee indicates President Curris has successfully reduced discrepancies between administrator and faculty pay raises;

Resolved, That the Faculty Senate expresses its appreciation to President Curris for his understanding of Faculty Senate salary concerns; and

Further resolved, That the Faculty Senate appreciates the vision and leadership of President Curris to identify and correct such discrepancies resulting in a more equitable distribution of salary monies between administration and faculty.

This resolution was passed unanimously by the Faculty Senate on March 10, 1998.
To: Academic Vice President and Provost Steffen H. Rogers  
From: Robert A. Waller, Editorial Consultant for the  
Faculty Manual  
Re: Nomination Pool for Senate Officers

On behalf of Faculty Senate President Fran McGuire I transmit for your review and submission to the general Faculty Meeting in May this modification of the Faculty Constitution concerning the nomination pool for Senate Officers. The proposed amendment was approved at the Senate meeting on March 10th by the requisite majority.

The Constitution of the Faculty of Clemson University in Article II (pp. 55-58 of the August 1997 Faculty Manual) prescribes the conditions under which the Faculty Senate operates. Section 3 makes provision for the "Officers" of the Senate. Among the stipulations is the following: "The term of the Vice President shall be extended by one year, if necessary, to permit his or her service as President. Should such an extension of term be necessary, his or her successor will serve a two-year term" (page 56).

The application of this principle has the effect of limiting the Advisory Committee’s submission choices in March to those elected Senators in their second year of service on a three-year term. With a 35-member body, that proviso effectively limits the possible candidates to approximately a dozen individuals each year. It has been suggested that this number is too limiting and that language should be considered to enlarge the pool. To effect such a change, the following sentences would be substituted for those quoted above:

"Candidates for any office may be nominated irrespective of their year of service in the Senate. The terms for officers will be extended until the end of their term in office. The College of the successful candidates would elect a replacement for a full three-year term."

Such a change would enlarge the lists of potential candidates to be considered by the Advisory Committee or for nomination from the floor.

Since this change affects the Constitution, it must be approved by "a two-thirds majority vote of the members present" at the Spring meeting of the University faculty. Following that endorsement, the amendment would become effective upon approval by the Board of Trustees (page 60).

C.C.:  
Faculty Senate President Francis A. McGuire  
Policy Committee Chairman W. Huffman  
Madesames Betty M. Mood Cathy T. Sturkie
Recreation Advisory Committee Meeting
Fike Renovation Plans
February 12, 1998
2:30 pm

Members of the Recreation Advisory Committee and special guests present include:
Dr. Subhash Anand, Dr. Kirk Brague, Dr. Larry Gahan, Ms. Adrienne Gerus, Ms. Sonya
Goodman, Mr. David Hamilton, Mr. Steve Perry, James R. Pope Jr., Ms. Suzanne Rook, Mr. George
Smith, Dr. Joel Brawley, Mr. Pat Hall, Mr. Gerald Vander Mey, Dr. Web Smathers, Dr. Harry
Haritos, Dr. Fran McGuire, Dr. Ron Gantt, Mr. Rowland Alston, Mr. Dexter Hankins, Ms.
Elizabeth Tucker, Dr. Joy Smith, Dr. Dave Allison, Mr. Bob Brookover, Mr. Fred Sabota, Mr. Justin
Ross, and Mr. Ron Sealey.

Meeting started at 2:30 p.m. Dr. Jim Pope opened up the meeting with introductions.

Dr. Joel Brawley discussed the history of Fike Recreation Center. In the late 1960’s a
committee was formed. The committee was dominated by football interest. Six million was given
to build Jervey and Fike Recreation Center. Fike received about 1 1/2 million and was originally
designed with a student body of approximately 8,500 in mind.

Discussion of peer institutions and ACC schools which have built recently including
Georgia, Texas A & M, and Duke.

Bob Brookover discussed how long the expansion has been discussed. Bob then passed out
a packet of information to everyone present. The information included:
- expansion and renovation
- floors in the gym are in need of repair
- deck of pool needs to be replaced
- convert office space into classrooms
- entrance into Fike will be at the appropriate entrance (the side facing the volleyball
courts and intramural fields)
- aerobics is presently maxed out (fees and charges at peer institutions)
- better outdoor lighted field space is needed
- initial funding proposal

Expansion to East Campus:
- outdoor pool and lighted fields

Jim Pope talked about the phases of implementation:

- need clear orders (marching orders)
- task force of about 12 people to identify goals and needs
- develop models

Dr. Joy Smith said that the next step is to officially announce that there is a need to expand
and back it up with facts. It needs to be taken to the administrative council first. Then the “how
to...” comes into play. Indicating the needs comes before the finances.
The visitation group discussed their impressions of Lander, Georgia Southern, Georgia Tech, and Georgia.

Jim Pope presented a slide show from the University of Georgia's 320,000 square foot Ramsey Center.

Comments/Suggestions:

1. What is the square foot per student standards?
2. Usage data
   - when and by what groups
3. Are we adding the right facilities?
4. Need to be up front about the fees/costs.
5. Survey students

Other comments:
   Bob discussed the cutbacks in hours of operation, student employment, and programs due to budget constraints. Gerald Vander Mey and Pat Hall discussed the building process.
### Group Codes *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Academic - departments with academic affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>PSA - departments with primary funding from PSA budgets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Administrative - departments serving as a primary administrative function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Athletics - departments with primary athletic function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Auxiliaries - departments identified as self-supporting units</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* A group code was assigned to each employee based on the home department appearing on the personnel record of the individual at the time of data retrieval.

### Category Codes *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>General Administrative - Presidential and Vice Presidential positions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Academic Administration - Level 1 -- Academic Dean, Associate Dean, Assistant Dean positions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Academic Administration - Level 2 -- Department Chair, School Director, Assistant to Dean positions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Administrative Support - Level 1 -- Managers with primary supervisory responsibility (classified and unclassified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Administrative Support - Level 2 -- Support positions without primary supervisory responsibility (classified only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Faculty -- Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, Instructor, Research Associate, Lecturer positions with primary teaching and/or research responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Coaches -- Athletic area coaches as determined by state title codes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Information Technology - Level 1 -- Managers with primary supervisory responsibility in the information technology area (classified only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Information Technology - Level 2 -- Support positions without primary supervisory responsibility in the information technology area (classified only)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* A category code was assigned to each employee based on the state title code of the employee. Some exceptions were noted where job responsibility did not coincide with job title. These exceptions were coded manually.

### Transaction Codes *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>Statewide Grade Adjustment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>Cost of Living Adjustment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>Unclassified Pay Adjustment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208</td>
<td>Source of Funds Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>Pay Base Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>Sabbatical 1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td>Sabbatical Full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>Extended Leave Without Pay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214</td>
<td>Return from Leave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>Leave Without Pay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td>Demotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223</td>
<td>Special Increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>295</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>299</td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>Performance Based Pay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>Classified Performance Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>Promotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>Transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>Reclassification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219</td>
<td>Additional Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td>Additional Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>221</td>
<td>Remove Additional Duties</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Transaction Codes with associated transactions were collected from the Job History tables of Clemson's data warehouse. The above groupings of transactions were used to examine details of increases.
### University Summary

Average Percent Increase for All Employees in Group and Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>General</th>
<th>Academic</th>
<th>Athletics</th>
<th>Administrative</th>
<th>Unclassified</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Coaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.20%</td>
<td>1.25%</td>
<td>0.90%</td>
<td>2.35%</td>
<td>2.85%</td>
<td>2.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATION - LEVEL 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATION - LEVEL 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATION - LEVEL 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT - LEVEL 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT - LEVEL 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>FACULTY</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FACULTY - 9 to 12 Month Conversion</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FACULTY - 12 to 18 Month Conversion</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>COACH</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY - LEVEL 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY - LEVEL 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Average Percent Increase of All Employees in a Budget Center

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Academic</th>
<th>PSA</th>
<th>Administrative</th>
<th>Athletics</th>
<th>Auxiliaries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATION - LEVEL 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATION - LEVEL 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT - LEVEL 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT - LEVEL 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 FACULTY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY - LEVEL 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY - LEVEL 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE**

- **Academic**: 2.09%
- **PSA**: 2.09%
- **Administrative**: 2.09%
- **Athletics**: 2.09%
- **Auxiliaries**: 2.09%

**ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATION - LEVEL 1**

- **Academic**: 3%
- **PSA**: 3%
- **Administrative**: 3%
- **Athletics**: 3%
- **Auxiliaries**: 3%

**ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATION - LEVEL 2**

- **Academic**: 2.71%
- **PSA**: 2.71%
- **Administrative**: 2.71%
- **Athletics**: 2.71%
- **Auxiliaries**: 2.71%

**ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT - LEVEL 1**

- **Academic**: 2.27%
- **PSA**: 2.27%
- **Administrative**: 2.27%
- **Athletics**: 2.27%
- **Auxiliaries**: 2.27%

**ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT - LEVEL 2**

- **Academic**: 3.93%
- **PSA**: 3.93%
- **Administrative**: 3.93%
- **Athletics**: 3.93%
- **Auxiliaries**: 3.93%

**FACULTY**

- **Academic**: 3.35%
- **PSA**: 3.35%
- **Administrative**: 3.35%
- **Athletics**: 3.35%
- **Auxiliaries**: 3.35%

**FACULTY - 9 to 12 Month Conversion**

- **Academic**: 14.99%
- **PSA**: 14.99%
- **Administrative**: 14.99%
- **Athletics**: 14.99%
- **Auxiliaries**: 14.99%

**FACULTY - 12 to 9 Month Conversion**

- **Academic**: 14.99%
- **PSA**: 14.99%
- **Administrative**: 14.99%
- **Athletics**: 14.99%
- **Auxiliaries**: 14.99%

**INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY - LEVEL 1**

- **Academic**: 2.50%
- **PSA**: 2.50%
- **Administrative**: 2.50%
- **Athletics**: 2.50%
- **Auxiliaries**: 2.50%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>Academic</th>
<th>PSA</th>
<th>Administrative</th>
<th>Athletics</th>
<th>Auxiliaries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATION - LEVEL 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATION - LEVEL 1</td>
<td>9 to 12 Month Conversion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATION - LEVEL 2</td>
<td>12 to 9 Month Conversion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT - LEVEL 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT - LEVEL 1</td>
<td>9 to 12 Month Conversion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT - LEVEL 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 FACULTY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6a FACULTY - 9 to 12 Month Conversion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6b FACULTY - 12 to 9 Month Conversion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 COACH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY - LEVEL 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY - LEVEL 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Architecture, Arts and Humanities

### Average Percent Increase of All Employees in Budget Center

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>Academic</th>
<th>PSA</th>
<th>Administrative</th>
<th>Athletics</th>
<th>Auxiliaries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATION - LEVEL 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td>9 to 12 Month Conversion</td>
<td>2.97%</td>
<td>2.95%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATION - LEVEL 2</td>
<td>5.12%</td>
<td>5.12%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT - LEVEL 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td>Classified</td>
<td>2.53%</td>
<td>2.53%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td>2.04%</td>
<td>2.63%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATION - LEVEL 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>FACULTY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6a</td>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>4.32%</td>
<td>3.37%</td>
<td>0.07%</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Tenured</td>
<td>5.98%</td>
<td>4.87%</td>
<td>0.08%</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Tenure Track</td>
<td>3.28%</td>
<td>3.28%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lecturer/Research Associate</td>
<td>2.95%</td>
<td>2.63%</td>
<td>0.13%</td>
<td>0.17%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6b</td>
<td>FACULTY - 9 to 12 Month Conversion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>5.47%</td>
<td>4.42%</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
<td>0.09%</td>
<td>0.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Tenured</td>
<td>7.16%</td>
<td>6.21%</td>
<td>0.18%</td>
<td>0.09%</td>
<td>0.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Tenure Track</td>
<td>4.31%</td>
<td>4.31%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>COACH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY - LEVEL 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY - LEVEL 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Business and Public Affairs

**Average Percent Increase of All Employees in Budget Center**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Academic</th>
<th>PSA</th>
<th>Administrative</th>
<th>Athletics</th>
<th>Auxiliaries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATION - LEVEL 1</td>
<td>2.19%</td>
<td>2.18%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td>ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATION - LEVEL 1 - 9 to 12 Month Conversion</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATION - LEVEL 2</td>
<td>3.27%</td>
<td>3.28%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b</td>
<td>ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATION - LEVEL 2 - 12 to 9 Month Conversion</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT - LEVEL 1</td>
<td>2.41%</td>
<td>2.41%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td>ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT - LEVEL 1 - 9 to 12 Month Conversion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT - LEVEL 2</td>
<td>2.58%</td>
<td>2.58%</td>
<td>0.24% 0.07%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>FACULTY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6a</td>
<td>FACULTY - 9 to 12 Month Conversion</td>
<td>4.80%</td>
<td>3.48%</td>
<td>0.33% 0.69%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6b</td>
<td>FACULTY - 12 to 9 Month Conversion</td>
<td>5.18%</td>
<td>3.02%</td>
<td>1.02% 0.69%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>COACH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY - LEVEL 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY - LEVEL 2</td>
<td>10.70%</td>
<td>2.40%</td>
<td>7.09%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>PSA</td>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>Auxiliaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATION - LEVEL 1</td>
<td>2.25%</td>
<td>2.30%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATION - LEVEL 1 8 to 12 Month Conversion</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATION - LEVEL 2</td>
<td>3.49%</td>
<td>2.95%</td>
<td>0.54%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATION - LEVEL 2 12 to 9 Month Conversion</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT - LEVEL 1</td>
<td>5.08%</td>
<td>2.99%</td>
<td>1.05%</td>
<td>2.22%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified</td>
<td>4.34%</td>
<td>2.49%</td>
<td>1.75%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td>8.44%</td>
<td>2.70%</td>
<td>5.55%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT - LEVEL 1 8 to 12 Month Conversion</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT - LEVEL 2</td>
<td>3.58%</td>
<td>2.51%</td>
<td>0.09%</td>
<td>0.11%</td>
<td>0.32%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 FACULTY</td>
<td>4.07%</td>
<td>2.90%</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
<td>0.15%</td>
<td>0.35%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>4.78%</td>
<td>3.29%</td>
<td>0.32%</td>
<td>0.42%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Tenured</td>
<td>3.19%</td>
<td>2.88%</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Tenure Track</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer/Research Associate</td>
<td>3.05%</td>
<td>2.12%</td>
<td>0.24%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6a FACULTY - 9 to 12 Month Conversion</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Tenured</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6b FACULTY - 12 to 9 Month Conversion</td>
<td>3.50%</td>
<td>2.49%</td>
<td>1.01%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>3.90%</td>
<td>2.49%</td>
<td>1.01%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Tenured</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Tenure Track</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 COACH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY - LEVEL 1</td>
<td>5.43%</td>
<td>2.45%</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
<td>1.71%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY - LEVEL 2</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Health, Education and Human Development

#### Average Percent Increase of All Employees in Budget Center

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Academic</th>
<th>PSA</th>
<th>Administrative</th>
<th>Athletics</th>
<th>Auxiliaries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 General Administrative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Academic Administration - Level 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.25%</td>
<td>3.25%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a Academic Administration - Level 1 0 to 12 Month</td>
<td></td>
<td>17.92%</td>
<td>6.78%</td>
<td>11.11%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Academic Administration - Level 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.86%</td>
<td>2.86%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Administrative Support - Level 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.93%</td>
<td>2.66%</td>
<td>0.78%</td>
<td>0.46%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a Administrative Support - Level 1 0 to 12 Month Conversion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Administrative Support - Level 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.34%</td>
<td>2.44%</td>
<td>0.92%</td>
<td>0.59%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.64%</td>
<td>3.17%</td>
<td>0.26%</td>
<td>1.39%</td>
<td>0.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6a Faculty - 9 to 12 Month Conversion</td>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>5.95%</td>
<td>3.41%</td>
<td>2.24%</td>
<td>0.17%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6b Faculty - 12 to 9 Month Conversion</td>
<td>Not Tenured</td>
<td>4.43%</td>
<td>3.56%</td>
<td>0.84%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Coach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Information Technology - Level 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Information Technology - Level 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.92%</td>
<td>1.87%</td>
<td>1.84%</td>
<td>2.60%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Library

**Average Percent Increase of All Employees in Budget Center**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>Academic</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>PSA</th>
<th>Administrative</th>
<th>Athletics</th>
<th>Auxiliaries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATION - LEVEL 1</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td>ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATION - LEVEL 1 9 to 12 Month Conversion</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATION - LEVEL 2</td>
<td>4.02%</td>
<td>4.02%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b</td>
<td>ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATION - LEVEL 2 12 to 9 Month Conversion</td>
<td>4.02%</td>
<td>4.02%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT - LEVEL 1</td>
<td>5.28%</td>
<td>2.49%</td>
<td>1.02%</td>
<td>1.88%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td>ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT - LEVEL 1 9 to 12 Month Conversion</td>
<td>5.28%</td>
<td>2.49%</td>
<td>1.02%</td>
<td>1.88%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b</td>
<td>ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT - LEVEL 1 12 to 9 Month Conversion</td>
<td>5.28%</td>
<td>2.49%</td>
<td>1.02%</td>
<td>1.88%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT - LEVEL 2</td>
<td>4.23%</td>
<td>2.49%</td>
<td>1.02%</td>
<td>0.89%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>FACULTY</td>
<td>7.09%</td>
<td>2.20%</td>
<td>4.06%</td>
<td>0.75%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6a</td>
<td>FACULTY - 9 to 12 Month Conversion</td>
<td>7.09%</td>
<td>2.20%</td>
<td>4.06%</td>
<td>0.75%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6b</td>
<td>FACULTY - 12 to 9 Month Conversion</td>
<td>7.09%</td>
<td>2.20%</td>
<td>4.06%</td>
<td>0.75%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>COACH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY - LEVEL 1</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
<td>2.49%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY - LEVEL 2</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>2.49%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. **Call to Order**  President Francis A. McGuire called the meeting to order at 2:32 p.m.

2. **Approval of Minutes**  The March 10, 1998 Faculty Senate Minutes were approved as distributed.

3. **“Free Speech”**  Parker Smith, Student Pro Tempe, stated that Student Senate is working on the future of Johnstone Dormitory and shared names of Student Government Officers for next year.

   Cathy Sams, Chief Public Affairs Officer, discussed publicity for research; plans to increase external news coverage and awareness of University research; and steps faculty members can take to heighten the awareness of News Services of research activities.

   John Huffman, Professor of Chemistry, noting the importance of journals to research universities, expressed his concerns regarding the manner in which journals are to be cut from the Library’s collection and requested the Library to resubmit another way to select journals to delete.

4. **Committee Reports**
   
a. **Research Committee** - Senator Ed Pivorun, Chair, provided an overview of the Research Committee for this year (Attachment A).
   
b. **Scholastic Policies Committee** - Chair Nancy Ferguson submitted the Annual Report from this Committee (Attachment B).
   
c. **Welfare Committee** - John Leininger, Chair, presented the final copy of the Welfare Report in addition to a message regarding Workman’s Compensation for faculty during the summer (Attachment C).
   
d. **Finance Committee** - Chair Robert Campbell noted that this Committee’s Annual Report was submitted in March (see Faculty Senate Minutes dated March 10, 1998).
   
e. **Policy Committee** - John Huffman, Chair of the Policy Committee, submitted the Annual Report dated April 14, 1998 (Attachment D).

   **University Committees and Commissions**  (none)
5. **Board of Trustees Subcommittees**

   a. **Educational Policies Subcommittee** - Senator JoAnne Deeken reported that this subcommittee met on April 8 and was appreciative that a faculty member was present. Senator Deeken stated that a Faculty Senate Report was an agenda item and that the Board has agreed to consider our proposal for a faculty representative to the Board. Action items during this meeting included: changing our policy to be in compliance with the law regarding out-of-state fee waivers for undergraduate students; a departmental name change; final exam schedule; Faculty Manual changes on Grievance procedures, reappointment of department chairs and directors, and research associate title change; and the evaluation of administrators.

   b. **Agriculture and Natural Resources Subcommittee** - Senator Russ Sutton submitted his report from this subcommittee meeting (Attachment E).

6. **Old Business**

   a. **Performance Funding** - Ronald J. Thurston, Chair, submitted for acceptance a Draft Report from this Committee which had been electronically mailed to each Senator. After editing by the Policy Committee, this Report will proceed to the Board of Trustees (Attachment F).

   b. Senator JoAnne Deeken moved that the action item of the February Faculty Senate meeting be readmitted for discussion which was seconded. Vote was taken and passed unanimously. Much discussion was held during which Senators shared information from their colleagues. Senator Jack Peck amended the motion to change wording to “Research Professor” instead of “Research Fellow” which was seconded. Discussion was held on the amendment which included the concept and the title. Senator Peck altered his amendment to allow graduated titles (Assistant Research Professor, Associate Research Professor, and Full Research Professor). Vote was taken on amended title and failed. Discussion reverted back to original proposal of “Senior Research Fellow”. Senator Huffman moved to refer back to table for the consideration by the 1998-99 Faculty Senate. Vote was taken to return this issue to table and passed (Attachment G).

   c. Senator Huffman submitted, explained, and recommended acceptance of the policy statement on Post Tenure Review, noting that it was faculty-friendly and fair. If accepted, this policy would be incorporated into the **Faculty Manual**. Senator Peck made a motion to amend policy (Attachment H) contingent on the success of the Executive Secretary of the Board of Trustees, Thornton Kirby, to promote policy with the Commission on Higher Education. If unsuccessful, then the originally-submitted Post Tenure Review policy statement would be upheld. Motion was seconded. Discussion followed. Vote was taken to accept amendment and passed unanimously. Vote was then taken on amended policy statement (to include contingency plan and reversion to original policy if unsuccessful with CHE) and also passed unanimously (Attachment I).

7. **Outgoing President’s Report and Remarks and Introduction of Faculty Senate President**

   Remarks by President McGuire were received followed by an ovation from the Faculty Senate. President McGuire then introduced the new Faculty Senate President, Patricia T. Smart. New officers were installed at 3:50 p.m.

   

   Kathy Neal Headley, Secretary
8. **New Business**

   a. President Smart introduced the new senators as a group to the continuing Senators and guests.

   b. President Smart reminded Senators to return Committee Preference Questionnaires to the Faculty Senate Office as soon as possible.

   c. Motion was made and seconded to continue the work of the Faculty Senate Budget Accountability Committee. Vote was taken and passed unanimously.

   d. Motion was made and seconded to reaffirm the Proposal regarding a Faculty Representative to the Board of Trustees. Vote was taken and passed unanimously (Attachment J).

   e. President Smart stated that the 1998-99 Faculty Senate will continue the good relationship with the Board of Trustees and University administration established this year; will continue the cooperative effort between administration and Faculty Senate regarding salary issues; and will continue to maintain the relationship with the Classified Staff Commission and Student Government.

9. **Adjournment** The meeting was adjourned by President Smart at 4:15 p.m.

   [Signature]

   Elizabeth Dale, Secretary

   [Signature]

   Cathy Toth Sturkie, Administrative Assistant

Absent: P. Skewes, H. Wheeler (V. Shelburne for), F. Eubanks (M. Cranston for), M. Jacobi, E. Makram, R. Singh, T. Taylor
FACULTY SENATE RESEARCH COMMITTEE SUMMARY REPORT
1997 - 1998 Academic Year

Ed Pivorun, Chair
Raj Singh
Michael Morris
Ted Taylor
Horace Skipper
Hap Wheeler
Gerald Christenbury

1) The Faculty Senate Research Committee [and the Chair of the Committee as a member and Chair of a Subcommittee of the University Research Council] served as a major advisory group regarding the development of a faculty incentive return policy. Discussions and dialog between Dr. Shah and Provost Rogers helped to ensure that a policy that rewarded the faculty was instituted. The advice and concerns of the Research Committee was sought and used during the development of the incentive return policy.

The Committee was also presented with a memorandum from Dr. Shah, Chief Research Officer, that provides an update on the activities of the University Research Council. This document is provided to all members of the Faculty Senate and is entitled STRATEGIC ISSUES AFFECTING RESEARCH/SCHOLARSHIP GROWTH AT CLEMSON UNIVERSITY.

2) The Faculty Senate Research Committee discussed the establishment of a special faculty rank entitled Senior Research Professor. Dr. Shah was present to explain the need for the establishment of this special rank.

Dr. Shah clarified his position on the establishment of this special faculty rank in the following way:

a) would build up the research expertise on campus
b) would not be a tenure track position and could not be converted to a tenure track position.
c) the salary would be obtained from outside funding
d) would add flexibility in recruiting senior faculty
e) would aid in the development of a research network by attracting researchers to the campus with contacts and experience.
f) would have a home department and the overhead would be returned to the department

g) would be subjected to a yearly renewal process; departmental faculty dissatisfaction would result in termination
h) the University would not impose a person on a department-departmental approval would be required-the department has the final voice in hiring/firing
i) the recommendation of the home department to invite a faculty member to accept the research professorship would be subject to approval by the Dean.

Dr. Shah believes that the title Senior Research Professor is preferable to the title Senior Research Fellow. A researcher would be able to sell themselves to a granting agency more readily if his/her title designated that they were a professor rather than a postdoc or research fellow or associate. The majority of the Senate Research Committee concurred.
3) Dr. Shah also discussed the concept of developing Institutes/Centers of Excellence. These centers would allow for faculty with collective strengths to more effectively market their research capabilities to outside funding sources. All members of these centers will have a departmental home and all credit would go back to the individual PI's department/college. Interdisciplinary efforts will not compete with departments and colleges.

4) Chuck Toney, Public Information Director, Architecture, Humanities and Academic Affairs met with the Research Committee to discuss how the University can better communicate the research efforts of the faculty to the outside world.

The Committee suggested that there needs to be a more aggressive approach to getting the message out about Clemson's research capabilities and programs.

Enclosed is a memo from Robin Denny outlining future initiatives from the News Services for promotion of research at Clemson University.

5) The Faculty Senate Research Committee discussed and reviewed the contents of the following two documents provided to the Committee by Dr. Steve Chapman, Senior Contract Advisor:

i) The revised document: POLICY ON RESEARCH ETHICS
ii) The new document: Clemson University RESEARCH DATA ACCESS & RETENTION POLICY (draft 9/22/97)

6) The Research Committee met with WC Hallums to review and edit the contents of the Policy Guide entitled: Sponsored Programs Accounting and Administration.
The following concerns should be addressed by the next Senate Research Committee:

i) The needs for more University Research Achievement Awards based on distinguished research achievements. These awards could be categorized into Assistant/Associate Professors Awards and Full Professors Awards. By impacting a large number of faculty, both relatively new and those with distinguished careers at Clemson, a reward system of this type would help foster the Research Culture that has to evolve at the University.

ii) The need for the University to outline a clear set of operating principles for institutes on campus:

1. The source of operating capital for an institute
2. The assignment of recognition for projects and publications and the fate of indirect costs which result from grants obtained through an institute
3. The composition of the governing bodies of institutes
4. The allocation or hiring of personnel into institutes
5. The assignment of academic status to institutes.
6. The process by which an institute obtains approval.

We need to request that any bodies involved in instituting or implementing institutes should have representation from the Faculty Research Committee.

These requests are made in an effort to initiate and maintain a dialog between the administration and the faculty to the end that any institute will benefit the existing research initiatives on campus. Institutes have at times compromised college and departmental budgets and other resources. In so doing they have limited existing programs that are meritorious. Conflicts and the ill will that results can be avoided if institutes are promulgated under a set of guidelines acceptable to the faculty.

iii) The Research Committee must address the reality that the graduate program at Clemson is in need of major financial support. The stipends offered our graduate students are not competitive with other research institutions. In addition, the University must recognize the importance of maintaining and fostering undergraduate and graduate research courses.
March, 1998

TO: Fran McGuire, Faculty Senate President
    Ed Pivorun, Faculty Senate Research Committee

FROM: Robin Denny, Director of News Services

RE: Research news and promotion

I'm writing this memo as a follow-up to a recent meeting of the Faculty Senate's Research Committee, attended by Chuck Toney of the News Services staff. He passed along to me and others on the news staff some of the concerns expressed about Clemson University research news and promotion. As a result, all news services staff members who are responsible for research news promotion met to review our past and current activity and determine what could be done in the future to increase and improve media coverage of Clemson research.

Attached is sample of research-related articles that have appeared in newspapers statewide during this fiscal/academic year (July 1997 to March 1998). In addition, numerous Clemson researchers or research stories have appeared on television news broadcasts and in some national and trade papers.

Our discussion regarding future initiatives for promotion of research included:

1 - List names, telephone numbers, e-mail address and other information about news services staff members in Inside Clemson so all faculty will know who to contact about promoting their research.

2 - Address Faculty Senate during free speech period to inform them of process for getting media coverage of research and to get feedback from senators.

3 - Develop a monthly tip sheet or packet of 3-5 executive summaries of research projects and distribute to Associated Press newswire.

4 - Assist Chief Research Officer with new research newsletter and research annual report.

5 - Submit research stories and/or ideas to Clemson World magazine.

6 - Acquire and review available editorial calendars for newspapers and other publications to match CU research or researchers with special editions as appropriate.

7 - Pitch faculty researchers as sources for news media interviews as appropriate on daily breaking news stories.

On behalf of the news staff, I appreciate the Senate’s interest in promoting research and look forward to working with many faculty researchers in promoting their important work. If you have any questions or comments, please contact me at 656=2061 or via e-mail: robin.denny@pubaff.clemson.edu
Scholastic Policies Committee Report for 1997-98

Committee Members: Melanie Cooper, Elizabeth Dale, Mary LaForge, Elaine Richardson, Peter Skewes, Nancy Ferguson, Chair.

The major focus of Scholastic Policies was on teaching evaluation. The committee proposed an evaluation package to be included for tenure, promotion, and post-tenure reviews. A revised form for student evaluation of teaching was prepared and has been forwarded to the Provost for validation prior to final approval by the Senate.

Members of the Committee were involved on ad hoc committees to study the Academic Calendar, Withdrawal Policy, Calculation of GPA, and status of the Library.

The committee was asked to look at ways to improve attendance at graduation and suggested that the committee responsible for the graduation ceremony address this issue.

The 1998-99 Scholastic Policies committee should follow the validation process for the student evaluation form by the Provost's office.
Faculty Senate
Welfare Committee
Year End Summary
April 14, 1998

Committee Members:
Subhash Anand
Francis Eubanks
John Leininger
Elham Makram

The Welfare Committee had a slow start this year, with the original committee chair resigning, and had no direction until December. Once the group began to meet we dealt the issues below:

1. Addressed faculty concerns regarding the status of the President’s Commission on the Status of Black Faculty and Staff. This has been slowed because of the president’s medical condition. His office has expressed their support and stated they are trying to model the commission on after the success of the Women’s Commission.

2. After concerns were expressed by faculty, from several colleges, we looked into the issues of summer school class size and enrollment requirements. These issues deal with the loads for the summer as they are compared to the fall and spring semesters, and the limiting factors this is placing on the summer school programs with heavy laboratory loads or course offerings that would be filled with graduate assistants. These are important concerns with long term effects on the university’s ability to meet the needs of students. This was passed on the finance committee since the issues were driven more from a funding issue rather than a welfare issue.

3. Since this was the first year, since the reorganization of the University that the Centennial Professorship was being selected, the committee identified the new grouping for colleges to be pair on a 3 year rotating basis. The list was presented to the faculty senate and passed.

4. At the request of several faculty the committee began researching what our peer institutions offered their faculty with respects to tuition waivers for themselves and their dependents. After contacting these institutions, it was found that only one school offers assistance to children of faculty and staff. This was a 45% tuition reduction. The committee will pass on the information to the 1998-99 committee for further review and consideration.

5. There was some concern as to whether 9 month faculty were covered under Workmen’s Compensation if they came into assist someone over the summer. After numerous inquiries to the personnel office it was determined these faculty are covered as long as they are doing the work that would normally be part of their job during the 9 month contract period.
I spoke with Fran the other day and filled him up in on most of what I talked with you about the other day. I may get back from my field trip by the start of the meeting. I will try to make it.

Below is the email I got regarding the workman comp. issue.

I have talked with Rosemary McGregor, Attorney at the State Accident Fund, regarding the workers' compensation for 9-month employees and time lost from a second job due to a work injury.

Ms. McGregor stated that if a 9-month employee sustains a work injury out of and while in the course of his/her employment at Clemson University during the three months on unpaid leave, he may be covered by workers' compensation insurance. Each injury case is looked at separately to determine if compensable.

For example, if a professor is using Clemson University equipment to produce handouts for a private consulting job, it is our understanding that he would not be covered under Clemson University workers' compensation.

Second Job:

Section 42-1-40 of the South Carolina Workers' Compensation Law Annotated, provides, "An employee's earning capacity at the time of an accident is the total of his wages, and earnings from concurrent employments can be used in computing the average weekly wage".

Ms. McGregor stated that if a 9-month employee is injured out of and while in the course of his employment with Clemson University, and the case is found compensable, earning from a second job would be used in computing his compensation rate.

If you have any questions, please let me know.

Freddie

The other issue that we were looking into:

I have received word from all but one of our peer institutions about tuition waivers for dependent students of faculty. Only one institution
John Leininger, 3/26/98 6:07 AM -0500,

has any waiver and it is only a 45% waiver. In the process I found that the state of Penn. allows the student to attend the home school at no cost and any other state school for 1/2 tuition. The question is where do we go from here?

John Leininger
Associate Professor
Graphic Communications Dept.
Clemson University
G-01 Tillman Hall
Clemson, SC 29634-0720
ljohn@clemson.edu
(O) 864/656-3447
(F) 864-656-4808
(H) 864-654-7970
FACULTY SENATE POLICY COMMITTEE
ANNUAL REPORT TO THE SENATE
APRIL 14, 1998

Members: James Acton
         Alan Grubb
         Eleanor Hare
         Martin Jacobi
         JoAnne Deeken
         Matt Saltzman
         John Huffman, Chair

Meetings of the Faculty Senate Policy Committee were usually held on the third Tuesday of each month. Much of the work of the Committee was involved with relatively minor changes in the Faculty Manual, which were brought before the entire Senate for action. These will not be covered in this report. Several more substantive matters were considered by the Committee, passed by the entire Senate and approved by the university administration. These include:

- Policy for revocation of degrees.
- Establishment of the office of faculty ombudsman.
- Change in title of "Research Associate/Professorial Rank" to "Postdoctoral Fellow."
- Establishment of a Graduate Council.

Several Committee resolutions were passed by the Senate, but final action has not been taken by the administration. These include:

- Evaluation of Administrators. The administration objects to evaluation of the Provost by faculty. This was passed by the Senate, and will have to be negotiated with the administration before the policy can be inserted into the faculty Manual.
- Revision of the Grievance Procedures. These were passed by the Senate, revised at the request of the administration, and the amended policy was passed. There has been no final action by the administration.
- Faculty policy on political activity. The 1996-97 Senate passed a policy which was rejected by the administration in favor of a policy written by the administration which had previously been rejected by the Senate. Thus, at present there is no policy dealing with political activity by faculty in the Faculty Manual. A policy which would apply only to faculty was drafted, and passed by the Senate. There has been no response (again) from the administration.

Three matters are currently unresolved:

- Revision in Faculty Constitution to permit Senators in their third year to run for office. This was passed by the Senate, but must be approved by a vote of the faculty at the May general faculty meeting.
- Establishment of non-tenure track research positions: The administration proposed the establishment of non-tenure track research positions, with professorial rank. The Policy Committee rejected the concept of non-tenure track positions bearing professorial rank, and instead drafted a policy establishing the position of "Senior research Fellow." This policy was tabled by the Senate at the February meeting. An attempt to remove the motion from the table at the March meeting failed.
- Post-tenure Review: A draft policy was submitted to the Senate for review at the March meeting. Minor revisions were made at the March Policy Committee meeting, which was attended by Provost Rogers. The revised policy will be presented to the Senate under old business.
Meeting was called to order by board member Patti McAbee. The first item was an introduction of FS representative by VP Dr. John Kelly. Dr. Kelly expressed appreciation (and board members agreed) that FS is included in subcommittee meetings.

Items of discussion included: Land Management Items; Ag. & Nat. Resources Task Force Recommendations Implementations; Updates on specific issues within the College; Legislative Budget; State Crop Pest Commission; and, State Livestock-Poultry Health Commission.

Respectfully submitted,

Russell W. Sutton
S.C. Commission on Higher Education Performance Funding Assessment: Issues Concerning the Projected Impact on Clemson University Faculty.

A Report by the Select Senate Committee on Performance Funding Indicators

Submitted to the Faculty Senate
April 14, 1998

Committee Members: Ashby B. Bodine, Sydney Cross, Larry Dooley, David Fleming, Bob Green, Dory Helms, John Huffman, Beth Kunkel, Frances McGuire, David Lee, Madelynn Oglesby, Jerry Reel, Tom Scott, Louis Sill, Pat Smart, Dewitt Stone, Ron Thurston (Chairman).

Background: During the 1996-97 academic year, the Chairman of the Educational Policy Committee of the Clemson University Board of Trustees (Joseph Swann) asked then Faculty Senate President, Ron Thurston, if the Senate had considered the projected impact of the performance funding indicators from the point of view of the faculty. Subsequently, the 1997-98 Senate President, Fran McGuire appointed Thurston to chair a Faculty Senate Select Committee to discuss and draft a report on these issues. This report includes questions, comments and recommendations that the faculty may have relative to the various performance funding criteria.

Disclaimer: The material presented herein represents issues, concerns and suggestions which were discussed and drafted into text form by the Senate Select Committee on Performance Funding Indicators. The Committee makes no pretense that the information contained herein represents the general opinion of the Clemson University Faculty. However, it should be noted that Committee members, including faculty, staff and administrators, were selected from a wide variety of disciplines, and all of the members had many years of experience at Clemson University. As is usual in any lengthy discourse or deliberations, some Committee members attended faithfully while others attended infrequently if at all. Attendance at the various meetings will not be documented.

Please note that Clemson University has an appointed Performance Funding Committee which operated independently of the Senate Select Committee. The University Committee is Chaired by Thorton Kirby. In general, the focus of the University Committee was to consider how Clemson University would respond to assessment of the various indicators as mandated by the S.C. Commission on Higher Education. This included setting benchmarks and goals, a process beyond the purview of the Senate Select Committee, which did not engage in a review of the various assessment benchmarks. The purview of the Senate Committee was to examine the general impact and concerns relative to the various performance funding criteria.
Prologue: By legislative mandate, it is decreed that future funding of public institutions of higher education in South Carolina will be on the basis of assessment in accordance with 37 performance indicators. The presumption is that all of the indicators will, either directly or indirectly, represent a measure of quality performance by institutions of higher education. In this regard, South Carolina is unique in the number of performance indicators used to assess the state universities, the rigor the assessment, and the amount of funds appropriated on the basis of the performance assessment score.

The Senate Select Committee is concerned that faculty will be scrutinized heavily through several evaluations, resulting in increased demands on their performance, while at the same time will experience a continued decline in the work environment due to poor support for higher education in general. In a recent rating by Memex Press Inc. entitled Critical Comparisons of American Universities and Colleges (refer to http://memex-press.com/cc/), a review of select programs resulted in an academic ranking for Clemson University of bottom 26% of all universities studied, which was the poorest rating for all comparable institutions in the Southeastern region. In addition, it was noted that Clemson is one of the few universities that spends no student tuition or fee money for scholarships, placing us in the bottom 1% in this category. As summarized by the Southern Regional Education Board for 1997, the outlook for the State is also precarious. While the rate of job growth in the region doubled in the 1990’s, spending on higher education did not keep pace with economic growth or government spending in other areas. Growth in state tax funds for higher education over the past five years was the lowest of any five-year period since the mid-1970’s, resulting in a per student funding decrease of almost 11 percent. The salaries of faculty in colleges in the SREB region have declined 3 percent when adjusted for inflation, while the national average for workers increased 5 percent. A greater financial burden has been passed on to students, resulting in large increases in student borrowing.

Considering the above facts, it is the conclusion of the Committee that legislation to promote quality through performance funding assessment will not succeed if there is not an increase in respect and support for higher education in this State.

The Performance Indicators: The South Carolina Commission on Higher Education (CHE) was given the task of developing the methodology and setting specific benchmarks to be used for the assessment process. This process has been slow in developing, and after input from CHE benchmark and sector Committees, and deliberation of the Commission with various university representatives, the assessment process has finally been formalized.

Categories and Individual Assessment Criteria.

A. Critical Success Criteria: Mission Focus

1. Expenditure of funds to achieve institutional mission
2. Curricula offered to achieve mission
3. Approval of a mission statement
4. Adoption of a strategic plan to support the mission statement
5. Attainment of goals of the strategic plan.

B. Critical Success Criteria: Quality of the Faculty

6. Academic and other credentials of professors and instructors
7. Performance review system for faculty to include student and peer evaluations.
8. Post-tenure review for tenured faculty
9. Compensation of faculty.
10. Availability of faculty to students outside of the classroom.
11. Community or public service activities of faculty for which no extra compensation is paid.

C. Critical Success Factor: Instructional Quality

12. Class sizes and student/teacher ratios.
13. Number of credit hours taught by the faculty.
14. Ratio of full-time faculty as compared to other full-time employees.
15. Accreditation of degree granting programs.

D. Critical Success Factor: Institutional Cooperation and Collaboration

17. Sharing and use of technology, programs, equipment, supplies, and source matter experts within the institution and with other institutions.
18. Cooperation and collaboration with private industry.

E. Critical Success Factor: Administrative Efficiency

19. Percentage of administrative costs as compared to academic costs.
20. Use of best management practices.
21. Elimination of unjustified duplication of and waste in administrative and academic programs.
22. Amount of general overhead costs.

F. Critical Success Factor: Entrance Requirements.

23. SAT and ACT scores of student body.
24. High school standing, grade point averages, and activities of student body.
25. Post-secondary non-academic achievement of the student body.
26. Priority on enrolling in-state students.

G. Critical Success Factor: Graduate Achievements.

27. Graduation rate.
28. Employment rate for graduates
29. Employer feedback on graduates who were employed or not employed
30. Scores of graduates on post-graduate professional, graduate or employment-related examinations and certification tests
31. Number of graduates who continue their education
32. Credit hours earned of graduates

33. Transferability of credits to and from the institution
34. Continuing education programs for graduates and others
35. Accessibility to the institution of all citizens of the state

H. Critical Success Factor: Research Funding
36. Financial support for reform in teacher education
37. Amount of public and private sector grants

Committee Response to the Performance Funding Criteria

A. Critical Success Criteria: Mission Focus
1. Expenditure of funds to achieve institutional mission

1a. General discussion  Research is considered to be part of teaching, therefore, the faculty are concerned that when reporting this criterion, it can be skewed by including “pork” and restricted research money as part of the academic effort. We are a comprehensive University and the inclusion of research monies as part of academic expenditures impacts liberal arts, engineering and sciences much differently. Research money is best used to assess the health of the graduate program than the undergraduate mission. Public service money does not count as academic expenditures but can have a big impact on the academic mission and commitment of dollars through salaries and services. There is concern that the movement to make the PSA service a type of granting agency will cost millions in terms of moving faculty salaries toward E&G support. How can the PSA agency function independently within the University when so much of what they do impacts the entire faculty? In conclusion, the faculty strongly support any method to assess the amount of spending directed toward achievement of the mission of the University. However, much skepticism exists concerning how this can be analyzed, given the multifaceted activities and goals of individual. Since we are the most “public service” oriented university in the State, it seems that almost anything we do, including athletics, could be rationalized in terms of “expenditures to achieve the mission of the University”.

1b. Questions, comments and recommendations The only way this criterion would have significant meaning with regard to education of students would be if the mission includes only E&G activities.
At the time this report was written, the CHE has indicated that PSA paid employees would be counted in the faculty/employee assessment, but that other PSA activities would be ignored. The Committee stressed that the most important issue was that at the level of the faculty, where there are not enough funds to achieve the institutional mission.

An analogy was given: If we are being held responsible for our health, and how we eat and divide the food on our plate is a big issue and will be assessed, this ignores the number one determinant of our health in the first place, and that is, how much food was given to us and what is its nutrient value? Assessment is only valid if the State is giving us enough money to achieve our mission.

It is concluded that this may be a useless exercise if those individuals responsible for controlling higher education do not change their attitude. There is an aura of suspicion which resides over higher education in this State, but regardless it is the opinion of the Committee that we cannot maintain quality in higher education, when subjected to national and world scrutiny, as a progressive State if our educational system is unappreciated and devalued.

It is good that the general public and those involved in higher education are undergoing a process of introspection and quality evaluation of our institutions. Such self-assessment is the mark of a progressive organization. Some needed changes must occur, but the attitude cannot be “robbing Peter to pay Paul”.

2. Curricula offered to achieve mission

2a. General discussion The curriculum is the purview of the faculty. Certainly, the majority of the curriculum offered in a given academic program should support the mission of the university, college and department. However, given the multifaceted disciplinary structure of most universities, mission statements are usually vague. Nevertheless, the general modus operandi of a department should reflect appreciation for and design of curriculum to satisfy the objectives and goals of our mission and strategic plans, especially as reflected in our obligations as a land grant university.

2b. Questions, comments and recommendations There is much concern about duplication of programs between public institutions of higher education. However, it should be recognized that a certain core of curriculum is necessary to support the primal mission of the institution, especially as regards research. For example, English and biochemistry support the agriculture research mission, yet programs in these disciplines may be stronger at other institutions.

The best evaluation of how the curriculum meets the mission of the institution is at the level of the department and college of the particular academic program being considered.
Attention should be given to the amount of credit hours required to obtain a particular degree. This should be in line with the same requirements at our peer institutions.

There is a certain amount of inertia, which resides in decision-making about curriculum. Faculty are reluctant to give up existing courses, and often are hesitant to adopt new ones.

Demand and relevance do not always drive curricular needs, but sometimes the decision is based on financial desires. This is especially true of summer courses, which allow 9-month faculty to receive extra pay. No course should be offered unless it meets the objectives and goals of a particular academic program. The cost/benefit ratio should be considered also.

3. Approval of a mission statement

3a. General discussion The Committee recognized that our mission statement should reflect our responsibilities as a land grant institution: The three major legislative acts which originally defined the roles of Land Grant Universities were the Morrill Act of 1862, the Hatch Act of 1887 and the Smith Lever Act of 1914. Basically, these Acts indicated that the Federal Government would provide support for land grants for the formation of universities which could teach any subject, but agriculture, mechanics and military strategy and tactics were to be mandatory. It was pointed out that in some states the land grant universities dominate higher education, but this is not true for South Carolina. Originally, responsibilities of land grant universities were to reflect service and affordable education for the general populace.

The Committee expressed some confusion as to how "Mission Focus" was to be measured. According to the special report from the Commission on Higher Education (CHE) the measure will primarily include how an institution spends its funds to meet the objectives outlined in the Mission Statement. In accordance with previous legislation, the CHE had to gather mission statements (little input on content), but now they can evaluate them, and even reject the mission statements. Although we are a land grant institution, the CHE has identified us as a research institution along with USC and MUSC. Ostensibly, there will be some commonality of goals for these three institutions. The CHE has not set a goal for research institutions to become Carnegie I universities, but the legislative study committee indicated that this should be a realistic goal. If they (CHE) decide to set this aspiration as a goal, they will have to move money to the institutions to make it possible for this to happen.

The Carnegie definition for a research I institution is the graduation of 100 doctoral students per annum, and federal grant funding of 50 million per year. Although Clemson University meets the goal of graduating 100 doctoral students, our revenue for federal grant money in 1997 was just over 30 million, although the amount of grant money seems to be increasing for 1998. Being a research I institution allows for the hiring of better faculty and graduate students. However, Clemson University will have
to move resources and promote hiring of research faculty if we chose to achieve this goal.

It is easier to be a Carnegie I research institution if you have a medical school. The concept of a Carnegie Research I institution does not apply unilaterally across all disciplines. Liberal arts would contribute little to this, but the University has grown to a broad and rich institution that can teach the arts and the whole spectrum of educational topics very well.

3b. Questions, comments and recommendations

The suggestion was made that we need to have our mission and strategic plans formulated in terms of what a land grant university should do, especially concerning our obligations within the State, given the existence of over 30 other institutions of higher education within South Carolina. A comment was made that if the university has strayed from the original land grant concept, this was because the factors of leadership and need dictated the direction of change.

Is the land grant concept inherently narrow? Should we get rid of the term "land" and stress other important issues and resources? The Committee strongly recommended that the definition of a 21st century land grant university had to be redefined, not general for all land grant institutions, but couched in terms of the responsibilities and duties of Clemson University as a land grant institution in the State of South Carolina.

How will the CHE view our mission given that we, along with USC and MUSC, are now identified as research institutions? Accordingly, how do you separate efforts in academic research versus that driven by public service research money?

Clemson should work with USC and MUSC to make sure that mission statements are apropos and do not reflect overlap of duties.

Do we want to write specific goals into the mission statement, or keep the mission statement general and refer to the strategic plan for specifics? The current mission statement does not address the defining characteristics outlined by CHE.

The mission statement for Clemson University should be defined to be inclusive of the emphasis on our unique obligations within the State of South Carolina, but should not discount our role nationally, and on an international level.

How do we infuse the land grant concept into undergraduate education? Students should be involved in direct, systematic research. Should every undergraduate student be exposed to public service, and in what way?

How should we administrate the various research activities on campus? Should we centralize the administration of research for engineering, the Office of Sponsored Programs and PSA research funds? Engineering currently routes their major grants through the office of Sponsored Programs but has the authority to sign-off on grants of
up to half-million dollars. The Vice President currently handles PSA research funds for Agriculture and Public Service. Centralizing research may make it less parochial and therefore more accessible to the broader university. This may make faculty more responsive.

Should PSA be established as a separate agency (institute) and research funded by PSA be contracted back to the faculty on a grant basis? How does the academic sector interact with the non-academic sector, especially the academic function (funded with over 80 million dollars of E & G moneys) with the South Carolina Agriculture and Forestry Research System (over 60 million dollars)?

**4. Adoption of a strategic plan to support the mission statement**

4a. **General discussion** The Committee strongly supported the idea that work units should have strategic plans, which conform to the overall mission of the institution. However, the best plans are made and acted upon at the level in which the work is done. In other words, strategic plans should be formulated at the level of departments working together with the college administration.

4b. **Questions, comments and recommendations** In the past, strategic plans have, all too often, been based on campus politics more than needs and mission. Faculty input is the key to assuring that work units have a chance to meet the objectives and goals outlined in their strategic plans.

Strategic plans should heavily focus on mission and, and should not be approved without intensive cost/benefit and feasibility assessment.

A plan for periodic updating of strategic plans should be in effect.

**In addition to focus on measurable service output, strategic plans should include discussion of how to improve the academic sector.**

**5. Attainment of goals of the strategic plan**

5a. **General discussion** It goes without saying that an effective unit will achieve most of the objectives and goals set forth in their strategic plan. The Committee strongly felt that if strategic plans are going to be effective, then assessment of the ability of units to meet the objectives and goals of their strategic plan is necessary.

5b. **Questions, comments and recommendations** Who is going to do the assessment of whether or not a particular unit meets the objectives and goals of their strategic plan?

Often success in meeting goals and objectives is based on monetary gains rather on valid assessment of what was done and the impact of the effort.
How will success be measured across the various units, especially academic versus auxiliary services, versus student services versus the public service sector?

The administration as well as the faculty, should also be held responsible if given units do not meet the goals and objectives of their strategic plan.

B. Critical Success Criteria: Quality of the Faculty

6. Academic and other credentials of professors and instructors

6a. General discussion To maintain a quality faculty, the credentials of the professoriate and instructors should be recognized as being very important. The Committee strongly supports any effort that could be used to develop the professionalism of the faculty.

6b. Questions, comments and recommendations Quality universities have faculty development centers and continuing education programs to improve the credentials of their faculty. Clemson University is remiss in this area. It is recommended that the Provost work with the Faculty Senate to improve professional development for the faculty, especially as concerns moving technology into the classroom.

Experiences which could prove to be very positive for the faculty, such as going on sabbatical leave or participating in professional meetings, etc., are often discouraged or looked on with suspicion at Clemson University. The administration could take a more active role in encouraging good faculty to take advantage of these types of activities in order to improve their professional skills.

Professional development of the faculty is an area that could be much improved and encouraged at Clemson University

7. Performance review system for faculty to include student and peer evaluations

7a. General discussion As discussed for post-tenure evaluation (vide #8 below), the faculty do not fear being evaluated. In actuality, they have undergone annual evaluation since accepting employment in the academic arena. The major concerns relate to the validity of the evaluations, the fairness with which they will be applied across all of the faculty, and how they will be used. With respect to student evaluations, it is feared that some faculty may attempt to mask ineffectiveness in the classroom by inveiglement of the students in order to curry favor for the purpose of getting a good evaluation. As far as peer evaluation is concerned, the outcome will largely be determined by who selects the peers and from what institution they are chosen from.

7b. Questions, comments and recommendations Relative to this indicator, the biggest concern was the validity of student evaluations and how they will be used. Student evaluations can be useful and should be taken seriously. However, it is well known that youth are impressionable, and in certain instances can be manipulated into
giving good evaluations. The biggest concern is that if the faculty are going to be heavily judged on student evaluations, then grade inflation will likely occur, together with dilution of the rigor of classroom instruction. If a faculty member has repeat poor evaluations for a given class, then the tenure and promotion committee of a given department should thoroughly review the situation to determine if the poor evaluations are warranted before any corrective measures are instituted. Accepting student evaluations *prima facie* is risky.

8. Post-tenure review for tenured faculty

8a. General discussion It is mandated by law that faculty will be post-tenure reviewed in accordance with best practices guidelines as defined by the CHE. At the time this document was written, the Policy Committee of the Faculty Senate was in the process of completing the post-tenure review policy for Clemson Faculty. While the opposition to post-tenure review among the faculty is slight, there is general concern about the amount of money and time it will take to complete and evaluate all of the reviews that the faculty will undergo. This will include review by students, outside peers, a special faculty committee, the department chair, the dean and the provost. No one seems to understand the importance of the annual review versus post-tenure review. Why is it believed that the post-tenure review will improve faculty evaluations, if the general belief is that annual reviews have failed? The sentiment often expressed by the faculty is that there seems to be a general mistrust of faculty by administrators and the general public, almost to the point of belief that all tenured faculty are negligent in the performance of their duties, and accordingly, they need to be evaluated so thoroughly that this can be proven to be true. While it is true that some tenured faculty may be remiss in the performance of their duties, when the faculty are considered as a whole, this is the exception rather than the rule. The Faculty Senate conducted a study of post-tenure review in 1995. Data from post-tenure evaluations already in place at several universities has shown that further evaluation does nothing to punish poor performing faculty. They are already known to their peers and the administration. Therefore, if post-tenure review is accepted as a means of getting rid of poor faculty, it will likely fail. The value of post-tenure review is to identify outstanding faculty and direct resources to their programs. The faculty in South Carolina public institutions of higher education are rapidly digressing toward being the most evaluated among their peers nationally, while on the other hand, being the lowest paid and supported. This is a bad situation, which most assuredly will further erode faculty morale and weaken the ability of South Carolina to attract the best faculty into their institutions of higher education.

8b. Questions, comments and recommendations Given the multifaceted nature of the university, evaluation policy is best formulated and enforced within working units (departments, etc.) rather than at the level of the university upper administration in general. However, some standardization is necessary to assure that the grievance policy applies equally to all faculty.

For evaluations to be beneficial they must be taken seriously and the persons doing the evaluation must be respected. The faculty has been concerned that the administration has resisted evaluation, while pushing for more and more faculty evaluations. This is viewed upon as being the corporate model of management and is highly disliked by many faculty. It is
generally accepted that if the faculty should undergo thorough evaluations, then the administration should likewise be evaluated, and held to the outcome of their evaluations.

A major concern was the cost/benefit of evaluations. Clemson University has roughly 1,000 faculty. How much time will be spent preparing dossiers, reading them and preparing summaries for the evaluation of each faculty member? Could this process be shortened and the same effect be achieved?

Faculty evaluations should serve the purpose of generating support for good faculty, and developing faculty who fall short in their duties. Evaluation may result in discovery of reasons to initiate dismissal for cause, but the process itself should not rely on, nor be driven by faculty evaluations per se.

A concern of the Committee was that given the multitude of evaluations the faculty now has to undergo, none will be taken seriously.

9. Compensation of faculty.

9a. General discussion Faculty salaries at Clemson University average 8 to 10% below our peer institutions. In the late 1980's, then Provost Maxwell instituted a study of faculty salaries and on the basis of results, "catch-up" money for salary adjustments was given to bring faculty salaries in line with those of peer institutions. Since this time, no university-wide effort has been made to adjust faculty salaries, and inequities between salary increments given to the administration versus those given to the faculty have created a significant "gap" between the salaries awarded to administrators versus those of the faculty.

It is unrealistic to assume that the adjustment necessary to bring faculty salaries to parity with those of our peer institutions can be made in one year without significant input of new money from the state. A continued problem has been mandated salary increments driven by legislative edict but not funded by new state moneys. This has resulted in a significant amount of the E&G budget (over 90%) and the PSA budget (over 80%) being used to fund personnel.

9b. Questions, comments and recommendations Desirous would be a rating system based on the departmental level of peer institutions, not just on an institutional average. Undesirable is a system that removes flexibility and only focuses on how we compare relative to a peer group. Decisions for salary increments should be based on how to reward excellence while not promoting mediocrity, both on an individual and departmental level basis.

The Committee agreed that problematic at Clemson University is the fact that evaluations are not taken seriously which has led faculty to believe that rewards (salary increments) are not related to performance. A well designed evaluation system, which gave recognition for performance, and therefore some guarantee of a better salary increase, would provide incentive and motivation to the faculty. Reward for
performance is directly tied to morale, energy and momentum of the faculty. It is also important in establishing a better relationship between the faculty and the administration. Hopefully, the new evaluation systems being encouraged by CHE will rectify this situation.

A recommendation was made that evaluations should include assessment of how individuals perform relative to their own individual goals AND the departmental goals.

A budget should be developed (long-range) to look at "what ifs", to make feasible recommendations as to how faculty salaries can be brought to parity with those of peer institutions, and maintained at or above this aggregate comparator.

Moneys that are spent frivolously often represent loss of moneys for potential use in faculty compensation. Clemson needs to investigate which services it provides, and define if the need for these services matches the amount of resources which have to be committed to provide the service. This should apply for teaching, research and outreach. Plans should be developed to assess the success of all programs versus cost effectiveness. This is especially true for institutes and centers. We need to be sure we are focused on problems that we can afford, or those that generate resources for self-perpetuation.

A study is needed to compare salary inequities on a gender, discipline and rank basis. Some faculty are overpaid, some are underpaid. It is difficult to know what the situation is as many faculty receive extra pay for overtime duties, etc., in addition to their base salaries. We need a system to resolve this situation. It is recommended that a committee or group of accountants, distinguished faculty, etc. be formed to develop a plan to ameliorate this problem. One solution would be to hire a consultant to recommend policies to correct the inequities that exist relative to all salaries. This might be more efficient because of the strong feelings which exist internally relative to salary issues.

10. Availability of faculty to students outside of the classroom.

10a. General discussion The Committee had no problem with the concept that faculty should be available to students outside of normal classroom hours.

10b. Questions, comments and recommendations Faculty should post the time they will be available outside of the classroom at a place where students can easily access the information. Availability outside of the classroom cannot be extrapolated to the faculty member's personal time away from the University except in well defined, extenuating circumstances. Some faculty will not give students their home phone number and this is their right.

The Committee was concerned that all students will respond to this query on the evaluation form, but if they have not sought help outside of the classroom, how would they be qualified to answer whether or not the faculty member was available?
The Committee felt that this criterion would have meaning only in cases where faculty grossly negligent of their responsibility to mentor students.

There may be a great disparity between faculty concerning how many students they contact per semester, and therefore, the demands on their out-of-classroom time may also be quite different.

An alternative to faculty contact outside of the classroom is for the university to provide tutoring to regular students as they do athletes. This could be achieved by hiring graduate students and creating a center similar to the learning center available to athletes. Is the issue the availability of the faculty member to students outside of the classroom, or is the issue, providing help outside of normal classroom hours?

A major concern was that this criterion was a perception issue. In other words, the students will evaluate whether a faculty member is available often based on perception of the faculty member’s availability, not on an experience of having tried to contact the faculty member outside of normal classroom time.

11. Community or public service activities of faculty for which no extra compensation is paid.

11a. General discussion The Committee believed that it was beyond the purview of the University or CHE to assess what faculty do on their own time. Therefore, this criterion should apply to what is done during normal working hours.

11b. Questions, comments or recommendations Faculty should be involved in service to the University other than performance of those duties normally defined within their work unit. However, it is difficult to reconcile how this criterion is a measure of quality.

The Committee knew of no faculty members who had received merit in their annual or other evaluations based on service beyond their normal job duties. Therefore, assessment based on this criterion involves rating a performance which faculty normally do not receive any recognition or credit for.

Because Clemson University is a land grant institution, many faculty perform services for which no extra compensation is paid. This is part of the function of a land grant university.

Faculty should be encouraged to participate in duties for which there is no extra compensation, but the enthusiasm for this will be minimal unless there is a reward system for such activities, especially as relates to evaluations, tenure and promotion.
C. Critical Success Factor: Instructional Quality

12. Class sizes, student/teacher ratios

12a. General discussion  The average class size for research universities is 25.08 (MUSC and USC included). Clemson is around 24.08. This includes lecture, lab and lecture-lab combinations. USC is at 26. The CHE recommendation was 23.

Comprehensive institutions have 15 FTE students per FTE faculty. For research institutions, the recommended ratio is 12 to one. The research sector average was 16.2, Clemson’s ratio is 16.8. This was calculated using only the 800 instructional faculty. USC’s average is 15.7. The CHE’s recommendation was 12, but they were encouraged to accept 14. If you take 12 times 15 credit hours, that is 180 credit hours with an average course of three credits with 60 students. Research institutions would only have 60 students per faculty member. So to go from an average class size of 16 to 14 would cost 40 million additional dollars because the faculty size would have to be increased one third or more.

Small sections may improve the evaluation of credit hours taught by the faculty, but this may have a negative impact on class size and student teacher ratios.

FTE of students is often confused with average section size analysis. SAT, credit hours taught and average section size are political issues discussed by parents and legislators.

12b. Question, comments and recommendations  Is it necessarily bad to decrease class size to the CHE’s original recommendation of 12, even though it would cost more money to increase the size of the faculty?

Concerning the credit hours taught by the faculty and the class size, should we maximize our score on one of the performance issues and forget the other, or, should we find a balance point? We can’t do both at the highest level.

Graduate classes are smaller than undergraduate classes. Are we helped or hurt by larger number of graduate students?

A feasible solution seems to be the recommendation that a 9/6 teaching load be assigned. This would be 3 and 2 three credit hour classes per fall and spring semester, respectively.

Would having the faculty teach small sections while graduate students taught large sections help the situation?
How can we keep the Board of Trustees informed and convinced that we have an adequate workload? To ignore this responsibility would invite micromanaging by those remotely associated with the university.

13. Number of credit hours taught by the faculty

13a. General discussion There still is uncertainty concerning how credit hours taught by the faculty will be assessed. Much of this relates to how you give credit for variable credit sections such as graduate dissertations. The way dissertation sections are currently assessed is to take the number of dissertation sections per faculty, then take the number of students divided by the number of hours they are taking and that is the credit hours per course. For example, 3 master’s students taking 3 hours of 891, this would have been calculated as 3 into 9 credit hours, so you would have been given credit for 3 hours taught. This method was implemented 4 or 5 years ago. The credit for Ph.D. students is calculated the same way. Anything that is variable credit is done this way. This was known at CHE as the four cell Mississippi State Model. Using this method, the Credit hour average for Clemson University would be 9.2 per faculty member. If dissertations, etc. are taken out, it drops to 6.9 (average credit hours taught per semester). In other words, if 6.9 is the average, the faculty member is teaching 2.3 sections of 3 credit hour courses. This calculation is not tied to the number of students. The Educational Policy Committee of the Board of Trustees has recommended an average of 9. If twelve is considered a full load, and a faculty member is given 25% off for research, then full load for three-quarter availability to the classroom would be 9 credit hours. So the Board favors 9 as opposed to 6.9.

The Delaware study examines cost per credit hour on a basis of FTE faculty. This will allow looking at organized sections per FTE charged to instruction. This method gives a better estimate of the cost per credit hour charged to discipline. The calculated credit hours of 6.9 for Clemson University gives an organized section estimate close to what the average number of sections is nationwide; i.e., 1.9 to 2.0 organized sections per instructional effort FTE of a faculty member at research institutions. At comprehensive institutions, the average is over 3.0, and the average is even higher for tech schools.

Instructional effort includes that which is funded with “120” money (E & G state money). This does not include scholarly endeavor, the “130” money, sponsored research, etc. The “130” funding includes 60 FTE’s charged to scholarly internal research. This represents state dollars paying for research. PSA funds are completely separate. The Delaware study takes out “130” and PSA funding. For example, if the Delaware study comes out to include two organized sections per one FTE instructional effort, this is based solely on instructional effort.

NSF grants do not include salary money. This effort can be identified as “130” money to give credit to the departments which have faculty on NSF grants.

The percentage of students at Clemson who are graduate students is one of the highest in the country. Thus, in the past Clemson has heavily focused on graduate education.
At USC, every faculty member has a separate section for 891, 991. We do not do this, we do a "roll-up". When a graduate student fails to sign up for 891, 991 this ultimately ends up hurting institutional funding.

13b. Questions, comments and recommendations How can the faculty effectively communicate what they do to the Board of Trustees and other shareholders that cannot be expressed as credit hours taught by the faculty? This is especially important for a research institution.

What is the best way to give credit for variable credit courses (masters and doctoral research)? Could we increase the number of dissertation hours required? Could the graduate candidates continue to take dissertation credit beyond 18 hours?

Controversy: If faculty are told that they have to get more grants concurrent with having more scholarly publications, how can they be expected to spend more and more time on teaching?

What will each faculty member be required to teach and how will this change when they need release time to do research? If a persons gets a "buy-out" for research, is that covering the portion of their time already paid for or is that considered differently?

We need to be able to show the products and output per unit basis. Should the productivity of a unit be assessed, or should it be on an individual basis?

How do you answer the question, what do you expect out of this size of a unit in terms of what should be the product of the unit, the salaries, how many courses and sections taught? The unit can help adjust for changes in research, etc. A problem is that we have exceedingly small units in some cases.

How do you develop a university-wide policy that regulates faculty teaching effort and research when there are great differences across the disciplines, as exemplified by the differences between the social sciences and the basic sciences?

The CHE staff recommendation is 9 hours per research institution per faculty per semester. Would we be better off not making a recommendation at this time?

Does the Delaware system where organized sections per FTE instruction are reported give a more accurate report of faculty teaching effort and allow more flexibility when dealing with PSA and sponsored research?

Will mandating that faculty have a certain teaching load result in classes being offered to meet this requirement, and not necessarily to meet a particular need to train students in a discipline?
14. Ratio of full-time faculty as compared to other full-time employees

14a. General discussion As an indicator of academic quality, this criterion has some problems. The University is more than just the sector which is paid from E & G money. In fact, E & G money represents less than one third of the total University revenue (exclusive of tuition and fees). Therefore, bloat in the non-academic sector, also a serious threat to academic quality, would not be reflected in this indicator. It should also be pointed out that this indicator represents a ratio, and thus is inherently flawed in that adequacy in numbers (i.e., do we have the correct number of faculty and support staff) cannot be represented by a ratio. The real issue here is that a correct number of faculty are need to achieve the goals of our academic mission(s), and they need to be supported by an adequate, but not excessive, number of administrators and staff.

14b. Questions, comments and recommendations How will administrators who hold faculty rank be counted in this ratio?

Presumably, this ratio includes persons supported on research dollars. How will support personnel who are hired to help persons who have grant money (and are subsequently paid from the grant money) be counted in this ratio?

If the intent of this ratio is to have more faculty per staff, then this puts pressure on the University to get rid of staff to keep the ratio adequate. When the number of needed faculty is down, the remaining faculty have to work harder to get the job done. Getting rid of staff to optimize this ratio could burden the faculty even more by forcing them not only to do classroom work, but to also do the work previously done by the staff.

There are non-academic people who support the academic mission, which will not be counted in this ratio. How will bloat in the non-academic areas be monitored and corrected?

An adequate ratio will not reflect areas which are more in need of additional faculty relative to other areas which may have more than adequate faculty numbers.

If a decision is made that the ratio needs to be changed, it is recommended that priorities be established, i.e., those whose job duties impact less on the mission of the University or particular units within the University should be released first. This recommendation is made in recognition of the fact that the importance of the job duties can change when examined across units, particularly when comparing science and engineering versus liberal arts.

This ratio could be affected by setting the desired class size at a greater number.

The ratio of full-time to part-time faculty was recognized as being very important. It is assumed that the University will not exceed the 25% limit as set by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools.
How will staff who teach be counted in the ratio?

15. Accreditation of degree granting programs

15a. General discussion  This indicator is based on the Inventory of Academic Programs for which accreditation is available. It applies basically to nursing, education and engineering. Traditionally, accreditation is thought to be desirable as it gives public recognition to the institution, maintains quality in the educational programs by assuring that the student has selected an institution that operates on a sound financial basis, has an approved program of study, qualified instructors, adequate facilities and equipment, and approved recruitment and admissions policies.

15b. Questions, comments and recommendations  Every program for which accreditation is available should be periodically reviewed to make sure resources to operate the programs are adequate. Accredited programs should take extra measure to monitor the performance of their graduates.

What does it mean to be accredited and by whom? This subject has been discussed at the national level. For a number of years the Council on Post secondary Accreditation recognized, coordinated, and periodically reviewed the work of post secondary accrediting bodies. However, on December 31, 1993, COPA disbanded. Several groups were appointed to assume the duties previously conducted by COPA, and in 1996 the Council for Higher Education Accreditation was established. It is recommended that Clemson University affiliate with this organization. Several Commissions provide directives on accreditation such as the Commission on Recognition of Post secondary Accreditation, and the distance Education and Training Councils Accrediting Commission. It is the purview of the Provost, Deans and unit leaders together with their faculty, to decide on which programs will be accredited by special agencies.

Many groups are currently discussing the question of the effectiveness of accreditation. Of concern are questions such as the following: Does accreditation matter? Is a national body needed? How well is the system functioning?

It is recommended that the University give more attention to, and attempt to better follow the guidelines put forth by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools relative to government and management of institutions of higher education.

16. Institutional emphasis on quality teacher education and reform

16a. General discussion  Teacher reform refers to programs which directly impact on teachers within the K-1 through K-12 system. In this regard, the purview for handling of these programs would normally relate to work units which deal with education. However, it is recognized that some units outside of education departments do have special programs for teacher training. The status of teacher training in South Carolina was recognized as a dilemma. Historically, teaching of most subjects in secondary schools is conducted by individuals with degrees in
education and possibly with minors in particular disciplines. This situation has resulted in many teachers having the gift of providing information in unusual and exciting ways but with little capability to adequately understand the breadth and depth of the subject they are to teach. The knowing "how" but not "what" to teach results in poor student appreciation for the importance and applications of the subject matter, thus resulting in a strongly diminished interest in the discipline. Oftentimes, individuals with minimal credentials in an academic discipline are of necessity pushed into teaching in these areas, e.g., high school coaches in history or the sciences, with the result that the better students are not adequately challenged. By its very nature this process of "dumbing down" results in a recentering of the academic standards with concomitant accentuation of mediocrity.

It is important that less emphasis be given to "method teaching" and more importance be placed on understanding both the intricacies and the nuances of the subject matter that is essential and fundamental to academic disciplines. Secondary school teachers should pursue advanced degrees in discipline-based curricula (MS and Ph.D.) and enrich their knowledge, didactic methods, and hands-on experiences through workshops, seminars, internships, and coops jointly administered through the education and basic discipline colleges. A collaborative effort between those individuals espousing concepts for teaching and those espousing the teaching of concepts should provide an integrated and dynamic process for disseminating ideas and encouraging creativity.

16b. Questions, comments and recommendations  NSF and the Governor’s school of Science and Mathematics in South Carolina sponsor programs to improve discipline instruction in secondary education units, especially as it relates to science. Clemson University faculty should explore ways to cooperate with these agencies or units to address the problem of poor discipline instruction.

Faculty time is usually not directed toward special education of teachers. This work is usually done in the summer as an ancillary project. It is recommended that the appropriate Clemson administrative persons work closely with the CHE to develop encourage and fund new programs whereby faculty could participate with credit toward furthering the professional development of secondary education teachers.

Given the projected importance of technology in the next century, it is recommended that special priority be given to programs that will be directed at improving the level of science education in our institutions of secondary education. It was pointed out that secondary education teachers are actually encouraged to pursue degrees in education programs (M.Ed.) rather than science degrees (MS). Persons with the latter often have to return to school to get further training in education.

Part of the problem of getting Clemson faculty involved in teacher education is that the focus for this type of work is usually through education departments. This could create animosity between other colleges if funds are diverted to specific units for this purpose, a function that normally is considered ancillary to the main mission of the University.
Getting faculty together with secondary teachers is hard for the first summer session because some public school teachers are still in class when our summer session begins.

D. Critical Success Factor: Institutional Cooperation and Collaboration

17. Sharing and use of technology, programs, equipment, supplies, and source matter

17a. General discussion The sharing of knowledge, equipment and supplies across disciplines within the university and with other institutions is a worthy undertaking, which should be encouraged. Clemson University, as a land grant institution, already has a good “track-record” with regard to this criterion.

17b. Questions, comments and recommendations To be a highly regarded technological institution requires commitment toward maintaining advanced equipment and adequate supplies, especially in the pure sciences and engineering. The fact that the State has not fully funded salary increases has resulted in money diverted away from equipment and supplies into personnel. The University needs to join USC and MUSC to carry the message to the legislature that this method of operation negatively impacts upon our institutions of higher education.

There is some degree of turf-protection when it comes to sharing equipment, especially if the equipment is purchased by faculty from grant resources.

The University should consider creating special funds to maintain needed expensive equipment such as electron microscopes, NMR equipment, cell cytometers, etc. Departments are so underfunded that they cannot even afford the service contracts on equipment of this type. This makes faculty reluctant to share expensive equipment in their laboratories because if it is broken, they believe (which is often the case) that they will have to fix it from their own budgets, or even their “own pockets”.

18. Cooperation and collaboration with private industry

18a. General discussion Clemson University faculty have a good record of cooperating and collaborating with private industry. This goal is part of the charter of a land grant university. However, if not properly managed, problems can arise from associating with the corporate world.

18b. Questions, comments and recommendations Collaboration with any industry naturally requires rigid adherence to policy concerning conflict of interest and responsibility with regard to the rules and regulations governing the University.

Most faculty interaction with the corporate world is positive and beneficial to their professional development, which extrapolates to better education of students. However, there are instances where the potential for personal gain, especially financial, have
generated problems. The consulting policy for the University is well established but not uniform across departments.

Some faculty are confused about what is required (legally and as concerns adherence to policy) of them when they enter into agreements with corporations. The Office for Sponsored Programs should exercise more control over this issue to prevent the signing of agreements that are not beneficial to the University or which are not in compliance with state, or federal regulations. A standardized form that must be submitted to this office when faculty are planning to enter into agreements with industry would be highly beneficial.

The issue of how industry money is given to faculty has created problems also. Gifts do not provide overhead and are easy to manipulate. Grants, which require overhead, are not appealing to some industries.

E. Critical Success Factor: Administrative Efficiency

19. Percentage of administrative costs as compared to academic costs

19a. General discussion The Faculty Senate has been concerned with this issue for a number of years. The 1996-97 Senate reported that as little as only 25% of total available University monies are used for paying faculty salaries and for teaching supplies. However, this is difficult to document due to the multifaceted functions and costs of the University as a whole. Another concern is that when cost of the teaching faculty is calculated, does this include the cost of the dean’s offices? Proper accountability requires that “the right dollar be put into the right category” to match federal and state requirements.

This year’s score for Clemson was 71.1% over 8.1%. The 71.1% is identified as total academic costs over total E&G money available; whereas, the 8.1% is administrative costs versus total E&G. The calculation for this year for Clemson did not include the PSA budget. If PSA were included, the percentages for last year would change to 63.4%/6.3% (academic year 95-96). This year’s percentage calculated including PSA would be 61.8%/6.4% (for the fiscal year that ended June 30). The denominator includes student services (8.1 million), institutional support (17.7 million), FM&O (18.5 million), scholarships (13.1 million) plus the amount for academic costs. Mandatory transfers of 1.1 million are not in the denominator. The denominator is 279.5 million. Academic costs are 172.6 million dollars. Auxiliary services are not in the denominator (motor pool, post office, agricultural sales, development, Madren Center, Clemson House (53.4 million dollars).

In the calculation used by most Universities (IPED’S) extension research dollars would count in research. The way the federal government is set up, administrative costs are charged to research or public service. Student services are calculated differently, as institutional support.
The "120 account" includes faculty salaries, supplies, etc. was 83 million dollars for fiscal year 95-96. During this time 323,312,000 was the total University expenditures. This last year (96-97) our expenditures increased to 334,107,000. Expenditures on 120 money increased to 86 million dollars. The way the calculation is done for CHE, is that academic costs include 86 million for faculty salaries and supplies, plus 63 million for research, plus academic support which is 22.6 million. Academic support includes the library and other areas. For the previous year (95-96), the amounts were 83 million, 64.3 million and 21.5 million. Research includes unrestricted and restricted expenses. Although the amount considered as academic expenditures increased, the percentage did not because the total expenditures for the University increased. For example, PSA increased 3 million dollars. This will appear in the denominator of the formula used to calculate academic efficiency. It is not known if dean's salaries fall into academic or institutional support. It should be noted for this last year that PSA expenses were 48.6 million, 8.1 million for student services. Revenue last year from State and local appropriations was 139.8 million, about 86 was E&G, the rest was PSA. From tuition and fees, we brought in 63 million dollars. Federal appropriations (mostly PSA) were 11.2 million; government grants and contracts, 34 million. Private grants and contracts, 20.9 million. Endowments, $608,000; Educational activities 5.1 million; auxiliaries, 55.7 million; 10.8 million comes from other funding (patents, etc.).

Management of money in all categories is heavily impacted by mandatory raises from the State, which are not totally funded. This causes money shifts in all areas. One must take into account that although there are about 1000 faculty, there are approximately 3000 other employees.

19b. Questions, comments and recommendations The way academic costs are calculated seems to be misleading as many of the included categories do not impact directly on what happens in the classroom. A university could score well in this category simply by having good research and academic support programs, and still not be supporting classroom instruction. Greater importance should be assigned to just faculty salaries and supplies, exclusive of those assigned to any administrative office, as an indicator of support for academic functions.

A major problem is that faculty and staff salaries are mandated by the State but not fully funded. This causes necessary money shifts from support to personnel, deleting our basic resources. PSA does not get money for pay raises. Faculties who have approved Experiment Station Projects are expected to do the research with limited supply or equipment money (much of the money has been moved to salaries).

What is a good way to show that the money students have invested on their education is coming back to them in the classroom? The CHE is supposed to look at the individual categories, which comprise the academic efficiency calculation, but how they will use this analysis to assess performance funding still is not known.

How can we compare this type of data with similar data from our peer institutions?
What brought about performance funding assessment nationally were parents and other concerned persons complaining that classroom instruction was bad, and that faculty were not in the classroom, and students were being closed out of classes. Grave concern was also expressed about increases in tuition. How can we reconcile this given the fact that we are not a teaching institution per se, but rather are being considered as being a research institution?

20. Use of best management practices.

20a. General discussion  NARCUBO and IPEDS systems allow freedom in assessment of management systems. A concern is how the interpretation of these reports actually reflects conditions present on campus. For example, counting administrators as faculty because they also hold faculty titles. We have auxiliary services, student services, PSA, E&G and athletics managed as different budgetary units. Therefore, it is possible to have wealth in areas ancillary to E&G. This creates many hard feelings between the faculty and the administration. Does the public understand this? The opinion of the Committee was that difficulties relative to this situation have hurt Clemson in the past. Another area of concern is that although the over 80 million dollars for E&G has to be properly accounted for, what about the over 60 million in tuition and fees? Faculty often wonder about what happens to the 70 million generated from student fees, i.e., how is the money spent and who determines the priorities? Clemson University ranks in the bottom 1% of major universities surveyed (refer to http://www.memex-press.com/cc/) concerning the amount of tuition and fees they spend on scholarships for students.

20b. Questions, comments and recommendations  Concern: Unitizing the University and lack of homology among the different units. This results in wealth in one area, poverty in another. Don’t cooperate very well in this regard.

The faculty may have input but they have very little influence. Input is taken just for input sake. The professoriate is a body of highly trained individuals. To ignore there potential for decision-making is a major mistake. Lack of faculty input would mean negating committee work and giving up advisory boards. This would have a negative impact on the university.

Administrators often define “the lowest cost” as being the best practice. The faculty believe that this has caused difficulties in determining better management that would cost more. **Best management practices should not be defined as lowest cost management priority.**

The way efficiency is reported using the current IPEDS system can actually cover up for inefficiency.

Another concern is lobbyists. Who chooses their agenda? The focus of the university is often condensed into packages presented to the CHE and legislation for funding. Often faculty do not have much input in deciding what issues or focus areas money is being sought for yet the faculty will have to do the work. This creates confusion and
difficulties in managing the university and fosters distrust between the administration and the faculty. Lobbyists usually push the agenda of the university administration rather than that of the faculty. Sometimes they push the student agenda, but not often.

The faculty are being told to work faster and be more productive, but cannot get more money to do so.

Traditionally we have taken issues and information and knowledge and redigested it and measured it worth and measured its impact, and, by the very nature of the process we do it meticulously and slowly. Now, it seems as if we are being asked to change from a gourmet restaurant to a fast food service.

The Committee strongly agreed that it would be a mistake to impose the corporate style of management upon the University, where a few administrators make most of the important decisions.

21. Elimination of unjustified duplication of and waste in administrative and academic programs.

21a. General discussion The Committee viewed this criterion as having both a positive and negative effect. Everyone agreed that any program should be scrutinized using best management practices for cost/benefit assessment. Bad programs should be eliminated. However, rewarding on the basis of elimination of programs is a negative success criteria; i.e., reward for becoming less rather than better. This practice may encourage elimination until one is essentially eliminated. The Committee had no problem with this criterion *per se* other than recognition of the fact that in a system already strapped for financial support, waste and inefficiency due to inadequate monetary support could become confused and good programs could be eliminated as the result.

21b. Questions, comments and recommendations Given the political reality of campus decision-making, will realistic assessment be the driving force for eliminating programs, or will the main issues used as reasons for program elimination arise from campus politics? The faculty has been concerned that programs, which are favored by the administration, are usually protected, regardless of their cost/benefit ratio.

The university would probably hesitate to ask for reinstatement of programs identified previously as “waste” just to get a good performance rating. This could impact on faculty positions, etc. Under this system, kingdoms of “richness” would be supported as opposed to impoverished areas such as E&G. What about those areas that are run by administrators (auxiliary services, student services and athletics) which are primarily composed of non-academics versus the academic program? In other words, will administrators eliminate their own programs, or those in which they are remotely associated with?
This criterion is flawed in principle as administrators who eliminate their own programs will cause a loss of direct impact jobs, maybe even their own. Closing academic programs would impact the faculty and students and not the administration directly.

Academic programs are assessed on a cyclical basis by many internal and external processes (CHE, SACS, etc.) The programs of the administration are not assessed with the same rigor.

Problem: Who is going to do the assessment of what is and what is not waste?

A system needs to be put in place for better evaluation of administrator-driven programs not for the purpose of elimination, but to answer the question: Is there something else could we be doing and is there a better way of doing what we are doing?

The Committee strongly supports getting rid of redundancy and duplication of effort. CHE does not focus on efficiency when it comes to graduate school. Protecting bad programs because of politics has, in the past, also been a problem.

22. Amount of general overhead costs.

22a. General discussion Defined as general overhead costs divided by FTE students.

General overhead costs includes institutional support plus restricted and unrestricted research funds.

22b. Questions, comments and recommendations If research expenses, even grant money, are included in the assessment ratio, does this not penalize the institution for spending more money on research while the student FTE remains constant?

Overhead costs for new buildings would be included in this ratio, but what about the cost of maintaining the buildings?

Expanding in the non-academic area can cause problems in the academic area. Hopefully, this indicator will hold excessive non-academic expansion in check.

How will auxiliary units fit into this scenario? For example, the Foundation pays for a lot of faculty awards and salary supplements. How will this contribution be assessed? How will the University be held accountable for spending money wisely which is not allocated by the State?

The quality of the University is not only affected by the amount of money spent, but also by the priorities set for spending this money. Nothing in the performance indicators deals with priorities and selected projects that money is spent on, other than generalities in the University mission statement. Unfortunately this has led to duplication of effort such as the engineering program at USC which is now in competition with the engineering program at Clemson.
F. Critical Success Factor: Entrance Requirements.

23. SAT and ACT scores of student body.

23a. General discussion  SAT and other indicators of student performance at the high school level are an indicator of the quality of the incoming student body. The recruitment of good students is influenced by a multiplicity of factors, the primary ones being the reputation of the institution and the availability of scholarship or other financial aid or deferments. Good recruitment programs can also influence the number of students with good SAT scores who choose to attend a particular institution.

As it currently stands at CHE, it appears that the average SAT score will not be compared with that of USC, but with those of peer institutions. The middle 50% for the freshman class will be used to calculate an SAT midpoint, that is, rank SAT’s from highest to lowest, chop off the bottom and top 25%, and take the midpoint of the remaining range and compare with the same calculations of our peer institutions. David Fleming stated that our peers are around 1166, whereas Clemson is 1134. We are about 30 to 40 points below our peers; USC is about 120 points below their peers. We have 86% of our students with over 1000 on the SAT. The national average is 1013. So, 75% of our students are over the national average.

At Clemson University, which has the highest SAT average of incoming freshman students in the State of South Carolina, the average SAT score is heavily influenced by the ability to select from a large number of applicants and the acceptance of a significant number of out-of-state students with superior academic credentials. Scholarship awards and good recruitment programs are perceived as playing a minor role in attracting outstanding students at the present time.

Student number can influence the average SAT score. If you want more students, your SAT average usually declines. One way to limit the number of undergraduates is to increase the number of graduate students. However, graduate students are expensive to the institution. Most of the CHE’s analysis is based on performance of the institution relative to the undergraduate student body.

23b. Questions, comments and recommendations  Reduction in the number of incoming freshman and increasing the number of transfer students may be a way to improve SAT averages. The SAT scores of transfer students are not considered.

Our scholarship program, especially for national merit scholars, is deficient. The scholarship program needs to be reviewed and novel ways for better funding need to be sought. However, this will probably not have a big impact in terms of increasing student
numbers overall. Clemson University ranks in the lower 1% of major universities surveyed in terms of the amount of tuition and fee money spent on scholarships (vide www.memex-press.com/cc/).

Scholarship funding is limited. For example, consider the Palmetto Fellowship, two $5000 grants, which the legislature has provided. Scholarships can only be tuition, room and board, and books (limited by the legislature). So, if you offer a 1600 SAT student $5000 to come to Clemson, then later, they are chosen for the Palmetto Fellowship, then they will not get the entire $5000 for the Palmetto Fellowship. Instead, they can only get $2500 as the limit for assistance is $7500. Cannot give a student financial assistance beyond $7500.

The Committee recognized that financial aid can be a good way to attract scholars, and that in recent years, universities have almost assumed a "buyers strategy" to attract good students. The number of National Merit Scholars, even within the state, is large. Each state has an allotted number of National Merit Scholars. A National Merit Scholar in South Carolina may score lower on standardized tests for college admission than National Merit Scholars from other states. This means if you spend your scholarship funds on National Merit Scholars, you may get weaker students (based on SAT) than if you had recruited other out-of-state students. Nevertheless, National Merit Scholars are excellent students and recruiting National Merit Scholars is good for public relations.

The process by which we recruit students is flawed, as they may only know of a menial scholarship at an early date, but later be told of the possibility of significantly more funding. By this time they may have committed to other universities. Parents who have experienced the process of student recruitment often relate how ridiculous the process of attracting bright students at Clemson is compared to other institutions. This begs the question of whether we are depending on the institutional reputation to spontaneously attract good students versus a very active recruitment program? We need creative recruitment programs other than just throwing money at gifted students.

The way the SAT average is computed, you are better off getting 5, 1300 SAT students than 1 with an SAT of 1600. But, if you don't go after the top 25% you will end up dropping off middle students. Why spend the money to get the top-level student when you can recruit at the median level and have more effect on raising our SAT overall?

24. High school standing, grade point averages, and activities of student body

24a. General discussion The Committee viewed this criterion as being the purview of the student. While it is desirous that entering freshmen have excellent grade point averages concomitant with high class rank, plus experience in student government, this represents an area where the faculty exercise no control. Therefore, no questions, comments or recommendations were put forth for this particular evaluation criterion.

25. Post-secondary non-academic achievement of the student body
25a. **General discussion** The non-academic achievement of the student body was deemed to be unimportant as an indicator of quality in the academic sector, and beyond the control of the faculty. While the faculty should encourage students to become involved in non-academic endeavors, especially service to the community, this should be a decision made by the student. Therefore, no questions, comments or recommendations were put forth for this particular evaluation criterion.

26. **Priority on enrolling in-state students.**

26a. **General discussion** It is recognized that Clemson University is supported by taxes paid by the citizens of this state. However, a major University such as Clemson benefits from the diversity offered by local students interacting with other students from out-of-state and foreign origin. This adds richness and additional cultural experiences to the academic environment. However, there is an agreement with CHE is that Clemson will not exceed 35% out-of-state undergraduate students recruited for the freshman class. As it stands now, there is controversy concerning how out-of-state and in state is defined. There is not a clear definition on residency code. Presently it is determined by the geographic origin of the students at the time they apply. Using this criterion, Clemson University may have as high as 35 to 40 percent out-of-state students. What is the best available indicator?

26b. **Questions, comments and recommendations** A way to increase SAT scores is to keep the number of out-of-state student’s high, and waving out-of-state tuition for outstanding students. This would attract a significant number of well-qualified students to Clemson. If the state took the position that any out-of-state student with an 1150 SAT could come in at "in-state" tuition levels, this would also be a good incentive to attract outstanding students. However, in accordance with performance assessment, priority is to be given toward enrolling in-state students.

Can we offer in-state tuition to out-of-state students at the present time? NO. This is because they must have a recruiting scholarship to receive this offer. A recruiting scholarship is a university-wide scholarship, not a grant-in-aid. Currently we can reward a student a recruiting scholarship ($500) and then wave out-of-state tuition. The disadvantage is that the scholarship cannot be funded by state revenue, and cannot be tied to a department or major. Two percent of our tuition may be used for undergraduate scholarships. You can waive tuition for holders of general university scholarships. This is important and should be further researched, as it is not well defined. Dr. Reel reported that he would investigate this situation.

The Committee recommended that the current limitation of out-of-state students to 35% is reasonable. The number of out-of-state students should not drop below 25%. We should recruit only outstanding out of state students to attend Clemson University.

G. **Critical Success Factor: Graduate Achievements.**

27. **Graduation rate.**
27a. General discussion  Graduation rate is an important determinant of success in educating our students. This indicator is particularly important for athletes as a low graduation rate among athletes had a negative impact on their chances for success after leaving the University, and generates significant negative publicity for the University.

27b. Questions, comments and recommendations  The registrar should attempt to keep records of why students don’t graduate. This could be valuable data to ascertain if the reason for not graduating related to dissatisfaction with the University, academic failure or personal choice. Such information could be a sentinel for problems within the University.

A effort should be made to keep the graduation rate at 70% or better in the undergraduate sector.

28. Employment rate for graduates

28a. General discussion  The main mission of a University is to educate, not to prepare individuals directly for jobs. However, we live in a real world with high pressure for success. Therefore, attention has to be paid to the ability of graduates to become employed. However, in a free enterprise system such as the capitalistic model of the U.S., it was a concern of the Committee that faculty does not control this variable. While it was recognized that a University should not offer programs of minimal importance and impact upon the students, the dilemma of resolving the question of education for knowledge or employment, is, and probably will remain a highly debated issue. Many of the issues, which factor into this, are student related and generated. On the other hand, if all of the graduates were not getting employed, this should be cause for concern. The question has varied meaning over the disciplines and begs the question in and of itself: Is it o.k. to come to college to get an education or is the bottom line directly proportional to employment and subsequent job success?

28b. Questions, comments and recommendations  The university should continue to take an active role in preparing students for success after graduation. This could be express as improvement in sponsorship of job interviews, better interaction with potential employers, etc. Career days are very important for the students and should not be taken lightly. Faculty should participate in these events.

29. Employer feedback on graduates who were employed or not employed

29a. General discussion  Employer feedback concerning graduates of particular academic programs can serve as a good indicator of how well students are being prepared to enter into the corporate world. The monitoring of employer feedback is best done at the departmental level by the faculty which are most familiar with the training the students have received.
29b. Questions, comments and recommendations  Departments should have advisory committees which consist of successful, experienced business persons who could offer sound advice on ways in which employment of graduates can best be achieved. This will include advice on curriculum, rigor of training, etc. It should be kept in mind, however, that the academic training of students extrapolates beyond instruction just for the purpose of getting a job.

30. Scores of graduates on post-graduate professional, graduate or employment-related examinations and certification tests

30a. General discussion  This indicator is based on the percentage of students who take the exam and pass on the first attempt, versus the percentage of total students who pass the exam on subsequent attempts. Engineers take the “Fundamentals of Engineering Examination” and this is currently being used in assessment of their programs. Problems arise in scheduling these exams as typically they are given around the time final exams are being taken. Nurses and Education graduates also have to be certified.

30b. Questions, comments and recommendations  There is great variability across disciplines concerning who takes the test, what agency administers the test and the level of difficulty. Many disciplines do not offer such tests. Thus, it will be hard to standardize this criterion across the entire University.

Exam scores do give valuable feedback on the quality of specific programs. Good students, and quality faculty given adequate resources is the best way to assure that exam scores will be the best they can be.

Who will be required to take the exams? Allowing only top scholars to take the exam could skew this score. Hopefully, this will not lead to within college competition whereby units whose students score better on qualification exams will get more resources. This would be hard to standardize and would affect units such as nursing, engineering and education more than others.

31. Number of graduates who continue their education

31a. General discussion  The decision to continue ones education is solely the purview of the individual and not the University nor its faculty.

31b. Questions, comments and recommendations  As this was deemed an issue outside of the purview of the faculty, no questions, comments and recommendations are offered by the Committee relative to this particular criterion.

32. Credit hours earned of graduates

32a. General discussion  This is measured by the total hours required to graduate by sector/discipline/degree versus the number of credit hours taken upon graduation.
32b. Questions, comments and recommendations  The original mission of a land-grant University was to offer affordable higher education to students of average means and intellect. Some students come as freshman, do poorly, and have to take additional courses to meet the requirements for graduation. This is true of students who need to take remedial courses to "catch up" with students from more progressive secondary schools. Pushing this criterion to excellence will move us away from our mission and hurt the average students.

Many students entering the University do not know what they want to major in. Will courses they took in another discipline area count against them when considering this criterion?

The Committee agreed that students should not be allowed to accumulate excessive credit hours as undergraduates.


33. Transferability of credits to and from the institution

33a. General discussion  This is an area in need of improvement. It is known that during registration, transfer students often have a very difficult time because it is not know what courses they took at other institutions will transfer with credit.

33b. Questions, comments and recommendations  A better policy for handling transfer credits needs to be developed to improve the registration of transfer student.

Increasing the number of transfer students may elevate SAT's but will not bring in better students. In fact, this may lower student quality. The bulk of our transfer students come from colleges where they took courses in order to qualify to enter Clemson. Thus they were not top students to begin with. Last year over 700 out of a student body of 2550 freshmen were transfer students.

34. Continuing education programs for graduates and others

34a General discussion  As the population shifts toward more aged persons, the need for continued education will grow. Clemson University should capitalize on this by offering strong and varied programs as part of a continuing education effort.

34b. Questions, comments and recommendations  The University should encourage the faculty to become more involved in continuing education, but to do this a reward system should apply. Many faculty currently participate in continuing education but are not adequately compensated for their efforts.
35. Accessibility to the institution of all citizens of the state

35a. General discussion  This indicator is measured as a ratio of an institution's accumulated points for accessibility to maximum points allowed for this measure based on: the percent of other-race undergraduate students enrolled at an institution; The total number of credit hours generated off-campus; The total number of credit hours generated through distance education.

35b. Questions, comments and recommendations  It is recommended that the University continue to pursue a policy of diversity in accordance with state and federal regulations. As a public institution, we should be accessible to all citizens of this state, regardless of their background.

Clemson should continue to explore ways to offer education programs through distance learning via electronic means. How can we better use the Internet through virtual learning?

How does the Land Grant mission, which requires extension work mesh with the concept of “total credit hours generated through distance education?”

How can the University operate special programs for special students yet satisfy the requirements of having a high SAT average and graduation rate?

Given the limited resources of the University, what is our ability to participate in distance education?

I. Critical Success Factor: Research Funding

36. Financial support for reform in teacher education

36a. General discussion  Most of the financial support for reform in teacher education is ancillary money often given to support faculty during the summer months. A more stable source of funds to drive established programs for teacher reform should be developed. However, there was some question about which College (unit, etc.) would be in control of such programs.

36b. Questions, comments and recommendations  Programs for teacher education need to be redefined. Why is it that persons trained in education teach all of the subjects to potential teachers? We need discipline-orientated educators, i.e., chemists training chemistry and science teachers, etc. Funds to establish such programs should be directed to the appropriate units.

Funds for teacher training, especially that defined as continuing education are not readily available and there is no means to support these programs at the needed level through E&G or PSA funds. It would be beneficial if the CHE could work with the State Department of Education to improve funding for teacher training and move it to a disciplinary level.
37. Amount of public and private sector grants

37a. General discussion The Office of University Research has appointed Several Committees that have examined problems, which affect research laboratories and their ability to get extramural funding. A Council of Research Faculty has been appointed which represents a positive step toward solving the problems which negatively impact on the ability to get extramural funding.

37b. Questions, comments and recommendations What is our goal as a research institution? Is it to become a Carnegie I institution or what specifically are our objectives in research? What emphasis do we place on contract research versus competitive grant research? How much will be have to invest to be a research II or I institution? What are the advantages and disadvantages?

Perhaps a more feasible goal is to set a level in which you are going to grow research annually rather than to just aspire to be a Carnegie I institution.

Is Federal grant funding all that matters, especially for a university that emphasizes service to shareholders and cooperation with corporations?

How can we develop a good reward system for researchers?

How can we balance faculty workload if every faculty member is required to teach two courses each semester? What does it take to become a good researcher; i.e., how much time is required?

How can we set reasonable requirements for research output given the diversity of our colleges and departments, and therein, different abilities to attract extramural funding?

How can we develop a fair and competitive system of matching grant money if required?

We need to better coordinate the way we distribute the money we have.

We need to slow down, aim for our target and get it.

There have been too many instances of the administration favoring individuals or groups who do popular research, while the general attitude and support of research campus wide has suffered.

The University is considering hiring faculty with the title of research professor. How will these faculty be treated with respect to tenure, promotion and evaluations? Who will be in charge of these faculty at the level of the upper administration? How can we
better integrate the efforts of academic researchers (130 funds) versus those who do research with PSA money (131 funds)?

Clemson University, along with USC and MUSC, have been labeled as research Universities by CHE. What does this mean with respect to our obligations and expected performance as a research institution? Good research means having an excellent graduate program, but in recent years the graduate program at Clemson has been de-emphasized. A good balance should be maintained between undergraduate and graduate education.
Rationale to Untable Agenda Item

On the agenda for the Faculty Senate meeting in April, there will be a request to "untable" the proposal regarding Research Fellow. I'm writing you because I know that such a motion failed at the last Senate meeting (and I was one of those who voted against "untabling" at that time.) Upon reflection it seems to me that the idea of having some people attached to Clemson for research purposes is not one that most people dislike. Instead, the problems with the proposal dealt mainly with the name of people in this category. One group of senators supports the idea of a "Research Fellow" and the other the idea of "Research Professor".

It seems to me that we should take the chance given us to get this new type of employee added. I therefore am suggesting that we try to get the 2/3 majority necessary to bring the motion forward. Once we can speak to the motion, the various sides can argue over the title and the side with the most votes wins. In the agenda package will be a copy of the motion that was "tabled". Please take the opportunity to contact your faculty members and see which of the two titles they prefer, or if they do not support this new type of employee.

Note that the tabled item says "Research Fellow". Bringing the item back into discussion does not mean that you support that particular title. I assume that someone will suggest an amendment to change the title. At that point, discussion will follow and the amendment (to change the title) will either be passed or defeated. After that, the entire motion (amended or unamended) will come up for a vote.

Thanks for your support in bringing the tabled item into discussion.

JoAnne Deeken, Senator
Libraries
To: Policy Committee Chair John W. Huffman  
Thru: Faculty Senate President Francis A. McGuire  
From: Robert A. Waller, Editorial Consultant for the  
Faculty Manual  
Re: Addition of Academic Title "Senior Research Fellow" and  
Change in "Research Associate" to "Post Doctoral  
Research Fellow"

Pages 16 ff. in the current Faculty Manual outline the  
qualifications for the regular and special faculty ranks.  
Among the special ranks, provision is made for a "Research  
Associate (with Faculty Rank)" for those engaged in a spe-  
cial research function (page 17).

Given the importance now being attached to attracting  
research dollars, it is suggested that a more prestigious  
title be associated with those who engage exclusively in  
externally funded research projects with an expected per-  
manent commitment to the institution. Such a change would  
be consistent with the practices of such peer institutions  
as North Carolina State University.

To effect this change, the following language would be  
inserted following "Lecturers" and before "Research Associ-  
ate" on page 17:

Senior Research Fellow. The title of Senior  
Research Fellow may be granted to experienced persons  
engaged full time in research who are supported ex-  
clusively from external research funds or foundation  
accounts. Such appointments will be contingent on the  
availability of a specific source of funds and may be  
limited to the duration of a particular grant. Senior  
Research Fellow is not a tenurable position.

Consistent with this change, the title and description  
for "Research Associate (with Faculty Rank)" would be  
replaced with the following to denote a special category for  
the "post doc" experience. To wit:

---

APPROVED by the Senate Policy Committee on January 20, 1998
To: Vice President and Provost Stephen H. Rogers
From: Robert A. Waller, Editorial Consultant for the Faculty Manual
Re: Final Policy Statement on Post-Tenure Review

Among the issues facing higher education in South Carolina are the adjustments necessary to accommodate the legislative mandate for greater accountability in the evaluation of tenured faculty members. Specifically, the CHE and the General Assembly guidelines require among the "Quality Indicators" that the quality of the faculty be assured through a "performance review system for faculty to include student and peer evaluations" and to provide for "post-tenure review for tenured faculty." These requirements become operative as part of the new formula for funding higher education in South Carolina.

By this April we are required to have a post-tenure review process in place which incorporates the state's "Best Practices for Post-Tenure Review." Nine months from now our review process will be evaluated in comparison with the "Best Practices" document and we will be given a formula grade with 12 points at stake in the funding formula. Our goal is to meet the criteria by covering the 12 essential points in our procedures.

The subject of post-tenure review has been twice reviewed by the Faculty Senate: "Report on Post-Tenure Review" submitted by the Faculty Senate Select Committee on Tenure and unanimously accepted by the Senate on 2/13/96 and just last December 4th with the acceptance of the report on "The Periodic Review" submitted by the ad hoc Committee chaired by Senator Rajendra Singh.

Based on these studies and accumulated experience, the Faculty Senate on April 14 approved by the requisite two-thirds majority the attached statement concerning the implementation of Post-Tenure Review. I transmit this action on behalf of 1997-98 Faculty Senate President Fran McGuire subject to the condition that the CHE accept the proposal.

The principal discussion of tenure in the August 1997 Faculty Manual occurs on pages 25-26. It is proposed that a new section H. labeled "Post-Tenure Review" be inserted on page 26 and that the remaining sections be relettered.

C.C.: 1997-98 Faculty Senate President Francis A. McGuire
1998-99 Faculty Senate President Patricia T. Smart
Director David B. Fleming
Executive Secretary J. Thornton Kirby
Policy Committee Chair John W. Huffman
Faculty Senator John C. Peck
Mesdames Betty M. Mooi and Cathy T. Sturkie
POST TENURE REVIEW

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

Scope: All faculty members holding a tenured faculty position shall be subject to post-tenure review.

Guidelines: The faculty of each academic unit shall prepare written guidelines (approved by a majority of the faculty, the respective Dean, and the Provost) providing details of the post-tenure review process. Although the details may vary from one academic unit to another or from one college to another within the University, such guidelines must be consistent with the following principles:

a) The primary basis for post-tenure review is the individual’s contributions in the areas of research and/or scholarship, and teaching, and service.

b) Guidelines must be flexible enough to accommodate faculty members with different professional responsibilities.

c) Post-tenure review shall not infringe upon the accepted standards of academic freedom. Furthermore, sex, age, ethnicity, and other factors unrelated to an individual’s professional qualifications shall not be considered in the review process.

d) The chairperson of the academic department and the dean of the college must not be involved directly in the peer review process at the departmental level.

Procedure: The following procedures must be used for Post-Tenure Review:

1. All tenured faculty will be peer reviewed every six years. The year or years in which a faculty member is on sabbatical, unpaid leave, and/or extended sick leave shall not be counted in the review period. Departments will devise a schedule of staggered reviews of tenured faculty within each rank. Reviews will be conducted in order of seniority, beginning with those who have the most longevity at Clemson University.
2. The tenured and tenure-track faculty of each department will each year elect a PTR committee separate from the regular personnel committee(s) according to departmental bylaws. The faculty members subject to PTR in a particular year will not be eligible for membership on the committee. Only tenured faculty are eligible for election to the PTR committee. The size of the committee may vary from one academic unit to another; however, the committee must have a minimum of three members. In cases in which the department does not have enough tenured faculty to constitute a PTR Committee, the departmental Peer Review Committee will elect outside faculty from other departments who are qualified to serve on the PTR committee. The PTR committee will elect the chairperson.

3. The faculty undergoing post-tenure review must provide, at a minimum the following documents to the PTR committee and the Department Chair:
   a) a recent copy of the curriculum vitae (paper or electronic)
   b) a summary of teaching evaluations for the last 5 years, including student evaluations
   c) a plan for continued professional growth,
   d) detailed information about the outcomes of any sabbatical leave awarded during the six-year post-tenure review period,
   e) and any other documents relevant to the review.

4. The Chair of the academic unit must provide the committee with copies of the faculty member’s annual performance reviews covering five years accumulated since the initial tenure review or since the last post-tenure review.

5. The role and function of each faculty member, as well as the strength of the overall record, will be examined by the PTR committee, and if deemed appropriate, the committee shall obtain at least four letters from peers external to the department or the institution. At least two of these letters must come from a list of six submitted by the faculty member.

6. The PTR committee will provide a written report to the faculty member. The faculty member should be given at least two weeks time to provide a response to the committee. Both the committee’s initial report and the response of the faculty member will be given to the Dean of the academic unit. The Department Chair will submit an independent and written report to the faculty member and s/he will have two weeks time to provide a response. The Chair’s original report and the faculty member’s response will be submitted to the College Dean. The Dean will write his/her own report
copying the faculty member, the PTR committee, and the Chair and submit all materials to the Provost who establishes the final rating (see Outcome). The Provost files a report explaining the rating to the faculty member, the PTR committee, the Chair, and the Dean. A disclaimer to the Provost's finding can be filed.

**Outcome:** The following rating system will be used in all stages of the review by the PTR Committee, the Chair, the Dean, and the Provost:

a) **Excellent:** The faculty members in this category shall be recognized by a special pay raise effective in the academic year following the evaluation.

b) **Satisfactory:** No special award will be given.

c) **Unsatisfactory:** Leading to remediation (see below).

If the ratings by the Chairperson, Dean, and Provost differ markedly from the rating of the PTR committee, each must supply documented evidence explaining the difference. In cases involving a rating of "Unsatisfactory," the burden of proving unsatisfactory performance is on the University. To receive an "Unsatisfactory" as the final rating, both the PTR committee and the department chair must so recommend.

**Remediation:** Individuals who receive a rating of Unsatisfactory must be given a period of remediation to correct deficiencies detailed in the PTR reports. The Chairperson in consultation with the PTR committee and the faculty member will provide a list of specific goals and measurable outcomes the faculty member should achieve in each of the next three calendar years following the date of formal notification of the unsatisfactory outcome. The University will provide reasonable resources (as identified in the PTR reports and as approved by the Chair and the Dean) to meet the deficiencies. The Chairperson will meet at least twice annually with the faculty member to review the progress. The faculty member will be reviewed each year by the PTR committee and the Chair, both of whom shall supply written evaluations. At the end of the three-year period, another post-tenure review will be conducted. If the outcome is again Unsatisfactory, the faculty member will be subject to dismissal for unsatisfactory performance as outlined in the **Faculty Manual** (p. 28). If the review is Satisfactory or Excellent, then the normal review cycle of six years will resume.

**Dismissal for Unsatisfactory Professional Performance:**
If dismissal for unsatisfactory professional performance is recommended, the case will be subject to the rules and regulations outlined in the **Faculty Manual** (p. 28).
Cathy,

Would you please distribute this amendment to all FS members prior to the next meeting with the other materials. Thanks!

Jack

AMENDMENT:

Eliminate Point 3.c that requires each candidate to provide names of 6 external evaluators as part of the package of materials.

Original Statement:

5. The committee shall obtain at least four letters from peers external to the department or the institution as appropriate to the role and function of the faculty member, at least two of which must come from the list submitted by the faculty member.

Proposed Amendment:

5. The role and function of each faculty member, as well as the strength of the overall record, will be examined by the PTR committee, and if deemed appropriate, the committee shall obtain at least four letters from peers external to the department or the institution. At least two of these letters must come from a list of six submitted by the faculty member.

RATIONALE

I received numerous letters from CES faculty members, all seriously objecting the requirement for external evaluation letters of faculty members who are clearly doing a good job. I sent a copy of the amendment above to the CES faculty and again received a large number of responses, all in favor of the amendment.

Thornton Kirby tells me that he feels the CHE will be agreeable on this point if we can provide a convincing argument that our procedure will identify and correct problems associated with non-productive, tenured faculty members.

Jack Peck
Department of Computer Science
430 Edwards Hall
Clemson University
Clemson, SC 29634-1906
PROPOSAL

FACULTY REPRESENTATIVE TO
THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES

The Clemson University Faculty Senate requests approval for the selection of a Faculty Representative to the Board of Trustees using the process outlined below. We are requesting this individual be recognized as the official representative of the Faculty and be granted privileges beyond those accorded to visitors to Board meetings. This would include receipt of Minutes, Agendas, and attachments of all Board and Committee meetings; an opportunity to be included on the Agenda upon request; and inclusion in the Annual Board Retreat.

Selection Procedures

A Faculty Representative to the Board of Trustees Screening Committee, composed of one Distinguished Alumni Professor from each College, one Library representative, and the President of the Faculty Senate, will solicit nominations for the Faculty Representative to the Board of Trustees in the Fall, 1998, and every third year thereafter.

Any individual holding tenure at Clemson University will be eligible for nomination. The nomination period will run for fourteen days from the date of the Call for Nominations. Each nomination must include a complete curriculum vitae and a statement of interest from the nominee.

The Faculty Manual Editorial Consultant will examine all nominations to verify the faculty status of each nominee. The names of all eligible nominees will be distributed to the members of the Screening Committee. The Committee will consider the nominations and forward no fewer than two names of recommended candidates to the Clemson University Board of Trustees.

The Board will select the Faculty Representative from the names submitted by the Screening Committee. The Faculty Representative will serve a three-year term commencing with the first Board meeting following selection.
Position Description For Faculty Representative
to the Clemson University Board of Trustees

The Faculty Representative to the Board is crucial to the establishment of improved communication between the Faculty and the Board. The Representative will serve as the primary conduit between the Board and the Faculty and as such will carry out the following duties and responsibilities:

A. **Represent the Clemson University Faculty at Meetings of the Board of Trustees**

The Representative will represent the faculty at all meetings of the Board. The Representative will inform the Board of faculty concerns and issues as they arise. The Representative will also serve as a resource to the Board upon request.

B. **Communicate with the Faculty**

The Representative will report to the faculty at the December and May General Faculty meetings. In addition, the Representative will attend all meetings of the Executive/Advisory Committee of the Faculty Senate. The Representative will keep the Faculty apprised of all faculty related matters coming before the Board. The Representative will also meet with other faculty groups as needed.

C. **Gather Information from the Faculty**

The Representative will be responsible for periodic gathering of data from faculty. The Representative will be responsible for developing and implementing effective strategies for acquiring needed information.

D. **Consult with the Faculty Senate on Board Related Matters**

The Faculty Senate President will continue to represent the Senate at Board meetings. In addition, Senate representatives will attend meetings of the Board of Trustees' Committees. The Representative should consult with these individuals on a regular basis.
MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
MAY 19, 1998

1. Call to Order  President Patricia T. Smart called the meeting to order at 2:33 p.m. and introductions were made of new Senators.

2. Approval of Minutes  The April 14, 1998 Faculty Senate Minutes were approved as corrected.

3. Elections to University Commissions/Committees  Elections to University Commissions and Committees were held by secret ballot.

4. "Free Speech"  (None)

5. Committee Reports

   a. Policy Committee  - Senator John Huffman, Chair, stated that this Committee has not met but did hold an electronic mail poll regarding the Ombudsman Reporting Line and the Post Tenure Review Statement which will be presented during New Business.

   b. Research Committee  - Chair and Senator Kerry Brooks stated that the Research Committee has not met but will convene in the Fall.

   c. Scholastic Policies Committee  - Senator Nancy Ferguson, Chair, stated that this Committee has not met but noted that conversations have been held with representatives of Student Government regarding online teaching evaluation forms so that evaluations could be done by computer this Fall. The issue of validation is being pursued with the Provost.

   d. Welfare Committee  - Chair and Senator John Leininger stated that the Welfare Committee has not met but will continue with remaining issues from the last Senate session.

   e. Finance Committee  - Senator John Warner, Chair, stated that there was no report.

University Committees and Commissions

   a. Budget Accountability Committee  - Senator Robert Campbell, Chair, noted that this Committee met last week to examine issues related to peer institutions and discovered that problems in comparisons do exist. One serious problem appears to be that one-third of faculty members in the College of Agriculture, Forestry and Life Sciences who are eligible to vote for Faculty Senate are not included because of the manner in which they are being paid. Other issues of concern are: salary survey does not include a significant number of faculty; the Clemson University Fact Book seems to have incorrect totals; and not enough efforts being made regarding actual job categories of faculty.
b. Vice President/President-Elect Horace Skipper asked the status of the Commission to Plan the Future of Clemson University to which the Provost responded that reports will be made in the Fall.

6. President's Report  President Smart described the recent FOCUS Trip she attended along with Vice President Skipper and stated that perhaps Senators could attend in the future. President Smart also announced the establishment of the President’s Commission on the Status of Black Faculty and Staff at Clemson University.

7. Old Business (None)

8. New Business

   a. On behalf of the Policy Committee, Senator Huffman submitted and moved for acceptance the Reporting Line for the Office of Faculty Ombudsman (Attachment A). Vice President Skipper questioned the phrase regarding the exception of disputes involving retention, promotion, or tenure which limits the involvement of the Ombudsman; and moved to return to Policy Committee for clarification. Motion was seconded; vote was taken and passed.

   b. Senator Huffman, Chair of the Policy Committee, explained the history of the Amendment to the Post-Tenure Review Process and moved acceptance (Attachment B). Much discussion followed particularly regarding Numbers 2 and 5 in the Post-Tenure Review Guidelines, which involve the Post-Tenure Review Committee. A Call to Question by Senator Peter Skewes was received and vote was taken on motion as proposed by the Policy Committee and failed due to a lack of two-thirds majority necessary for a Faculty Manual change. This item will return to Policy Committee. Senator Huffman then requested a Sense of the Senate. Senator Saltzman suggested the Sense of the Senate reflect the three available options: (1) either a person outside the department would be added to the Post Tenure Review Committee, or (2) external letters would be required, or (3) the Department would let the individual being reviewed decide which option would be taken. A Sense of the Senate was taken, and the Senate favored letting the various departments chose between the three options.

   c. Senator Subrata Saha informed the Senate of a newsletter that will be sent to all faculty from the Office of the Chief Research Officer and the Graduate School.

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

Elizabeth Dale, Secretary

Cathy Toth Sturkie, Administrative Assistant

To: Policy Committee Chair  John W. Huffman
From: Robert A. Waller, Editorial Consultant for the Faculty Manual
Re: Reporting Line for the Office of Faculty Ombudsman

At the January 30, 1998 meeting of the Board of Trustees the Faculty Senate proposal for the implementation of a Faculty Ombudsman was approved. Since that time a search has been conducted and an individual identified to begin serving in the post.

The position description called for the Ombudsman to report to "a subcommittee of the Faculty Senate Executive/Advisory Committee." At its April 30th meeting the Executive Advisory Committee approved the subcommittee composition outlined below with direction that it be forwarded to the members of the Policy Committee for review and approval with the expectation that the subject would be an agenda item for the May 19th full Faculty Senate meeting.

Since there is some urgency about getting the reporting line established, members of the 1998-99 Faculty Senate Policy Committee are asked to E-Mail their reactions to this proposal to Chairman Huffman (Huffman) with a copy to Cathy Sturkie (Scathy) and to me (RAW7131) so a May 11 deadline may be met in getting the materials into the hands of the full Senate for the May 19th meeting.

Here's the relevant paragraph previously approved by the Senate and the Board of Trustees with the added language in sentence two underscored:

As a complement to the grievance counselors, the Faculty Senate through the Provost also provides a Faculty Ombudsman who can serve as a mediator in all presumed faculty grievances except those disputes involving retention, promotion, or tenure. The Ombudsman will report to a subcommittee of the Faculty Senate Executive/Advisory Committee with the following composition: Immediate Past President of the Faculty Senate, the Faculty Senate President, the Vice President/President Elect, and one faculty member appointed by the Advisory Committee annually. The confidential services of this full professor or professor emeritus
knowledgeable about the grievance process are available to all faculty members free of charge in the expectation of resolving disagreements before reaching the formal stages outlined in the following sections.

In this manner the reporting line for the new Office of Ombudsman would be established in the Faculty Manual for immediate implementation upon approval by the Provost.

c.c.: Academic Vice President and Provost Steffen H. Rogers
Faculty Senate President Patricia T. Smart
Past Faculty Senate President Francis A. McGuire
1998-99 Policy Committee members
Vice President/President Elect Horace D. Skipper
Ombudsman R. Gordon Halfacre
Mesdames Betty M. Moore and Cathy T. Sturkie
To: Interim Policy Committee Chair Matthew J. Saltzman  
From: Robert A. Waller, Editorial Consultant for the Faculty Manual  
Re: Amendment to the Post-Tenure Review Process  

Following the Faculty Senate's May 19th general discussion of the principles to be reflected in a modification of the Post-Tenure Review policy adopted in mid-April, the language suggested below reflects the three-pronged approach to give departments maximum flexibility in selecting the post-tenure review process as befits their professional circumstances.

Reproduced below is the current language previously approved by the Senate and the added language underscored for your convenience in understanding the options now being proposed:

"2. The tenured and tenure-track faculty of each department will each year elect a PTR committee separate from the regular personnel committee(s) according to departmental bylaws. In drafting departmental personnel policy procedures, departments must choose ONE of these options:

   a) utilize reference letters submitted from outside the department on each individual under review (see 3. below),
   b) add to the PTR committee an elected member from outside the department to provide external evaluation for all cases, OR
   c) allow the faculty member the option of determining the procedure of either outside letters or an outside member. The faculty members subject to PTR in a particular year will not be eligible for membership on the committee. Only tenured faculty are eligible for election to the PTR committee. The size of the committee may vary from one academic unit to another; however, the committee must have a minimum of three members. In cases in which the department does not have enough tenured faculty to constitute a PTR committee, the departmental Peer Review Committee will elect outside faculty from other departments who are qualified to serve on the PTR committee. The PTR committee will elect the chairperson."

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

The addition of these options to engage in the seeking of external letters, to add an external person from outside
the department to the PTR committee, or to allow the faculty member the option of the two systems is believed to satisfy the Best Practices criteria which requires that the Post-Tenure Review be as rigorous and as comprehensive in scope as the original tenure review and that the judgment "include evaluations from peers external to the department and/or institution as appropriate to the role and function of each faculty member."

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

A new section 3. would be inserted to outline the details of the letters of reference for option a) outlined above:

"3. In order to assure adequate external participation in the review process, the faculty member would be required to supply the names of six referees outside the department whom the PTR committee could contact as references with the PTR committee required to obtain a minimum of four letters of which at least two must come from the list of six submitted by the faculty member."

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

The old section 3. would be renumbered 4. and the previous 4. would become 5.

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

In the spirit of the above principles, the language in former section 5. now numbered 6. would be modified to read as follows (new language underscored):

"6. The role and function of each faculty member, as well as the strength of the overall record, will be examined by the PTR committee, and if provided in departmental bylaws under option a. or c., the committee shall obtain at least four letters from peers external to the department or to the institution. At least two of these letters must come from a list of six submitted by the faculty member."

Such language regulates the context in which outside evaluations are sought and authorizes the option to be employed.

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

To conclude the necessary changes, the old section 6. would be renumbered 7.

c.c.: Academic Vice President and Provost Steffen H. Rogers
Executive Secretary J. Thornton Kirby
Senate Secretary Elizabeth R. Dale
Director David B. Fleming
1998-99 Policy Committee Members
Mesdames Betty M. Moore and Cathy T. Sturkie
To: Vice President and Provost Stephen H. Rogers  
From: Robert A. Waller, Editorial Consultant for the Faculty Manual  
Re: Final Policy Statement on Post-Tenure Review  

Among the issues facing higher education in South Carolina are the adjustments necessary to accommodate the legislative mandate for greater accountability in the evaluation of tenured faculty members. Specifically, the CHE and the General Assembly guidelines require among the "Quality Indicators" that the quality of the faculty be assured through a "performance review system for faculty to include student and peer evaluations" and to provide for "post-tenure review for tenured faculty." These requirements become operative as part of the new formula for funding higher education in South Carolina.

By this April we are required to have a post-tenure review process in place which incorporates the state's "Best Practices for Post-Tenure Review." Nine months from now our review process will be evaluated in comparison with the "Best Practices" document and we will be given a formula grade with 12 points at stake in the funding formula. Our goal is to meet the criteria by covering the 12 essential points in our procedures.

The subject of post-tenure review has been twice reviewed by the Faculty Senate: "Report on Post-Tenure Review" submitted by the Faculty Senate Select Committee on Tenure and unanimously accepted by the Senate on 2/13/96 and just last December 4th with the acceptance of the report on "The Periodic Review" submitted by the ad hoc Committee chaired by Senator Rajendra Singh.

Based on these studies and accumulated experience, the Faculty Senate on April 14 approved by the requisite two-thirds majority the attached statement concerning the implementation of Post-Tenure Review. I transmit this action on behalf of 1997-98 Faculty Senate President Fran McGuire subject to the condition that the CHE accept the proposal.

The principal discussion of tenure in the August 1997 Faculty Manual occurs on pages 25-26. It is proposed that a new section H. labeled "Post-Tenure Review" be inserted on page 26 and that the remaining sections be relettered.

C.C.: 1997-98 Faculty Senate President Francis A. McGuire  
1998-99 Faculty Senate President Patricia T. Smart  
Director David B. Fleming  
Executive Secretary J. Thornton Kirby  
Policy Committee Chair John W. Huffman  
Faculty Senator John C. Peck  
Mesdames Betty M. Moore and Cathy T. Sturkie
POST TENURE REVIEW

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

Scope: All faculty members holding a tenured faculty position shall be subject to post-tenure review.

Guidelines: The faculty of each academic unit shall prepare written guidelines (approved by a majority of the faculty, the respective Dean, and the Provost) providing details of the post-tenure review process. Although the details may vary from one academic unit to another or from one college to another within the University, such guidelines must be consistent with the following principles:

a) The primary basis for post-tenure review is the individual’s contributions in the areas of research and/or scholarship, and teaching, and service.

b) Guidelines must be flexible enough to accommodate faculty members with different professional responsibilities.

c) Post-tenure review shall not infringe upon the accepted standards of academic freedom. Furthermore, sex, age, ethnicity, and other factors unrelated to an individual’s professional qualifications shall not be considered in the review process.

d) The chairperson of the academic department and the dean of the college must not be involved directly in the peer review process at the departmental level.

Procedure: The following procedures must be used for Post-Tenure Review:

1. All tenured faculty will be peer reviewed every six years. The year or years in which a faculty member is on sabbatical, unpaid leave, and/or extended sick leave shall not be counted in the review period. Departments will devise a schedule of staggered reviews of tenured faculty within each rank. Reviews will be conducted in order of seniority, beginning with those who have the most longevity at Clemson University.
2. The tenured and tenure-track faculty of each department will each year elect a PTR committee separate from the regular personnel committee(s) according to departmental bylaws. The faculty members subject to PTR in a particular year will not be eligible for membership on the committee. Only tenured faculty are eligible for election to the PTR committee. The size of the committee may vary from one academic unit to another; however, the committee must have a minimum of three members. In cases in which the department does not have enough tenured faculty to constitute a PTR Committee, the departmental Peer Review Committee will elect outside faculty from other departments who are qualified to serve on the PTR committee. The PTR committee will elect the chairperson.

3. The faculty undergoing post-tenure review must provide, at a minimum the following documents to the PTR committee and the Department Chair:
   a) a recent copy of the curriculum vitae (paper or electronic)
   b) a summary of teaching evaluations for the last 5 years, including student evaluations
   c) a plan for continued professional growth,
   d) detailed information about the outcomes of any sabbatical leave awarded during the six-year post-tenure review period,
   e) and any other documents relevant to the review.

4. The Chair of the academic unit must provide the committee with copies of the faculty member’s annual performance reviews covering five years accumulated since the initial tenure review or since the last post-tenure review.

5. The role and function of each faculty member, as well as the strength of the overall record, will be examined by the PTR committee, and if deemed appropriate, the committee shall obtain at least four letters from peers external to the department or the institution. At least two of these letters must come from a list of six submitted by the faculty member.

6. The PTR committee will provide a written report to the faculty member. The faculty member should be given at least two weeks time to provide a response to the committee. Both the committee’s initial report and the response of the faculty member will be given to the Dean of the academic unit. The Department Chair will submit an independent and written report to the faculty member and s/he will have two weeks time to provide a response. The Chair’s original report and the faculty member’s response will be submitted to the College Dean. The Dean will write his/her own report
copying the faculty member, the PTR committee, and the Chair and submit all materials to the Provost who establishes the final rating (see Outcome). The Provost files a report explaining the rating to the faculty member, the PTR committee, the Chair, and the Dean. A disclaimer to the Provost’s finding can be filed.

**Outcome:** The following rating system will be used in all stages of the review by the PTR Committee, the Chair, the Dean, and the Provost:

a) **Excellent:** The faculty members in this category shall be recognized by a special pay raise effective in the academic year following the evaluation.
b) **Satisfactory:** No special award will be given.
c) **Unsatisfactory:** Leading to remediation (see below).

If the ratings by the Chairperson, Dean, and Provost differ markedly from the rating of the PTR committee, each must supply documented evidence explaining the difference. In cases involving a rating of "Unsatisfactory," the burden of proving unsatisfactory performance is on the University. To receive an "Unsatisfactory" as the final rating, both the PTR committee and the department chair must so recommend.

**Remediation:** Individuals who receive a rating of Unsatisfactory must be given a period of remediation to correct deficiencies detailed in the PTR reports. The Chairperson in consultation with the PTR committee and the faculty member will provide a list of specific goals and measurable outcomes the faculty member should achieve in each of the next three calendar years following the date of formal notification of the unsatisfactory outcome. The University will provide reasonable resources (as identified in the PTR reports and as approved by the Chair and the Dean) to meet the deficiencies. The Chairperson will meet at least twice annually with the faculty member to review the progress. The faculty member will be reviewed each year by the PTR committee and the Chair, both of whom shall supply written evaluations. At the end of the three-year period, another post-tenure review will be conducted. If the outcome is again Unsatisfactory, the faculty member will be subject to dismissal for unsatisfactory performance as outlined in the Faculty Manual (p. 28). If the review is Satisfactory or Excellent, then the normal review cycle of six years will resume.

**Dismissal for Unsatisfactory Professional Performance:** If dismissal for unsatisfactory professional performance is recommended, the case will be subject to the rules and regulations outlined in the Faculty Manual (p. 28).
MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
JUNE 9, 1998

1. **Call to Order** President Patricia T. Smart called the meeting to order at 2:37 p.m.

2. **Approval of Minutes** The May 19, 1998 Faculty Senate Minutes were approved as distributed.

3. **“Free Speech”** Elizabeth Dale, Assistant Professor of History, expressed her opinion of the pros and cons of the proposed Post Tenure Review Amendments.

4. **Committee Reports**
   a. **Scholastic Policies Committee** - Senator Nancy Ferguson, Chair, stated that this Committee had not met.
   b. **Welfare Committee** - No report.
   c. **Finance Committee** - No report.
   d. **Policy Committee** - Senator Matt Saltzman informed the Senate that this Committee met on May 26th and will present items under New Business.
   e. **Research Committee** - Chair and Senator Kerry Brooks stated that the Research Committee has not met this summer.

5. **University Committees and Commissions**
   a. Senate Alternate Alan Grubb informed the Faculty Senate that as a member of the Committee to consider the issue of a faculty/staff code of conduct, he has been asked to nominate two faculty members to a subcommittee which will prepare a code of conduct for consideration similar to that of the Undergraduates.

5. **President’s Report** President Smart noted:
   a. concerns raised regarding parking changes near the P&A Building and Newman Hall. During discussion, it was decided that further concerns of Senators may be forwarded to the Welfare Committee through Senator Leininger and that Senator Jerry Christenbury will express concerns presented today to the Parking Advisory Committee.
   b. that at this time plans are for the May and August, 1999 Graduation Exercises to be held at Death Valley (at the request of the students), if Littlejohn is closed for renovation.
   c. suggested changes from the Board of Trustees to the Senate’s Proposal of a Faculty Representative to the Board. No dissent was expressed by the Senate (Attachment A).
6. **Old Business**  
a. On behalf of the Policy Committee, Senator Saltzman submitted for approval and explained the Amendments to the Post-Tenure Review Process. A friendly amendment was offered by Senator JoAnne Deeken but was rejected by Senator Saltzman. Senate Alternate Grubb offered a friendly amendment to strike Section 3. c. which was seconded. Following discussion and a call to question, vote to strike was taken and resulted in a tie. President Smart broke the tie to retain Section 3.c. as part of Amendments to the PTR under consideration. Further discussion was held on original submission. A friendly amendment was offered by Senator Eleanor Hare and was accepted. Vote was taken on call to question which would stop debate and failed. Senator Hare restated the friendly amendment, vote was taken, and failed. More discussion followed. Call to question was entered; vote was taken; and passed. Vote was then taken on Amendments to the Post-Tenure Review Process as presented from Policy Committee and included in Agenda Packet and passed with required two-thirds vote (Attachment B).

7. **New Business**  
The following items to be incorporated within the Faculty Manual were brought forward for approval by Senator Saltzman and were approved by the Faculty Senate with the required two-thirds vote.
   a. Student Athlete Enrichment Program (Attachment C).
   b. Refinement of Faculty Ombudsman’s Role and Reporting Line (Attachment D).
   c. Alignment of Administrative Duties After Reorganization (Attachment E).
   d. Vice Provost for Off-Campus, Continuing, and Distance Education (incorporated within Attachment E).

8. President Smart reminded Senators that there will be no Faculty Senate meeting in July and that the next meeting will be on August 18, 1998. Convocation will be August 19th with the Procession beginning at 8:30 a.m.

9. **Adjournment** The meeting was adjourned by President Smart at 3:59 p.m.

Elizabeth Dante, Secretary  
Cathy Toth Sturkie, Administrative Assistant

To: Academic Vice President and Provost Steffen H. Rogers  
From: Robert A. Waller, Editorial Consultant for the  
Faculty Manual  
Re: Faculty Representative to the Board of Trustees

On behalf of Faculty Senate President Patricia T. Smart and the 1998-1999 Faculty Senate I transmit for your review and approval the attached revised proposal for a "Faculty Representative to the Board of Trustees." This modified proposal was presented to the Senate on June 9th and no dissent was expressed. Since the concept has already been approved by the full Board in May and the two modifications they suggested have been incorporated, it is my belief that the matter needs only to be referred to the Educational Policy Committee and the full Board for information. The concept should be implemented effective for the 1998-99 academic year.

In the current Faculty Manual the role of the Board of Trustees in the governance of the University is presented on pages 5-6. Assuming your acceptance of the attached proposal, it is suggested that two additional paragraphs be added on page 5; the first referencing the position description of the Faculty Representative’s duties and the second outlining the selection process. As a new concept and procedure, it is proposed that the complete description of the duties and the selection process be added as an Appendix to the next printed edition of the Manual.

The addition of this approach to enhanced communication between the Faculty and the Board was supported in principle by the 1997-98 Senate and had the unanimous endorsement of the 1998-99 Senate.

c.c.: Executive Secretary J. Thornton Kirby  
1998-99 Senate President Patricia T. Smart  
1997-98 Senate President Francis A. McGuire  
Mesdames Betty M. Moore and Cathy T. Sturkie

Attachment: Revised Proposal for Faculty Representative to the Board of Trustees
REVISED PROPOSAL

FACULTY REPRESENTATIVE TO
THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES

The Clemson University Faculty Senate requests approval for the selection of a Faculty Representative to the Board of Trustees using the process outlined below. We are requesting this individual be recognized as the official representative of the Faculty and be granted privileges beyond those accorded to visitors to Board meetings. This would include receipt of Minutes, Agendas, and attachments of all Board and Committee meetings and an opportunity to be included on the Agenda upon approval of request.

Selection Procedures

A Faculty Representative to the Board of Trustees Selection Committee, composed of one Distinguished Alumni Professor from each College, one Library representative, and the President of the Faculty Senate, will solicit nominations for the Faculty Representative to the Board of Trustees in the Fall, 1998, and every third year thereafter.

Any individual holding tenure at Clemson University will be eligible for nomination. The nomination period will run for fourteen days from the date of the Call for Nominations. Each nomination must include a complete curriculum vitae and a statement of interest from the nominee.

The Faculty Manual Editorial Consultant will examine all nominations to verify the faculty status of each nominee. The names of all eligible nominees will be distributed to the members of the Selection Committee. The Committee will consider the nominations and make the final selection based on nominee’s curriculum vitae and statement of interest.

The Faculty Representative will serve a three-year term commencing with the first Board meeting following selection.

Approval Granted by the Board of Trustees
Memo from Thornton Kirby dated May 4, 1998
POST TENURE REVIEW

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

Scope: All faculty members holding a tenured faculty position shall be subject to post-tenure review.

Guidelines: The faculty of each academic unit shall prepare written guidelines (approved by a majority of the faculty, the respective Dean, and the Provost) providing details of the post-tenure review process. Although the details may vary from one academic unit to another or from one college to another within the University, such guidelines must be consistent with the following principles:

a) The primary basis for post-tenure review is the individual's contributions in the areas of research and/or scholarship, teaching, and service.

b) Guidelines must be flexible enough to accommodate faculty members with different professional responsibilities.

c) Post-tenure review shall not infringe upon the accepted standards of academic freedom. Furthermore, sex, age, ethnicity, and other factors unrelated to an individual's professional qualifications shall not be considered in the review process.

d) The chairperson of the academic department and the dean of the college must not be involved directly in the peer review process at the departmental level.

Procedure: The following procedures must be used for Post-Tenure Review:

1. All tenured faculty will be peer reviewed every six years. The year or years in which a faculty member is on sabbatical, unpaid leave, and/or extended sick leave shall not be counted in the review period. Departments will devise a schedule of staggered reviews of tenured faculty within each rank. Reviews will be conducted in order of seniority, beginning with those who have the most longevity at Clemson University.
2. Each year a PTR committee will be constituted separate from the regular personnel committee(s) according to departmental bylaws. The faculty members subject to PTR in a particular year will not be eligible for membership on the committee. Only tenured faculty are eligible for election to the PTR committee. The size of the committee may vary from one academic unit to another; however, the committee must have a minimum of three members. In cases in which the department does not have enough tenured faculty to constitute a PTR Committee, the departmental Peer Review Committee will elect outside faculty from other departments who are qualified to serve on the PTR committee. The PTR committee will elect the chairperson.

3. In order to assure adequate external representation in the review process, departments must choose ONE of these options in drafting departmental personnel policy procedures:

   a) utilize reference letters submitted from outside the department for each individual under review,

   b) add to the PTR committee a faculty member or professional equivalent from outside the department nominated and elected according to departmental bylaws, OR

   c) allow each faculty member under review the option of either having external letters solicited or incorporating the external committee member in the review process.

4. The faculty undergoing post-tenure review must provide, at a minimum, the following documents to the PTR committee and the Department Chair:

   a) a recent copy of the curriculum vitae (paper or electronic)

   b) a summary of teaching evaluations (if appropriate to the individual's duties) for the last 5 years, including student evaluations

   c) a plan for continued professional growth,

   d) detailed information about the outcomes of any sabbatical leave awarded during the six-year post-tenure review period,

   e) if required by departmental personnel policy procedures, the names of six referees outside the department whom the PTR committee could contact for references,

   f) and any other documents relevant to the review.

5. The Chair of the academic unit must provide the committee with copies of the faculty member's annual performance reviews covering five years accumulated since the initial tenure review or since the last post-tenure review.
6. The role and function of each faculty member, as well as the strength of the overall record, will be examined by the PTR committee. If provided in departmental bylaws, the PTR committee is required to obtain a minimum of four reference letters of which at least two must come from the list of six submitted by the faculty member.

7. The PTR committee will provide a written report to the faculty member. The faculty member should be given at least two weeks time to provide a response to the committee. Both the committee’s initial report and the response of the faculty member will be given to the Dean of the academic unit. The Department Chair will submit an independent and written report to the faculty member and s/he will have two weeks time to provide a response. The Chair’s original report and the faculty member’s response will be submitted to the College Dean. The Dean will write his/her own report copying the faculty member, the PTR committee, and the Chair and submit all materials to the Provost who establishes the final rating (see Outcome). The Provost will file a report explaining the rating to the faculty member, the PTR committee, the Chair, and the Dean. A disclaimer to the Provost’s finding may be filed.

**Outcome:** The following rating system will be used in all stages of the review by the PTR Committee, the Chair, the Dean, and the Provost:

a) **Excellent:** The faculty members in this category shall be recognized by a special pay raise effective in the academic year following the evaluation.

b) **Satisfactory:** No special award will be given.

c) **Unsatisfactory:** Leading to remediation (see below).

If the ratings by the Chairperson, Dean, and Provost differ markedly from the rating of the PTR committee, each must supply documented evidence explaining the difference. In cases involving a rating of "Unsatisfactory," the burden of proving unsatisfactory performance is on the University. To receive an "Unsatisfactory" as the final rating, both the PTR committee and the department chair must so recommend.

**Remediation:** Individuals who receive a rating of Unsatisfactory must be given a period of remediation to correct deficiencies detailed in the PTR reports. The Chairperson in consultation with the PTR committee and the faculty member will provide a list of specific goals and measurable outcomes the faculty member should achieve in
each of the next three calendar years following the date of formal notification of the unsatisfactory outcome. The University will provide reasonable resources (as identified in the PTR reports and as approved by the Chair and the Dean) to meet the deficiencies. The Chairperson will meet at least twice annually with the faculty member to review the progress. The faculty member will be reviewed each year by the PTR committee and the Chair, both of whom shall supply written evaluations. At the end of the three-year period, another post-tenure review will be conducted. If the outcome is again Unsatisfactory, the faculty member will be subject to dismissal for unsatisfactory performance as outlined in the Faculty Manual (p. 28). If the review is Satisfactory or Excellent, then the normal review cycle of six years will resume.

Dismissal for Unsatisfactory Professional Performance: If dismissal for unsatisfactory professional performance is recommended, the case will be subject to the rules and regulations outlined in the Faculty Manual (p. 28).
To: Academic Vice President and Provost Steffen H. Rogers  
From: Robert A. Waller, Editorial Consultant for the Faculty Manual  
Re: Student Athlete Enrichment Program in the Manual

On behalf of Faculty Senate President Pat Smart I report that at yesterday afternoon's meeting of the Senate, the following modification of the Faculty Manual was approved by the required two-thirds majority. The provisions should become fully operative upon your approval.

A report to the Faculty Senate on December 10, 1996, urged that the Student Athlete Enrichment Program (SAEP) be changed organizationally so that a reporting relationship is established between the Director of SAEP and the Provost in order to "reflect a closer tie between the academic support facility and the academic realm of the university." The NCAA accreditation process last March reaffirmed the need for such communication. The admissions and scholarship subcommittee of the Athletic Council recommended similarly that the Director of SAEP have a dual reporting line and recommended language to effect such a condition. The full Athletic Council has now endorsed the concept and the language.

It is time to have these two recommendations reflected in the Faculty Manual. The first recommendation requires that the Director of SAEP "meet regularly and be included in the regular meetings with the Senior Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Studies." Thus, the Faculty Manual on page 7 which lists the supervisory responsibilities of that office needs to be expanded so that after "summer school" the litany of responsibilities would be expanded with the following:

...Student Athlete Enrichment Program,....

This change necessitates that the Director of SAEP meet along with the other directors of admissions, financial aid, registrar, honors college, and undergraduate affairs as an equal partner in the administration of undergraduate academic concerns.

The second recommendation requires the SAEP Director to "meet at least semi-annually with the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs to report on the activities of SAEP and to communicate any concerns regarding the academic well-being and progress of student-athletes."
Among the subjects on which to report would be the implementation of athletic policies and NCAA regulations as they affect discipline and student/athlete obligations. To effect this condition, the array of responsibilities assigned the Provost should be amended in paragraph two on page 7. The following expression needs to be inserted following "serves as liaison officer between the Faculty Senate and the President":

... meets semi-annually with the Director of the Student Athlete Enrichment Program;

In this fashion the required lines of communication would be inscribed in the primary document for academic governance.

These recommendations have been scrutinized ad infinitum by various bodies concerned with campus athletics. As this is a minor internal administrative reporting arrangement, I suggest that it needs only to be referred to the Educational Policy Committee of the of Trustees Board for their information.

c.c.: Faculty Senate President Patricia T. Smart
Athletic Director Robert W. Robinson, Jr.
Senior Vice Provost Jerome V. Reel, Jr.
SAEP Director William J. D'Andrea
Subcommittee Chair Thomas J. Kuehn
Mesdames Betty M. Moore and Cathy T. Sturkie
To: Academic Vice President and Provost Steffen H. Rogers  
From: Robert A. Waller, Editorial Consultant for the  
Faculty Manual  
Re: Refinement of Faculty Ombudsman’s Role and Reporting Line

On behalf of Faculty Senate President Pat Smart I am reporting that yesterday afternoon the full Senate approved by the required two-thirds majority slight modifications in the role of the Ombudsman and established a reporting line for that person.

At the January 30, 1998 meeting of the Board of Trustees the Faculty Senate proposal for the implementation of a Faculty Ombudsman was approved. Since that time a search has been conducted and an individual identified to begin serving in the post. Recent experience suggests a slight change in the wording of that person’s duties.

The position description called for the Ombudsman to "work with faculty to prevent problems from growing into grievances or other formal actions by mediation prior to the initiation of the formal grievance process" and to report to "a subcommittee of the Faculty Senate Executive/Advisory Committee." At its May 19th Faculty Senate meeting the sentiments were expressed to drop the limitation of the field of mediation proposed in the original language and at the April 30th meeting the Executive/Advisory Committee approved the subcommittee composition outlined below.

Here’s the way in which the relevant paragraph will appear on page 30 to reflect these modifications:

The Faculty Senate through the Provost provides a Faculty Ombudsman who can serve as mediator in disputes involving faculty concerns and conflicts. The Ombudsman will report to a subcommittee of the Faculty Senate Executive/Advisory Committee with the following composition: Immediate Past President of the Faculty Senate, the Faculty Senate President, the Vice President/President Elect, and one faculty member appointed by the Advisory Committee annually. The confidential services of this full professor or professor emeritus knowledgeable about the grievance process are available to all faculty members free of charge in the expectation of resolving disagreements before reaching the formal stages outlined in the following sections.
In this manner the duties of the Ombudsman would be enlarged as a result of experience and the reporting line for the new Office of Ombudsman would be established in the Faculty Manual for immediate implementation. Since the concept has already been approved by the full Board of Trustees, I recommend that the refinements be implemented upon your approval and that this action be reported to the Educational Policy Committee of the Board of Trustees for their information.

c.c.: Faculty Senate President Patricia T. Smart
Past Faculty Senate President Francis A. McGuire
Vice President/President Elect Horace D. Skipper
Ombudsman R. Gordon Halfacre
Mesdames Betty M. Moore and Cathy T. Sturkie
To: Academic Vice President and Provost Steffen H. Rogers  
From: Robert A. Waller, Editorial Consultant for the Faculty Manual  
Re: Alignment of Administrative Duties After Reorganization

On behalf of Faculty Senate President Pat Smart I present for appropriate review the following changes to the Faculty Manual reflecting the administrative reorganization of recent months. These changes garnered the required two-thirds majority for inclusion in the Manual.

Here are the changes necessary to accommodate the present structure at the upper administrative levels:

Given that the Offices of Admission and Financial Aid now report to the Provost (as the Faculty Senate over the years has urged) and the Office of Professional Development has been transferred from the College of Business and Public Affairs, that part of the Provost’s manyfold responsibilities needs to be amended in line 6 on page 6 by having it read as follows:

Furnishing direction and guidance to the deans and to the directors of Admissions, Financial Aid, and Professional Development in the development and operation of academic programs and coordinating the activities of the deans and those directors are also responsibilities of the Provost,....

The many changes that have occurred in the administrative contribution of the Vice Provosts requires that Section F. (page 7) be rewritten as follows:

F. The Vice Provosts

The Vice Provosts function as staff members of the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost. They assist in administering the Office of Academic Affairs and perform duties as delegated by the Provost with the following general distribution of duties:

The Senior Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Studies coordinates all undergraduate academic programs including recruiting new undergraduate students; admitting and enrolling them; retaining students; and overseeing the Honors program, the Cooperative Education program, financial aid, registration services, Student Athlete Enrichment Program, and other University-wide undergraduate academic programs. The Dean of Undergraduate Studies or designee chairs the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee.
The Chief Research Officer and Senior Vice Provost for Research and Graduate Studies is responsible for the areas of: a. Graduate School, b. Research Compliance (including Human Subjects, Animal Research, & Institutional Biosafety), c. Intellectual Property and Special Projects, d. Sponsored Programs (Pre-award), e. Clemson University Research Foundation, f. Contract Advising (Legal), g. University Research Grant Committee, h. Technology Transfer, i. South Carolina Research Center, j. Clemson Apparel Research, k. Institute of Wildlife and Environmental Toxicology, and l. other select centers and institutes.

The Vice Provost for Computing and Information Technology is responsible for the university-wide planning for information technology, and for the administration, coordination, budgeting, and planning associated with the University’s central computing services groups: Administrative Programming Services, Information Systems Development, and the Computer Center.

The Vice Provost for Off-Campus, Continuing and Distance Learning is charged with improving the University’s service, performance, and competitiveness in these three areas. S/he directs, budgets, and markets the University’s activities in the following areas: professional development, off-campus programs, continuing education, and distance learning. The vice provost is assisted by a Director of Off-Campus, Distance and Continuing Education.

Other duties shared among the vice provosts include: serving on and occasionally chairing a variety of ad hoc committees; participation in program development; forming and maintaining relationships with other academic institutions and with the Commission on Higher Education; and such other duties as may be assigned by the Provost.

The division of responsibilities between the Vice President for Public Service and Agriculture and the Chief Research Officer necessitate that the former’s list of responsibilities on page 12 be limited to the following:

a. Agriculture and Forestry Research System
b. Cooperative Extension Service
c. Livestock-Poultry Health
d. Regulatory and Public Service Programs
e. Strom Thurmond Institute of Government and Public Affairs
f. Archibald Tropical Research Center in Dominica
g. Housing Institute
10 June 1998

Similarly, the Committees listed on pages 48-49 (Section F.) as reporting to the Vice President for Public Service and Agriculture will now be listed as reporting to the Chief Research Officer (see job description above).

As a matter of form I recommend that these changes be reported to the Educational Policy Committee of the Board of Trustees for information.

With these restructurings the roster of assigned duties should be nearly complete except for the realignment to occur with a new vice president for advancement being limited to alumni relations, development, public affairs, and conference and visitor programs. Responsibility for facilities, maintenance, and operations (including Environmental Health and Safety) gets shifted elsewhere.

C.c.: President Constantine W. Curris
Senior Vice Provost Jerome V. Reel, Jr.
Chief Research Officer Y. T. Shah
Vice Provost Christopher J. Duckenfield
Vice Provost Ralph D. Elliott
Vice President John W. Kelly
Interim Policy Committee Chair Matthew J. Saltzman
Public Affairs Officer Catherine T. Sams
Mesdames Betty M. Moore and Cathy T. Sturkie
THERE WAS NO FACULTY SENATE MEETING IN JULY, 1998
MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
AUGUST 18, 1998

1. Call to Order: President Patricia T. Smart called the meeting to order at 2:36 p.m.

2. Approval of Minutes: The General Faculty and Staff Minutes dated May 5, 1998 were approved as written and the Faculty Senate Minutes dated June 9, 1998 were approved as corrected.

3. “Free Speech” (None)

4. Announcements: President Smart introduced the Graduate Student Assistant to the Faculty Senate Office, Sheri Wimberly, and noted Senate housekeeping items.

5. Committee Reports
   a. Scholastic Policies - Senator Nancy Ferguson, Chair, referred to the Committee Report which notes concerns to be addressed regarding on-line student evaluations of faculty (Attachment A).
   b. Welfare - Chair John Leininger noted that items are being addressed and that regular meetings for the year will be scheduled.
   c. Finance - Senator John Warner, Chair, stated that this Committee is in the organization process and would like to have input regarding its charge.
   d. Policy - John Huffman, Chair, announced that this Committee will meet on the third Tuesday of each month at 3:30 p.m. Items for consideration include: Research Faculty rankings or the equivalent; extending terms of senators running for office; attendance policy for senators; post-tenure review; definition of “faculty” for Faculty Senate purposes; political activity statement; and tenure and promotion procedures under annual review.
   e. Research - Chair Kerry Brooks stated that this Committee will meet this Thursday at 9:30 a.m. in 313 Lee Hall and will consider last session’s committee suggestions to pursue (role and formation of institutes on campus; intellectual property issues; patent law; and the general role of research in tenure and promotion).

6. University Committees and Commissions
   a. Faculty Senate Senator and Secretary, Elizabeth Dale stated that a task force had been established on which she and Senator Huffman serve to draw up a code of conduct for faculty. Senator Huffman stated that the support of such a code by the Senate’s Executive/Advisory Committee was underwhelming. Senator Dale further noted that the Executive/Advisory Committee discussed this item which included the existence of many campus policies which lack enforcement by the administration.
7. **President’s Report**  
   President Smart:
   a. referred to a Summary of the Report by the Faculty Senate Committee to Study the Impact of Performance Funding on Clemson University Faculty (Attachment B);
   b. referred to a memo from the Provost regarding the Georgia Tech Football Game (Attachment C);
   c. noted that a Call for Nominations for the Faculty Representative to the Board of Trustees has been distributed via electronic mail and regular campus mail;
   d. stated that Coach Larry Shyatt will be the Faculty Senate Special Order of the Day at the September meeting;
   e. announced that the Faculty Manual had been disseminated to all faculty and thanked Robert A. Waller, Editorial Consultant, for his work in this regard;
   f. reminded the Senate that departmental by-laws need to be updated to reflect the recently-approved Post-Tenure Review.

8. **Old Business** (None)

9. **New Business**
   a. President Smart encouraged Senators to participate in the Academic Convocation on Wednesday, August 19, 1998.
   b. The date for the Board of Trustees Breakfast hosted by the Faculty Senate was announced to Senators by President Smart - October 10, 1998.
   c. President Smart stated that President Curris wishes to host a luncheon for the Faculty Senate.

10. **Adjournment:** President Smart adjourned the meeting at 3:04 p.m.

Absent: P. Skewes, F. Eubanks, S. Saha, R. Singh
Scholastic Policies Committee

Concerns to be addressed regarding on-line student evaluation of faculty:

1. The questions must be tested for reliability and validity if faculty evaluations are to be a part of the tenure and promotion procedures. This testing should not take place at the same time that the procedures are being changed because we will not know which variables result in lack of validity or reliability (if such a problem shows up).

2. Faculty evaluations should not be a punishment for students. In the end the faculty will pay the price for that. To have students not be able to preregister or get their grades until they have completed the evaluation process for ALL of their classes will only make the students angry at the faculty. I don't know about you, but I do not want angry students evaluating me-- especially if these evaluations are taken seriously in post-tenure review!!

3. The comments on the evaluations are as important as the bubble-in information-- if not more important! If students are rushing through the evaluations to get on-line, there will be NO comments. (The student government also has to help change the expectations of students and convince them that the time taken to do a thorough, thoughtful and honest evaluation is worthwhile and that, yes, it may make a difference in tenure, promotion and even reappointment considerations.)

4. How will all of this information will be stored and then how it will be transmitted at the time of tenure, promotion or post-tenure review.

5. All of these concerns do not mean that we cannot eventually have an electronic method of evaluation, but these concerns need to be addressed.
During the 1996-97 academic year, the Chairman of the Educational Policy Committee of the Clemson University Board of Trustees asked then Faculty Senate President, Ron Thurston, if the Senate had considered the projected impact of the performance funding indicators from the point of view of the faculty. Subsequently, the 1997-98 Senate President, Fran McGuire, appointed Thurston to chair a Faculty Senate Select Committee to discuss and draft a report on these issues. This report includes questions, comments and recommendations that the faculty may have relative to the various performance funding criteria.

This document provides a summary of the report by the Select Faculty Senate Committee on Performance Funding Indicators. The Committee makes no pretense that this information represents the general opinion of the Clemson University Faculty. However, it should be noted that Committee members, including faculty, staff and administrators, were selected from a wide variety of disciplines, and all of the members had many years of experience at Clemson University. It should also be noted that Clemson University has an appointed Performance Funding Committee which operated independently of the Senate Select Committee. The University Committee is chaired by Thornton Kirby. The focus of the University Committee was to consider how Clemson University would respond to assessment of the various indicators as mandated by the S.C. Commission on Higher Education. This included setting benchmarks and goals, a process beyond the purview of the Senate Select Committee, which did not engage in a review of the various assessment benchmarks. The purview of the Senate Committee was to examine the general impact and concerns relative to the various performance funding criteria.

Following are highlights of the report of the Select Committee. Noted are the issues, concerns and suggestions which were discussed by the Committee on Performance Funding Indicators. All 37 indicators will not be discussed in this summary.

A.1. EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS TO ACHIEVE INSTITUTIONAL MISSION

Difficult to analyze the multifaceted activities and goals of individual areas with the University. The Committee stressed that the most important issue at the level of the faculty is whether or not there are enough funds to achieve the institutional mission.

The opinion of the Committee is that we cannot maintain a reputation of being a progressive state which can withstand national and international scrutiny if our educational system is unappreciated and devalued.

A.2. CURRICULA OFFERED TO ACHIEVE MISSION

A certain core curriculum is necessary to support the primary mission of the institution, especially as regards research.

The faculty believes that the most efficient way to evaluate the curriculum match with the mission is at the departmental level.

A.3. APPROVAL OF A MISSION STATEMENT

If Clemson is to achieve Carnegie Research 1 status, resources will have to be moved to promote hiring of research faculty.

How will the CHE view our mission given that we, along with USC and MUSC, are now identified as a research institution? How do you separate efforts in academic research versus those driven by public service research money?

Clemson should work with USC and MUSC to make sure that mission statements are apropos and do not reflect overlap of duties.
A.4. ADOPTION OF A STRATEGIC PLAN TO SUPPORT THE MISSION STATEMENT

Strategic plans should heavily focus on mission, and should not be approved with intensive cost/benefit and feasibility assessment.

For strategic plans to be effective, assessment of the ability of units to meet the objectives and goals of their strategic plan is necessary.

Often success in meeting goals and objectives is based on monetary gains rather than on valid assessment of what was done and the impact of the effort.

The administration as well as the faculty, should also be held responsible if given units do not meet the goals and objectives of their strategic plan.

B.1. ACADEMIC AND OTHER CREDENTIALS OF PROFESSORS AND INSTRUCTORS

Quality universities have faculty development centers and continuing education programs to improve the credentials of their faculty.

Experiences which could prove to be very positive for the faculty, such as sabbatical leave or participating in professional meetings, etc., are often discouraged or looked on with suspicion at Clemson University.

B.7. PERFORMANCE REVIEW SYSTEM FOR FACULTY TO INCLUDE STUDENT AND PEER EVALUATIONS

Faculty do not fear being evaluated. Student evaluations can be useful and should be taken seriously.

Concerns are related to the validity of the evaluations, the fairness with which they will be applied across all of the faculty, and how they will be used.

It is feared that some faculty may attempt to mask ineffectiveness in the classroom by inveiglement of the students in order to curry favor for the purpose of getting a good evaluation.

The Committee was concerned that student evaluations will be the primary focus for the performance review which could lead to grade inflation as well as dilution of the rigor of classroom instruction.

The faculty in South Carolina public institutions of higher education are rapidly digressing toward being the most evaluated among their peers nationally, while on the other hand being the lowest paid and supported. This is a bad situation, which most assuredly will further erode faculty morale and weaken the ability of South Carolina to attract the best faculty into their institutions of higher education.

B.9. COMPENSATION OF FACULTY

Faculty salaries at Clemson average 8 to 10% below our peer institutions. Some departments average more than 10% lower than salaries at peer institutions.

A continued problem has been mandated salary increases driven by legislative edict but not funded by new state money.

Decisions for salary increases should be based on how to reward excellence while not promoting mediocrity.

The Committee agreed that problematic at Clemson is the fact that evaluations are not taken seriously which has led faculty to believe that rewards (salary increments) are not related to performance.

A well-designed evaluation system, which gave recognition for performance, and therefore some better guarantee of a better salary increase, would provide incentive and motivation to the faculty.

Rewarding faculty performance is directly related to faculty morale, energy and momentum. Rewarding performance is also important in establishing a better relationship between the faculty and the administration.

A budget should be developed (long range) based on feasible recommendations as to how faculty salaries can be brought to parity with those of peer institutions, and maintained at or above this aggregate comparator.

A study is needed to compare salary inequities on a gender, discipline and rank basis. Some faculty are overpaid, some are underpaid. One solution would be to hire a consultant to recommend policies to correct the inequities that exist relative to all salaries.
B.10 AVAILABILITY OF FACULTY TO STUDENTS OUTSIDE OF THE CLASSROOM

The Committee had no problem with the concept that faculty should be available to students outside of normal classroom hours.

Availability outside of the classroom cannot be extrapolated to the faculty member's personal time away from the University except in well-defined, extenuating circumstances. Some faculty will not give students their home phone number which is their right.

Concern that this criterion was a perception issue. The students will evaluate whether a faculty member is available often based on the perception of the faculty member's availability, not on an experience of having tried to contact the faculty member outside of normal classroom time.

B.13 NUMBER OF CREDIT HOURS TAUGHT BY THE FACULTY

There is uncertainty concerning how credit hours taught by the faculty will be assessed. Much of the uncertainty relates to how credit is given for variable credit sections such as graduate dissertations.

It is very difficult to effectively communicate accurate reflections of credit hours taught by faculty to the Board of Trustees and other shareholders. It is especially difficult, but very important, for faculty to communicate this information in a research institution.

If faculty are told that they have to get more grants concurrent with having more scholarly publications, how can they be expected to spend more and more time on teaching?

B.14 RATIO OF FULL-TIME FACULTY AS COMPARED TO OTHER FULL-TIME EMPLOYEES

How will administrators who hold faculty rank be counted in this ratio?
How will non-academic areas be monitored and corrected?
A ratio described as adequate may not reflect an accurate picture of areas which need additional faculty as opposed to those areas which may have more than adequate faculty members.
The ratio of full-time to part-time faculty was recognized as being very important.

D. 17 SHARING AND USE OF TECHNOLOGY, PROGRAMS EQUIPMENT, SUPPLIES, AND SOURCE MATTER EXPERTS WITHIN THE INSTITUTION AND WITH OTHER INSTITUTIONS.

To be a highly regarded technological institution requires a commitment toward maintaining advanced equipment and adequate supplies.
State has not fully funded salary increases and has resulted in money diverted away from equipment and supplies into personnel.
The University needs to join USC and MUSC to carry the message to the legislature that this method of operation negatively impacts upon our institutions of higher education, forcing a technological void.
Although many faculty share equipment, within and across the various state universities, this is usually done on an individual basis outside of formal share programs.

D. 18 COOPERATION AND COLLABORATION WITH PRIVATE INDUSTRY

Gifts do not provide overhead and are easy to manipulate. Grants which require overhead are not appealing to some industries.

Faculty who are successful in associating with industry and generate money are left to do what they please, even if their work habits are slack or, under normal circumstances, unacceptable, resulting in poor morale within the faculty.
E. 19 PERCENTAGE OF ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS AS COMPARED TO ACADEMIC COSTS

- The 1996-97 Senate reported that as little as only 25% of total available University monies are used for paying faculty salaries and for teaching supplies. Difficult to document due to the multifaceted functions and costs of the University as a whole.
- Inclusion of the cost of the dean's offices or other administrative function when calculating teaching function is problematic.
- Method of calculating academic costs currently misleading as many of the included categories do not impact directly on the classroom.
- Greater importance should be assigned to just faculty salaries and supplies.
- Best management practices should not be defined as lowest cost management priority.
- Faculty have little input on the agenda of University lobbyists yet do most of the work regarding the address to agenda items.
- Faculty are being told to work faster and be more productive, but are having to get their own money and resources to do so. Given the probability for getting significant extramural funding (less than 15% of all requests are funded), this is a very inefficient way to expect progress out of the faculty as a whole.
- The Committee strongly agreed that it would be a mistake to impose the corporate style of management upon the University, where a few administrators make most of the important decisions.

E. 21 ELIMINATION OF UNJUSTIFIED DUPLICATION OF AND WASTE IN ADMINISTRATIVE AND ACADEMIC PROGRAMS

- The Committee was concerned that programs favored by administration are occasionally protected regardless of the cost/benefit ratio.
- Academic programs are assessed on a cyclical basis by many internal and external processes (CHE, SACS, internal reviews, etc.). The programs of the administration are not assessed with the same rigor.

F. 23 SAT AND ACT SCORES OF STUDENT BODY

- Our scholarship program, especially for national merit scholars, is deficient.
- Scholarship funding is limited.
- The student recruitment process needs dramatic improvement. Parents have related their dissatisfaction with the process of attraction bright student at Clemson as opposed to the recruiting process at other institutions.

G. 30 SCORES OF GRADUATES ON POST-GRADUATE PROFESSIONAL, GRADUATE OR EMPLOYMENT-RELATED EXAMINATIONS AND CERTIFICATION TESTS.

- Successful scores on graduate examinations and certification tests are attained by the recruitment of good students; continuing the practice of hiring quality faculty; and assuring adequate resources for faculty instruction.

H. 33 TRANSFERABILITY OF CREDITS TO AND FROM THE INSTITUTION

- A better policy for handling transfer credits needs to be developed to improve the efficiency of registration for transfer students.
- Increasing the number of transfer students may lower student quality.

H. 34 CONTINUING EDUCATION PROGRAMS FOR GRADUATES AND OTHERS

- The University should encourage the faculty to become more involved in continuing education, but some method for rewarding the faculty for such activities must be developed.
In summary, it is the conclusion of the Senate Select Committee that legislation to promote quality through performance assessment and funding will not succeed if there is not an increase in respect and support for higher education in the State. The leadership of Clemson University needs to recognize and respond to the fact that the University needs immediate attention to reverse the declining scholastic and research performance of this institution. Accordingly, it is hoped that the Board of Trustees will take this report in advisement and work with the Clemson University administration to institute changes which will move the University forward in a positive manner.
MEMORANDUM
TO: Faculty of Clemson University
FROM: Steffen H. Rogers
Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost
RE: Georgia Tech Football Game

Inasmuch as there is a little over a month left until Fall Semester 1998 begins, let me inform you about an external factor that will bear upon our teaching mission this Fall, namely the evening football game with Georgia Tech.

That game has been scheduled for Thursday, November 12, 1998, in the evening. The decision as to date and time was made by the Atlantic Coast Conference not by our Athletic Department. The game will be televised and will likely begin at some point between 7 and 8 p.m. Because of the needs of the television crews and also because of the nature of Clemson supporters, the parking lots regularly used by our guests will need to be available by 3 p.m. that day.

In addition, the South Carolina Highway Patrol will be in position at 2 p.m. on game day. As the game traffic increases, they have the legal authority to change traffic flow so as to move the automobiles. Usually traffic on the state roads, which includes the entire campus, flows only towards the stadium.

Staff will need to leave campus by 3 p.m. to keep them from being stranded on campus.

For faculty whose classes are being taught at 2 p.m. or later, special parking hang tags will be distributed through your department for you to use. Although plans have not been finalized, you may be able to park in a remote lot where special buses will provide transportation to and from the campus core. I know it might not be as convenient as any of us would like, but I trust your good humor and concern for the University get us through a difficult day.

As you prepare your syllabi for your classes, you may want to rearrange your class schedule so that the material to be covered can be dealt with in a different way or time for the November 12, Thursday afternoon and evening classes. If you find that best, you have my permission to do so. Please let your department chair know so that the chair is able to answer any questions that may arise.

Thank you in advance for your support. I look forward to being with you for our opening Academic Convocation August 19, 1998.

bsr
MINUTES  
FACULTY SENATE MEETING  
SEPTEMBER 8, 1998

1. Call to Order: President Patricia T. Smart called the meeting to order at 2:33 p.m.

2. Approval of Minutes: The Faculty Senate Minutes dated August 18, 1998 were approved as written.

3. Special Order of the Day: Stating that it was a privilege to speak to the Faculty Senate, Larry Shyatt, Clemson University Basketball Coach, explained how thrilled he and his family are to return to the Clemson community. Coach Shyatt wants the members of the basketball team to be part of the Student Body and have a degree of passion for the classroom. Dignity, morality, and character are traits that he hopes each basketball player possesses. Coach Shyatt announced plans to invite faculty groups to each game as guests; for Midnight Madness on October 16 at 9:30 p.m. at Littlejohn Coliseum; and for a personal growth involvement program for the players. Ideas for appearances by the players for this program were requested.

4. “Free Speech”: (None)

5. Committee Reports

a. Scholastic Policies - Senator Nancy Ferguson informed the Senate that this Committee is looking at on-line teaching evaluations at other institutions.

b. Welfare - John Leininger, Chair, noted that this Committee has had an organization meeting and that regular meetings will be held on the second Friday of each month at 12:30 p.m. in the Second Floor Conference Room (LL3) of the Cooper Library. All are welcome.

c. Finance - Senator John Warner stated that items this Committee will consider include: travel, supplies, computer equipment and software, remediation, sabbaticals, and resources for professional development and growth.

d. Policy - John Huffman, Chair, stated that this Committee met last week and that changes to the University tenure and promotion procedures will not be changed at this time; an invitation to Provost Steffen H. Rogers and Y. T. Shah, Chief Research Officer, will be extended to discuss differences over the proposed “Research Faculty” position; and that the Faculty Manual change regarding the Nomination Pool for Faculty Senate Officers will be brought to the Senate in October. New Business items include: an Evaluation of Administrators revision; the reinsertion of the Provost into the policy regarding review of Administrators; Faculty Senate attendance policy; procedure that evaluations of committee and department chair go separately to the dean in Post-Tenure Review procedures be extended to procedures for tenure and promotion; definition of “faculty” for Senate purposes; and another look at Grievance procedures.

e. Research - Senator Kerry Brooks submitted the report from this Committee (Attachment A) and noted the date for the next meeting: September 15 at 4:00 p.m. in 415 Lee Hall. The Welfare Committee will consider a resolution regarding research institutes; will look into the general notion of intellectual property; and will consider a policy for Research Data and Retention similar to that of the Research Ethics Policy.
University Commissions and Committees

1) Traffic and Parking - Senator Jerry Christenbury announced that this Committee is considering changes to the appeal process; modifying the hang tag system; and reworking the fine system. Any comments are to be forwarded to Senator Christenbury or Senator Ted Taylor. Senator Christenbury responded to questions from the Senators and received parking concerns to take to this Committee.

2) Task Force on a Non-Student Code of Conduct - Senator Elizabeth Dale reported that this Task Force unanimously approved sending a letter to Vice President for Student Affairs, Almeda Rogers Jacks, recommending that existing procedures be followed and enforced instead of a code of conduct for all.

6. President's Report: President Smart informed the Senate:

   a. of the Review Committee for the Class of '39 Award for Excellence: Chalmers Butler (Chair), Larry LaForge, John Bednar, JoAnne Deeken, Kathy Neal Headley, and Nancy Ferguson (Alternate).

   b. of the option for nine-month employees to have their paychecks spread throughout the year. Senators applauded the availability of this option. Senator Taylor questioned the possibility of having uniform checks rather than varying amounts which President Smart will discuss with Brett Dalton.

   c. of a meeting among the members of the Executive/Advisory Committee and the Provost regarding Post-Tenure Review. Confirmation was made that the Faculty Senate intent was for these procedures to be loose as far as departmental bylaws are concerned. President Smart noted that some items will continue to be discussed. A decision was made that administrators from the department chair level and above will not be evaluated by this particular Post-Tenure Review document.

   d. of the selection of Francis A. McGuire as the first Faculty Representative to the Clemson University Board of Trustees for a three-year term.

7. Old Business

   a. The Report from the Faculty Senate Select Committee to Position Clemson University on Performance Funding and the Caveat which is included with the Report (Attachment B) was submitted for endorsement by Senator Robert Campbell. It was also noted that this Report had been accepted by the 1997-98 Faculty Senate and an explanation of the Caveat was provided by Senator Campbell. Motion was seconded. Discussion was held. Vote to Call to Question was held and passed. Vote was taken on Report as it stands including the Caveat and passed. President Smart noted that this discussion will be ongoing and that this Report is a starting point.

8. New Business

   a. President Smart informed the Senate that Brett Dalton had expressed a desire to issue the special paychecks at the end of the normal pay cycle rather than cut extra special checks and requested the support of the Senators. Following discussion, vote was taken to support and passed.
b. Senator Ferguson announced her intention to submit the Student Senate Bill regarding Academic Integrity (Attachment C) for endorsement. After the required two-thirds vote to bring to floor which passed, Senator Ferguson then made a motion to endorse the Bill which proposes the establishment of a committee to examine the issue of academic integrity, which was seconded. Discussion followed. Vote was taken on endorsement and passed.

9. **Announcements** President Smart shared with the Senate plans of the following:
   a. Faculty Gathering, October 2, 1998 at 4:30 p.m. at the Amphitheater.
   b. Board of Trustees Breakfast, October 10, 1998, 8:00 a.m. at the Madren Center
   c. Faculty Senate Party, October 24, 1998 at 7:00 p.m. at the Sturkie residence.
   d. Visits by the Faculty Senate President and Vice President/President-Elect to colleges to meet with faculty.

10. **Adjournment:** The meeting was adjourned by President Smart at 3:39 p.m.

   [Signature]

   Elizabeth Dale, Secretary

   [Signature]

   Cathy Toth Sturkie, Administrative Assistant

Absent: J. Acton, P. Skewes, M. Jacobi (A. Grubb for), M. Bridgewood, S. Hedetniemi, S. Anand, B. Naff
Faculty Senate Research Committee 1998-1999

August 20, 1998 Meeting Report #1

Committee Members in Attendance: K. Brooks (Chair), V. Shelburne, R. Singh
Committee Members Absent: S. Anand, M. Ellison, Ted Taylor, C. Voelker

We met in Room 313 Lee Hall. We have experienced scheduling difficulties, and so have selected 4PM on Tuesday, September 15 (3rd Tuesday) for our next meeting. If this time change is successful, we will retain this 3rd Tuesday meeting date for the remainder of the semester or academic year.

The agenda for the meeting was:

1) Introductions
2) Proxy representative/vice chair
3) Old Business: Distribute /discuss final report from 1997/98 Committee.
   a. Institutes on campus
   b. Graduate Program Stipends
4) New Business:
   a. Role of research in T&P
   b. Compliance Committee Issues
   c. Overhead Use for 'needs & services'
   d. Ownership of Web Materials
   e. Recent Patent Court Case
   f. Representative to CURF (Ed Page)
   g. Draft Performance Indicators report
   h. Issues from committee members
5) Adjournment

Discussion, Actions, and Recommendations by Item Number

2) Singh and Shelburne volunteered to substitute for the chair on an as-needed, case-by-case basis.

3a) Institutes: We discussed Institutes on campus at length. For the most part we agreed with recommendations from last year's Research Committee. There was consensus among the attending members that additional work on the Institutes issue per se might not be productive. Chair recommendation for discussion under old business in September: Put forth a resolution incorporating last year's recommendations.
3b) Stipends: Members felt also that we need not perform additional analysis on this issue. Again, Chair recommends consideration of a resolution on this topic.

4a) Brooks will meet with Dr. Shah and Dr. Smart on this issue in the near future.

4b) No action recommended.

4c) This issue will also be discussed with Dr. Shah -- there is also potential for Accountability Committee involvement on this issue.

4d) We agree that this is a vitally important issue, subsumed under the concept of 'Intellectual Property;' We intend to investigate over the course of the year and make recommendations prior to the conclusion of the 1998/99 Senate year.

4e) We agreed that this will be handled as part of the Intellectual Property topic.

4f) This item was moot, as Ed Page informed the Chair that President Curris has named this representative, namely Hap Wheeler.

4g) Received as an informational item, no action taken.

4h) We received from R. Waller the Draft Research Data Access and Retention Policy, returned to us from last years Policy Committee (with revisions). Actions: After checking on the history of this document, we will review it for approval and forward at our September meeting. We need to examine this policy for compliance with NSF policy and rewrite it for brevity. This draft policy has been distributed to all Research Committee members.

CAVEAT

TO

REPORT FROM THE FACULTY SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE
TO POSITION CLEMSON UNIVERSITY FOR
PERFORMANCE FUNDING

A number of passages in this Report (Sections 12a, 13a, 19a, and 33b) present numerical information about the operations of Clemson University. The Faculty Senate has not been able to verify these numbers; we are especially concerned about the claimed level of administrative expense in Section 19a, which is not nearly adequate to account for the salaries and benefits of Clemson University employees whose duties are primarily administrative.

Therefore, in endorsing this Report, the Faculty Senate does not vouch for the accuracy of the information in Sections 12a, 13a, 19a, or 33b.
S. C. COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION
PERFORMANCE FUNDING ASSESSMENT:
ISSUES CONCERNING THE PROJECTED IMPACT
ON CLEMSON UNIVERSITY FACULTY

A REPORT BY THE FACULTY SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE
ON PERFORMANCE FUNDING INDICATORS

ACCEPTED BY THE FACULTY SENATE
APRIL 14, 1998

Committee Members: Ashby Bodine, Sydney Cross, Larry Dooley, David Fleming, Bob Green, Dori Helms, John Huffman, Beth Kunkel, Francis McGuire, David Leigh, Madelynn Oglesby, Jerry Reel, Tom Scott, Lois Sill, Pat Smart, DeWitt Stone, Ron Thurston (Chair)
Background: During the 1996-97 academic year, the Chairman of the Educational Policy Committee of the Clemson University Board of Trustees (Joseph Swann) asked then Faculty Senate President, Ron Thurston, if the Senate had considered the projected impact of the performance funding indicators from the point of view of the faculty. Subsequently, the 1997-98 Senate President, Fran McGuire, appointed Thurston to chair a Faculty Senate Select Committee to discuss and draft a report on these issues. This report includes questions, comments and recommendations that the faculty may have relative to the various performance funding criteria.

Disclaimer: The material presented herein represents issues, concerns and suggestions which were discussed by the Senate Select Committee on Performance Funding Indicators. The Committee makes no pretense that this information represents the general opinion of the Clemson University Faculty. However, it should be noted that Committee members, including faculty, staff and administrators, were selected from a wide variety of disciplines, and all of the members had many years of experience at Clemson University. As is usual in any lengthy discourse or deliberations, some Committee members attended faithfully while others attended infrequently if at all. Attendance at the various meetings will not be documented.

Please note that Clemson University has an appointed Performance Funding Committee which operated independently of the Senate Select Committee. This University Committee is chaired by Thorton Kirby. In general, the focus of the University Committee was to consider how Clemson University would respond to assessment of the various indicators as mandated by the S.C. Commission on Higher Education. This included setting benchmarks and goals, a process beyond the purview of the Senate Select Committee, which did not engage in a review of the various assessment benchmarks. The purview of the Senate Committee was to examine the general impact and concerns relative to the various performance funding criteria.

Prologue: By legislative mandate, it is decreed that future funding of public institutions of higher education in South Carolina will be on the basis of assessment in accordance with 37 performance indicators. The presumption is that all of the indicators will, either directly or indirectly, represent a measure of quality performance by institutions of higher education. In this regard, South Carolina is unique in the number of performance indicators used to assess the state universities, the rigor the assessment, and the amount of funds appropriated on the basis of the performance assessment score.

The Senate Select Committee is concerned that faculty will be scrutinized heavily through several evaluations, resulting in increased demands on their performance, while at the same time will experience a continued decline in the work environment due to poor support for higher education in general. In a recent rating by Memex Press Inc. entitled Critical Comparisons of American Universities and Colleges (refer to www.memex-press.com/cc/), a review of select programs resulted in an academic ranking for Clemson University of bottom 26% of all universities studied, which was the poorest rating for all comparable institutions in the Southeastern region for the programs rated. It was noted that Clemson is one of the few universities that spends low amounts of student tuition or fee money for scholarships, placing us in the bottom 1% in this category. In a recent report of the Committee on University Research, which is a subcommittee of The Commission on the Future of Clemson University, it was noted that Clemson University ranked last in both total research funding and in per faculty funding, compared to 10 peer institutions.
As summarized by the Southern Regional Education Board for 1997, the outlook for the State is also precarious. While the rate of job growth in the region doubled in the 1990's, spending on higher education did not keep pace with economic growth or government spending in other areas. Growth in state tax funds for higher education over the past five years was the lowest of any five-year period since the mid-1970's, resulting in a per student funding decrease of almost 11 percent. The salaries of faculty in colleges in the SREB region have declined 3 percent when adjusted for inflation, while the national average for workers increased 5 percent. A greater financial burden has been passed on to students, resulting in large increases in student borrowing.

Considering the above facts, it is the conclusion of the Committee that legislation to promote quality through performance assessment and funding will not succeed if there is not an increase in respect and support for higher education in this State. The leadership of Clemson University needs to recognize and respond to the fact that the University needs immediate attention to reverse the declining scholastic and research performance of this Institution. Accordingly, it is hoped that the Board of Trustees will take this report in advisement, and work with the Clemson University administration to institute changes which will move the University forward in a positive manner.

Categories and Individual Assessment Criteria

The Performance Indicators: The South Carolina Commission on Higher Education (CHE) was given the task of developing the methodology and setting specific benchmarks to be used for the performance funding assessment process. This process has been slow in developing, and after input from CHE benchmark and sector Committees, and deliberation of the Commission with various university representatives, the assessment process has finally been formalized. The original performance funding categories and criteria are listed below. Consult the CHE or the University Performance Funding Committee for information as to how they will be assessed.

A. Critical Success Criteria: Mission Focus

1. Expenditure of funds to achieve institutional mission
2. Curricula offered to achieve mission
3. Approval of a mission statement
4. Adoption of a strategic plan to support the mission statement
5. Attainment of goals of the strategic plan

B. Critical Success Criteria: Quality of the Faculty

6. Academic and other credentials of professors and instructors
7. Performance review system for faculty to include student and peer evaluations
8. Post-tenure review for tenured faculty
9. Compensation of faculty
10. Availability of faculty to students outside of the classroom
11. Community or public service activities of faculty for which no extra compensation is paid
C. Critical Success Factor: Instructional Quality

12. Class sizes and student/teacher ratios
13. Number of credit hours taught by the faculty
14. Ratio of full-time faculty as compared to other full-time employees
15. Accreditation of degree granting programs
16. Institutional emphasis on quality teacher education and reform

D. Critical Success Factor: Institutional Cooperation and Collaboration

17. Sharing and use of technology, programs, equipment, supplies, and source matter experts within the institution and with other institutions
18. Cooperation and collaboration with private industry

E. Critical Success Factor: Administrative Efficiency

19. Percentage of administrative costs as compared to academic costs
20. Use of best management practices
21. Elimination of unjustified duplication of and waste in administrative and academic programs
22. Amount of general overhead costs

F. Critical Success Factor: Entrance Requirements

23. SAT and ACT scores of student body
24. High school standing, grade point averages, and activities of student body
25. Post-secondary non-academic achievement of the student body
26. Priority on enrolling in-state students

G. Critical Success Factor: Graduate Achievements

27. Graduation rate
28. Employment rate for graduates
29. Employer feedback on graduates who were employed or not employed
30. Scores of graduates on post-graduate professional, graduate or employment-related examinations and certification tests
31. Number of graduates who continue their education
32. Credit hours earned of graduates

G. Critical Success Factor: User-Friendliness of Institution

33. Transferability of credits to and from the institution
34. Continuing education programs for graduates and others
35. Accessibility to the institution of all citizens of the state

H. Critical Success Factor: Research Funding

36. Financial support for reform in teacher education
37. Amount of public and private sector grants

Committee Response to the Performance Funding Criteria

A. Critical Success Criteria: Mission Focus

1. Expenditure of funds to achieve institutional mission

1a. General discussion Major universities such as Clemson University, have many different disciplines with a variety of missions. Yet, of all of the functions which we are involved with, none are more important that the education of students. Research is considered to be part of teaching, and success with research can be difficult to quantitate. We are a comprehensive University and the inclusion of research monies as part of academic expenditures impacts liberal arts, engineering and sciences much differently. Research money is best used to assess the health of the graduate program rather than the undergraduate mission. Public service money does not count as academic expenditures, but can have a big impact on the academic mission through commitment of dollars for salaries and services. There is concern that the movement to make the PSA entity a type of granting agency will cost millions in terms of moving faculty salaries toward E&G support. How can the PSA agency function independently within the University when so much of what they do impacts the entire faculty? In conclusion, the Committee strongly supported any method to assess the amount of spending directed toward achievement of the mission of the University. However, much skepticism exists concerning how this can be analyzed, given the multifaceted activities and goals of individual areas within the University. Since we are the most "public service" oriented university in the state, it seems that almost anything we do, including athletics, could be rationalized in terms of "expenditures to achieve the mission of the University".

1b. Questions, comments and recommendations The only way this criterion would have significant meaning with regard to the education of students would be if the mission statement includes only E&G activities.

At the time this report was written, the CHE has indicated that PSA paid employees would be counted in the faculty/employee assessment, but that other PSA activities would be ignored. This could mean that PSA employees could count as a negative factor against performance assessment, while some of the beneficial aspects of PSA will be ignored by the CHE.

An analogy was given: If we are being held responsible for our health, and how we eat and divide the food on our plate is a big issue and will be assessed, this ignores the number one determinant of our health in the first place, and that is, how much food was given to us and what is its nutrient value? Assessment is only valid if the state is giving us enough money to achieve
our mission. The Committee stressed that the most important issue at the level of the faculty is whether or not there is enough funds to achieve the institutional mission.

It was concluded that performance assessment may be a useless exercise if those individuals responsible for controlling higher education do not change their attitude. There is an aura of suspicion which resides over higher education in this state. It was the opinion of the Committee that we cannot maintain a reputation of being a progressive state which can withstand national and international scrutiny if our educational system is unappreciated and devalued.

It is good that the general public and those involved in higher education are undergoing a process of introspection and quality evaluation of our institutions. Such self-assessment is the mark of a progressive organization. Some needed changes must occur, but the attitude cannot be one of "robbing Peter to pay Paul".

2. Curricula offered to achieve mission

2a. General discussion The curriculum is the purview of the faculty. Certainly, the majority of the curriculum offered in a given academic program should support the mission of the University, college and department. However, given the multifaceted disciplinary structure of most universities, mission statements are usually vague. Nevertheless, the general modus operandi of a department should reflect appreciation for and design of curriculum to satisfy the objectives and goals of our mission and strategic plans, especially as reflected in our obligations as a land grant university.

2b. Questions, comments and recommendations There is much concern about duplication of programs between public institutions of higher education. However, it should be recognized that a certain core curriculum is necessary to support the primal mission of the institution, especially as regards research. For example, English and biochemistry support the research mission in all areas, yet programs in these disciplines may be stronger at other institutions.

The best evaluation of how the curriculum meets the mission of the institution is most efficient when done at the level of the department and college of the particular academic program being considered.

Attention should be given to the amount of credit hours required to obtain a particular degree. This should be in line with the same requirements at our peer institutions. There is a certain amount of inertia that resides in decision-making about curriculum. Faculty are reluctant to give up existing courses, and often are hesitant to adopt new ones.

Demand and relevance do not always drive curricular needs, but sometimes the decision is based on financial desires. This is especially true of summer courses, which allow 9-month faculty to receive extra pay. No course should be offered unless it meets the objectives and goals of a particular academic program. The cost/benefit ratio should be considered also.
3. Approval of a mission statement

3a. General discussion The Committee recognized that our mission statement should reflect our responsibilities as a land grant institution: The three major legislative acts which originally defined the roles of land grant universities were the Morrill Act of 1862, the Hatch Act of 1887 and the Smith Lever Act of 1914. The Federal Government provided support for land grants for the formation of universities which could teach any subject, but agriculture, mechanics and military strategy and tactics were to be mandatory. It was pointed out that in some states, the land grant universities dominate higher education, but this is not true for South Carolina. Originally, responsibilities of land grant universities were to reflect service and affordable education for the general populace.

The Committee expressed some confusion as to how "Mission Focus" was to be measured. According to the special report from the Commission on Higher Education (CHE) the measure will primarily include how an institution spends its funds to meet the objectives outlined in the mission statement. In accordance with previous legislation, the CHE had to gather mission statements (little input on content), but now they can evaluate them, and even reject the mission statements. Although we are a land grant university, the CHE has identified us as a research institution along with USC and MUSC. Ostensibly, there will be some commonality of goals for these three institutions. The CHE has not set a goal for research institutions to become Carnegie I universities, but the legislative study committee indicated that this should be a realistic goal. If they (CHE) decide to set this aspiration as a goal, they will have to move money to the institutions to make it possible for this to happen.

The Carnegie definition for a research I institution is the graduation of 100 doctoral students per annum, and federal grant funding of 50 million per year. Although Clemson University meets the goal of graduating 100 doctoral students, our revenue for federal grant money in 1997 was just over 30 million, although the amount of grant money seems to be increasing for 1998. Being a research I institution allows for the hiring of better faculty and graduate students. However, Clemson University will have to move resources and promote hiring of research faculty if we chose to achieve this goal.

It is easier to be a Carnegie I research institution if you have a medical school. The concept of a Carnegie Research I institution does not apply unilaterally across all disciplines. Liberal arts would contribute little grant resources, but the University has grown to a broad and rich institution that can teach the arts and the whole spectrum of educational topics very well.

3b. Questions, comments and recommendations The suggestion was made that we need to have our mission and strategic plans formulated in terms of what a land grant university should do, especially concerning our obligations within the state, given the existence of over 30 other institutions of higher education within South Carolina. A comment was made that if the University has strayed from the original land grant concept, this was because the factors of leadership and need dictated the direction of change.

Is the land grant concept inherently narrow? Should we get rid of the term "land" and stress other important issues and resources? The Committee strongly recommended that the definition
of a 21st century land grant university had to be redefined, not in general terms for all land grant institutions, but couched in terms of the responsibilities and duties of Clemson University as a land grant institution in the State of South Carolina.

How will the CHE view our mission given that we, along with USC and MUSC, are now identified as research institutions? Accordingly, how do you separate efforts in academic research versus that driven by public service research money?

Clemson should work with USC and MUSC to make sure that mission statements are apropos and do not reflect overlap of duties. Do we want to write specific goals into the mission statement, or keep the mission statement general and refer to the strategic plan for specifics? The current mission statement does not address the defining characteristics outlined by CHE.

The mission statement for Clemson University should be defined to be inclusive of the emphasis on our unique obligations within the State of South Carolina, but should not discount our role nationally, and on an international level.

How do we infuse the land grant concept into undergraduate education? Students should be involved in direct, systematic research. Should every undergraduate student be exposed to public service, and in what way?

How should we administrate the various research activities on campus? Should we centralize the administration of research for engineering, the Office of Sponsored Programs and PSA research funds? Engineering currently routes their major grants through the Office of Sponsored Programs but has the authority to sign-off on grants of up to half-million dollars. The Vice President for Agriculture and Public Service currently handles PSA research funds. Centralizing research may make it less parochial and therefore more accessible to the broader university. This may make faculty more responsive.

Should PSA be established as a separate agency (institute) and research funded by PSA be contracted back to the faculty on a grant basis? How does the academic sector interact with the non-academic sector, especially the academic function (funded with over 80 million dollars of E&G money) with the South Carolina Agriculture and Forestry Research System (over 60 million dollars)?

4. Adoption of a strategic plan to support the mission statement

4a. General discussion The Committee strongly supported the idea that work units should have strategic plans, which conform to the overall mission of the institution. The best plans are made and acted upon at the level in which the work is being done. In other words, strategic plans should be formulated at the level of departments working together with the college administration.

4b. Questions, comments and recommendations In the past, strategic plans have, all too often been based on campus politics more than needs and mission. Faculty input is the key to assuring that work units have a chance to meet the objectives and goals outlined in their strategic plans.
Strategic plans should heavily focus on mission, and should not be approved without intensive cost/benefit and feasibility assessment. A plan for periodic updating of strategic plans should be in effect.

In addition to focus on measurable service output, strategic plans should include discussion and plans for improvement of the academic sector.

5. Attainment of goals of the strategic plan

5a. General discussion It goes without saying that an effective unit will achieve most of the objectives and goals set forth in their strategic plan. The Committee strongly felt that if strategic plans are going to be effective, then assessment of the ability of units to meet the objectives and goals of their strategic plan is necessary.

5b. Questions, comments and recommendations Who is going to do the assessment of whether or not a particular unit meets the objectives and goals of their strategic plan?

Often success in meeting goals and objectives is based on monetary gains rather on valid assessment of what was done and the impact of the effort.

How will success be measured across the various units, especially academic versus auxiliary services, versus student services versus the public service sector?

The administration as well as the faculty, should also be held responsible if given units do not meet the goals and objectives of their strategic plan.

B. Critical Success Criteria: Quality of the Faculty

6. Academic and other credentials of professors and instructors

6a. General discussion To maintain a quality faculty, the credentials of the professoriate and instructors should be recognized as being very important. The Committee strongly supports any effort that could be used to develop the professionalism of the faculty.

6b. Questions, comments and recommendations Quality universities have faculty development centers and continuing education programs to improve the credentials of their faculty. Clemson University is remiss in this area. It is recommended that the Provost work with the Faculty Senate to improve professional development for the faculty, especially as concerns moving technology into the classroom.

Experiences which could prove to be very positive for the faculty, such as going on sabbatical leave or participating in professional meetings, etc., are often discouraged or looked on with suspicion at Clemson University. The administration could take a more active role in encouraging good faculty to take advantage of these types of activities in order to improve their professional skills.
Professional development of the faculty is an area that could be much improved and encouraged at Clemson University.

7. Performance review system for faculty to include student and peer evaluations

7a. General discussion As discussed for post-tenure evaluation (vide #8 below), the faculty do not fear being evaluated. In actuality, they have undergone annual evaluation since accepting employment in the academic arena. The major concerns relate to the validity of the evaluations, the fairness with which they will be applied across all of the faculty, and how they will be used. With respect to student evaluations, it is feared that some faculty may attempt to mask ineffectiveness in the classroom by inveiglement of the students in order to curry favor for the purpose of getting a good evaluation. As far as peer evaluation is concerned, the outcome will largely be determined by who selects the peers and from what institutions they are chosen from.

7b. Questions, comments and recommendations Relative to this indicator, the biggest concern was the validity of student evaluations and how they will be used. Student evaluations can be useful and should be taken seriously. However, it is well known that youth are impressionable, and in certain instances can be manipulated into giving good evaluations. The biggest concern is that if the faculty are going to be heavily judged on student evaluations, then grade inflation will likely occur, together with dilution of the rigor of classroom instruction. If a faculty member has repeat poor evaluations for a given class, then the tenure and promotion committee of a given department should thoroughly review the situation to determine if the poor evaluations are warranted before any corrective measures are instituted. Accepting student evaluations *prima facie* is risky.

8. Post-tenure review for tenured faculty

8a. General discussion It is mandated by law that faculty will be post-tenure reviewed in accordance with best practices guidelines as defined by the CHE. At the time this document was written, the Policy Committee of the Faculty Senate was in the process of completing the post-tenure review policy for Clemson Faculty. While the opposition to post-tenure review among the faculty is slight, there is general concern about the amount of money and time it will take to complete and evaluate all of the reviews that the faculty will undergo. This will include review by students, outside peers, a special faculty committee, the department chair, the dean and the provost. No one seems to understand the importance of the annual review versus post-tenure review. Why is it believed that the post-tenure review will improve faculty evaluations, if the general belief is that annual reviews have failed? The sentiment often expressed by the faculty is that there seems to be a general mistrust of faculty by administrators and the general public, almost to the point of believing that all tenured faculty are negligent in the performance of their duties, and accordingly, they need to be evaluated so thoroughly that this can be proven to be true. While it is true that some tenured faculty may be remiss in the performance of their duties, when the faculty are considered as a whole, this is the exception rather than the rule. The Faculty Senate conducted a study of post-tenure review in 1995. Data from post-tenure evaluations already in place at several universities has shown that further evaluation does nothing to punish poor performing faculty. They are already known to their peers and the administration. Therefore, if post-tenure review is accepted as a means of getting rid of poor
faculty, it will likely fail. The value of post-tenure review is to identify outstanding faculty and direct resources to their programs. The faculty in South Carolina public institutions of higher education are rapidly digressing toward being the most evaluated among their peers nationally, while on the other hand, being the lowest paid and supported. This is a bad situation, which most assuredly will further erode faculty morale and weaken the ability of South Carolina to attract the best faculty into their institutions of higher education.

8b. Questions, comments and recommendations  Given the multifaceted nature of the university, evaluation policy is best formulated and enforced within working units (departments, etc.) rather than at the level of the university upper administration in general. However, some standardization is necessary to assure that University grievance policies apply equally to all faculty.

For evaluations to be beneficial they must be taken seriously and the persons doing the evaluation must be respected. The faculty have been concerned that the administration has resisted evaluation, while pushing for more and more faculty evaluations. This is viewed upon as being the corporate model of management and is highly disliked by many faculty. It is generally accepted that if the faculty should undergo thorough evaluations, then the administration should likewise be evaluated, and held to the outcome of their evaluations.

A major concern was the cost/benefit of evaluations. Clemson University has roughly 1,000 faculty. How much time will be spent preparing dossiers, reading them and preparing summaries for the evaluation of each faculty member? Could this process be shortened and the same effect be achieved?

Faculty evaluations should serve the purpose of generating support for good faculty, and developing faculty who fall short in their duties. Evaluation may result in discovery of reasons to initiate dismissal for cause, but the process itself should not rely on, nor be driven by faculty evaluations per se.

A concern of the Committee was that given the multitude of evaluations the faculty now must undergo, none will be taken seriously. In the past, performance and faculty evaluations have been poorly correlated.

9. Compensation of faculty

9a. General discussion  Faculty salaries at Clemson University average 8 to 10% below our peer institutions. In the late 1980's, then Provost Maxwell instituted a study of faculty salaries and on the basis of the results, "catch-up" money for salary adjustments was given to bring faculty salaries in line with those of peer institutions. Since this time, no University-wide effort has been made to adjust faculty salaries, and inequities between salary increments given to the administration versus those given to the faculty have increased. The end result has been the creation of a significant "gap" between the salaries awarded to administrators versus those given to the faculty.
It is unrealistic to assume that the adjustment necessary to bring faculty salaries to parity with those of our peer institutions can be made in one year without significant input of new money from the state. A continued problem has been mandated salary increments driven by legislative edict but not funded by new state money. This has resulted in a significant amount of the E&G budget (over 90%) and the PSA budget (over 80%) being used to fund personnel.

9b. Questions, comments and recommendations Desirous would be a rating system based on the departmental level of peer institutions, not just on an institutional average. Undesirable is a system that removes flexibility and only focuses only on how we compare relative to a peer group. Decisions for salary increments should be based on how to reward excellence while not promoting mediocrity, both on an individual and departmental level basis.

The Committee agreed that problematic at Clemson University is the fact that evaluations are not taken seriously which has led faculty to believe that rewards (salary increments) are not related to performance. A well designed evaluation system, which gave recognition for performance, and therefore some guarantee of a better salary increase, would provide incentive and motivation to the faculty. Reward for performance is directly tied to morale, energy and momentum of the faculty. It is also important in establishing a better relationship between the faculty and the administration. Hopefully, the new evaluation systems being encouraged by CHE will improve this situation.

A recommendation was made that evaluations should include assessment of how individuals perform relative to their own individual goals AND the departmental goals.

A budget should be developed (long-range) based on feasible recommendations as to how faculty salaries can be brought to parity with those of peer institutions, and maintained at or above this aggregate comparator.

Moneys that are spent frivolously often represent loss of moneys for potential use in faculty compensation. Clemson needs to investigate which services it provides, and define if the need for these services matches the amount of resources which have to be committed to provide the service. This should apply for teaching, research and outreach. Plans should be developed to assess the success of all programs versus cost effectiveness. This is especially true for institutes and centers. We need to be sure we are focused on problems that we can afford, or those that generate resources for self-perpetuation.

A study is needed to compare salary inequities on a gender, discipline and rank basis. Some faculty are overpaid, some are underpaid. It is difficult to know what the situation is as many faculty receive extra pay for overtime duties, etc., in addition to their base salaries. We need a system to resolve this situation. It is recommended that a committee or group of accountants, distinguished faculty, etc. be formed to develop a plan to ameliorate this problem. One solution would be to hire a consultant to recommend policies to correct the inequities that exist relative to all salaries. This might be more efficient because of the strong feelings which exist internally relative to salary issues.
10. Availability of faculty to students outside of the classroom

10a. General discussion The Committee had no problem with the concept that faculty should be available to students outside of normal classroom hours. This should be accepted as part of one's normal duties as a mentor.

10b. Questions, comments and recommendations Faculty should post the time they will be available outside of the classroom at a place where students can easily access the information. This information should also be listed in the class syllabus. Availability outside of the classroom cannot be extrapolated to the faculty member's personal time away from the University except in well defined, extenuating circumstances. Some faculty will not give students their home phone number and this is their right.

The Committee was concerned that all students will respond to this query on the evaluation form, but if they have not sought help outside of the classroom, how would they be qualified to answer whether or not the faculty member was available?

The Committee felt that this criterion would have meaning only in cases where faculty were grossly negligent of their responsibility to mentor students.

There may be a great disparity between faculty concerning how many students they contact per semester, and therefore, the demands on their out-of-classroom time may also be quite different.

An alternative to faculty contact outside of the classroom is for the University to provide tutoring to regular students as they do athletes. This could be achieved by hiring graduate students and creating a center similar to the learning center available to athletes. Is the issue the availability of the faculty member to students outside of the classroom, or is the issue, providing help outside of normal classroom hours?

A major concern was that this criterion was a perception issue. In other words, the students will evaluate whether a faculty member is available often based on perception of the faculty member's availability, not on an experience of having tried to contact the faculty member outside of normal classroom time.

11. Community or public service activities of faculty for which no extra compensation is paid

11a. General discussion The Committee believed that it was beyond the purview of the University or CHE to assess what faculty do on their own time. Therefore, this criterion should apply to what is done during normal working hours.

11b. Questions, comments or recommendations Faculty should be involved in service to the University other than performance of those duties normally defined within their work unit. However, it is difficult to reconcile how this criterion is a measure of quality.
The Committee knew of no faculty members who had received merit in their annual or other evaluations based on service beyond their normal job duties. Therefore, assessment based on this criterion involves rating a performance which faculty normally do not receive any recognition or credit for.

Because Clemson University is a land grant institution, many faculty perform services for which no extra compensation is paid. This is part of the function of a land grant university.

Faculty should be encouraged to participate in duties for which there is no extra compensation, but the enthusiasm for this will be minimal unless there is a reward system for such activities, especially as relates to salary increases, tenure and promotion.

C. Critical Success Factor: Instructional Quality

12. Class sizes, student/teacher ratios

12a. General discussion The average class size for research universities is 25.08 (MUSC and USC included). Clemson’s average class size is around 24.08. This includes lecture, lab and lecture-lab combinations. USC is at 26. The CHE recommendation was 23.

Comprehensive institutions have 15 FTE students per FTE faculty. For research institutions, the recommended ratio is 12 to one. The research sector average was 16.2, while Clemson’s ratio is 16.8. This was calculated using only the 800 instructional faculty. USC’s average is 15.7. The CHE’s recommendation was 12, but they were encouraged to accept 14. If you take 12 times 15 credit hours, that is 180 credit hours with an average course of three credits with 60 students. Research institutions would only have 60 students per faculty member. To go from an average class size of 16 to 14 would cost 40 million additional dollars because the faculty size would have to be increased.

Small sections may improve the evaluation of credit hours taught by the faculty, but this may have a negative impact on class size and student teacher ratios.

FTE of students is often confused with average section size analysis. SAT scores, credit hours taught and average section size are political issues often discussed by parents and legislators.

12b. Question, comments and recommendations Is it necessarily bad to decrease class size to the CHE’s original recommendation of 12, even though it would cost more money to increase the size of the faculty?

Concerning the credit hours taught by the faculty and the class size, should we maximize our score on one of the performance issues and forget the other, or, should we find a balance point? We can’t do both at the highest level.

Graduate classes are smaller than undergraduate classes. Are we helped or hurt by a larger number of graduate students?
A feasible solution seems to be the recommendation that a 9/6 teaching load be assigned. This would be 3 and 2 three credit hour classes per fall and spring semester, respectively. Would having the faculty teach small sections while graduate students taught large sections help the situation?

How can we keep the Board of Trustees informed and convinced that we have an adequate workload? To ignore this responsibility would invite micromanaging by those remotely associated with the daily activities of the University.

13. Number of credit hours taught by the faculty

13a. General discussion There still is uncertainty concerning how credit hours taught by the faculty will be assessed. Much of this relates to how you give credit for variable credit sections such as graduate dissertations. The way dissertation sections are currently assessed is to take the number of dissertation sections per faculty, then take the number of students divided by the number of hours they are taking and that is the credit hours per course. For example, 3 master’s students taking 3 hours of 891, this would have been calculated as 3 into 9 credit hours, so you would have been given credit for 3 hours taught. This method was implemented 4 or 5 years ago. The credit for Ph.D. students is calculated the same way. Anything that is variable credit is done this way. This was known at CHE as the four cell Mississippi State Model. Using this method, the Credit hour average for Clemson University would be 9.2 per faculty member. If dissertations, etc. are taken out, it drops to 6.9 (average credit hours taught per semester). In other words, if 6.9 is the average, the faculty member is teaching 2.3 sections of 3 credit hour courses. This calculation is not tied to the number of students. The Educational Policy Committee of the Board of Trustees has recommended an average of 9. If twelve is considered a full load, and a faculty member is given 25% off for research, then full load for three-quarter availability to the classroom would be 9 credit hours. So the Board favors 9 as opposed to 6.9.

The Delaware study examines cost per credit hour on a basis of FTE faculty. This will allow looking at organized sections per FTE charged to instruction. This method gives a better estimate of the cost per credit hour charged to discipline. The calculated credit hours of 6.9 for Clemson University gives an organized section estimate close to what the average number of sections is nationwide; i.e., 1.9 to 2.0 organized sections per instructional effort FTE of a faculty member at research institutions. At comprehensive institutions, the average is over 3.0, and the average is even higher for tech schools.

Instructional effort includes that which is funded with “120” money (E&G state money). This does not include scholarly endeavor, the “130” money, sponsored research, etc. The “130” funding includes 60 FTE’s charged to scholarly internal research. This represents state dollars paying for research. PSA funds are completely separate. The Delaware study takes out “130” and PSA funding. For example, if the Delaware study includes two organized sections per one FTE instructional effort, this is based solely on instructional effort.

NSF grants do not include salary money. This effort can be identified as “130” money to give credit to the departments which have faculty on NSF grants.
The percentage of students at Clemson who are graduate students is one of the highest in the country. Thus, in the past Clemson has heavily focused on graduate education.

At USC, every faculty member has a separate section for 891, 991. We do not do this, we do a "roll-up". When a graduate student fails to sign up for 891, 991 this ultimately ends up hurting institutional funding.

13b. Questions, comments and recommendations How can the faculty effectively communicate what they do to the Board of Trustees and other shareholders that cannot be expressed as credit hours taught by the faculty? This is especially important for a research institution.

What is the best way to give credit for variable credit courses (masters and doctoral research)? Could we increase the number of dissertation hours required? Could graduate candidates continue to take dissertation credit beyond 18 hours?

Controversy: If faculty are told that they have to get more grants concurrent with having more scholarly publications, how can they be expected to spend more and more time on teaching?

What will each faculty member be required to teach and how will this change when they need release time to do research? If a person gets a "buy-out" for research, is that covering the portion of their time already paid for or is that considered differently?

We need to be able to show the products and output per unit basis. Should the productivity of a unit be assessed, or should it be on an individual basis?

How do you answer the question, what do you expect out of this size of a unit in terms of what should be the product of the unit be, the salaries, how many courses and sections taught? The unit can help adjust for changes in research, etc. A problem is that we have exceedingly small units in some cases.

How do you develop a university-wide policy that regulates faculty teaching effort and research when there are great differences across the disciplines, as exemplified by the differences between the social sciences and the basic sciences?

The CHE staff recommendation is 9 hours per research institution per faculty per semester. Would we be better off not making a recommendation at this time?

Does the Delaware system where organized sections per FTE instruction are reported give a more accurate report of faculty teaching effort and allow more flexibility when dealing with PSA and sponsored research?

Will mandating that faculty have a certain teaching load result in classes being offered to meet this requirement, and not necessarily to meet a particular need to train students in a discipline?
14. Ratio of full-time faculty as compared to other full-time employees

14a. General discussion As an indicator of academic quality, this criterion has some problems. The University is more than just the sector which is paid from E&G money. In fact, E&G money represents less than one third of the total University revenue (exclusive of tuition and fees). Therefore, bloat in the non-academic sector, also a serious threat to academic quality, would not be reflected in this indicator. It should also be pointed out that this indicator represents a ratio, and thus is inherently flawed in that adequacy in numbers (i.e., do we have the correct number of faculty and support staff) cannot be represented by a ratio. The real issue here is that a correct number of faculty are need to achieve the goals of our academic mission(s), and they need to be supported by an adequate, but not excessive, number of administrators and staff.

14b. Questions, comments and recommendations How will administrators who hold faculty rank be counted in this ratio?

Presumably, this ratio includes persons supported on research dollars. How will support personnel who are hired to help persons who have grant money (and are subsequently paid from the grant money) be counted in this ratio?

If the intent of this ratio is to have more faculty per staff, then this puts pressure on the University to get rid of staff to keep the ratio adequate. When the number of needed faculty is down, the remaining faculty have to work harder to get the job done. Getting rid of staff to optimize this ratio could burden the faculty even more by forcing them not only to do classroom work, but to also do the work previously done by the staff.

There are non-academic people who support the academic mission, which will not be counted in this ratio. How will bloat in the non-academic areas be monitored and corrected?

An adequate ratio will not reflect areas which are more in need of additional faculty relative to other areas which may have more than adequate faculty numbers.

If a decision is made that the ratio needs to be changed, it is recommended that priorities be established, i.e., those whose job duties impact less on the mission of the University or particular units within the University should be released first. This recommendation is made in recognition of the fact that the importance of the job duties can change when examined across units, particularly when comparing science and engineering versus liberal arts.

This ratio could be affected by setting the desired class size at a greater number.

The ratio of full-time to part-time faculty was recognized as being very important. It is assumed that the University will not exceed the 25% limit as set by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools.

How will staff who teach be counted in the ratio?
15. Accreditation of degree granting programs

15a. General discussion  This indicator is based on the Inventory of Academic Programs for which accreditation is available. It applies basically to nursing, education and engineering. Traditionally, accreditation is thought to be desirable as it gives public recognition to the institution, maintains quality in the educational programs by assuring that the student has selected an institution that operates on a sound financial basis, has an approved program of study, qualified instructors, adequate facilities and equipment, and approved recruitment and admissions policies.

15b. Questions, comments and recommendations  Every program for which accreditation is available should be periodically reviewed to make certain resources to operate the programs are adequate. Accredited programs should take extra measure to monitor the performance of their graduates.

What does it mean to be accredited and by whom? This subject has been discussed at the national level. For a number of years the Council on Post secondary Accreditation recognized, coordinated, and periodically reviewed the work of post secondary accrediting bodies. However, on December 31, 1993, COPA disbanded. Several groups were appointed to assume the duties previously conducted by COPA, and in 1996 the Council for Higher Education Accreditation was established. It is recommended that Clemson University affiliate with this organization. Several Commissions provide directives on accreditation such as the Commission on Recognition of Post secondary Accreditation, and the distance Education and Training Councils Accrediting Commission. It is the purview of the Provost, Deans and unit leaders together with their faculty, to decide on which programs will be accredited by special agencies.

Many groups are currently discussing the question of the effectiveness of accreditation. Of concern are questions such as the following: Does accreditation matter? Is a national body needed? How well is the system functioning?

It is recommended that the University give more attention to, and attempt to better follow the guidelines put forth by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools relative to government and management of institutions of higher education for the purpose of accreditation.

16. Institutional emphasis on quality teacher education and reform

16a. General discussion  Teacher reform refers to programs which directly impact on teachers within the K-1 through K-12 system. In this regard, the purview for handling of these programs would normally relate to work units which deal with education. However, it is recognized that some units outside of education departments do have special programs for teacher training. The status of teacher training in South Carolina was recognized as a dilemma. Historically, teaching of most subjects in secondary schools is conducted by individuals with degrees in education and possibly with minors in particular disciplines. The Committee recognized that many highly qualified and excellent teachers have received their training as education majors. However, a concern was expressed that some teachers have the gift of providing information in unusual and exciting ways but are deficient in their capability to adequately understand the breadth and depth
of the subject they are teaching. The knowing "how" but not "what" to teach results in poor student appreciation for the importance of the subject matter, thus resulting in a strongly diminished interest in the discipline. Oftentimes, individuals with minimal credentials in an academic discipline are of necessity pushed into teaching in these areas, with the result sometimes being that the better students are not adequately challenged. By its very nature this process of "dumbing down" results in a recentering of the academic standards with concomitant accentuation of mediocrity.

It is important that in addition to emphasis being given to "method teaching", more importance should be placed on understanding both the intricacies and the nuances of the subject matter that is essential and fundamental to academic disciplines. Secondary school teachers should be encouraged to pursue advanced degrees in discipline-based curricula (M.S. and Ph.D.) and enrich their knowledge, didactic methods, and hands-on experiences through workshops, seminars, internships, and coops jointly administered through the education and basic discipline colleges. A collaborative effort between those individuals espousing concepts for teaching and those espousing the teaching of concepts should provide an integrated and dynamic process for disseminating ideas and encouraging creativity.

16b. Questions, comments and recommendations

The National Science Foundation and the Governor's school of Science and Mathematics in South Carolina sponsor programs to improve discipline instruction in secondary education units, especially in areas of science and mathematics. Clemson University faculty should explore ways to cooperate with these agencies or units to address the problem of poor discipline instruction.

Faculty time is usually not directed toward special education of teachers. This work is normally done in the summer as an ancillary project. It is recommended that the appropriate Clemson administrative persons work closely with the CHE to develop, encourage and fund new programs whereby faculty could participate (with credit) in furthering the professional development of secondary education teachers.

Given the projected importance of technology in the next century, it is recommended that special priority be given to programs that will be directed at improving the level of science education in our institutions of secondary education. It was pointed out that secondary education teachers often pursue degrees in education programs (M.Ed.) rather than science degrees (M.S.). Persons with the latter often have to return to school to get further training in education before they can teach in secondary education programs.

Part of the problem of getting Clemson faculty involved in teacher education is that the focus for this type of work is usually through education departments. This could create animosity between other colleges if funds are diverted to specific units for this purpose, a function that normally is considered ancillary to the main mission of the University.

Getting faculty together with secondary education teachers is hard for the first summer session because some public school teachers are still in class when our summer session begins.
Nothing is more important that the early education of children. Early education can be no more effective than the persons who are responsible for education delivery, i.e., the teachers. Clemson University, as a land grant University, should take a more active role in supporting the continuing education of K-1 through -12 teachers by encouraging the teachers to pursue advanced degrees in discipline-based curricula (M.S. and Ph.D.), and to participate in hands-on experiences through workshops, seminars, internships, and coops for the purpose of enriching their knowledge, and didactic methods. The State would benefit from a program that encouraged and supported the expenses of participation in such training.

D. Critical Success Factor: Institutional Cooperation and Collaboration

17. Sharing and use of technology, programs, equipment, supplies, and source matter experts within the institution and with other institutions

17a. General discussion The sharing of knowledge, equipment and supplies across disciplines within the university and with other institutions is a worthy undertaking which should be encouraged. Clemson University, as a land grant institution, already has a good “track-record” with regard to this criterion.

17b. Questions, comments and recommendations To be a highly regarded technological institution requires commitment toward maintaining advanced equipment and adequate supplies, especially in the pure sciences and engineering. The fact that the state has not fully funded salary increases has resulted in money diverted away from equipment and supplies into personnel. The University needs to join USC and MUSC to carry the message to the legislature that this method of operation negatively impacts upon our institutions of higher education, forcing a technological void.

There is some degree of turf-protection when it comes to sharing equipment, especially if the equipment is purchased by faculty from grant resources.

The University should consider creating special funds to maintain needed expensive equipment such as electron microscopes, NMR equipment, cell cytometers, mass spectrometers, etc. Departments are so underfunded that they cannot even afford the service contracts on equipment of this type. This makes the faculty reluctant to share expensive equipment in their laboratories because if it is broken, they believe (which is often the case) that they will have to fix it from their own budgets, or even their “own pockets”.

Although many faculty share equipment, within and across the various state universities, this is usually done on an individual basis outside of formal share programs. The idea of developing a shared user source and protocol for equipment should be explored, if for no other reason than making faculty aware of what equipment is available for their use. Ignorance of equipment inventory results in unnecessary duplication of purchases.
18. Cooperation and collaboration with private industry

18a. General discussion Clemson University faculty have a good record of cooperating and collaborating with private industry. This goal is part of the charter of a land grant university. However, if not properly managed, problems can arise from associating with the corporate world.

18b. Questions, comments and recommendations Collaboration with any industry naturally requires rigid adherence to policy concerning conflict of interest and responsibility with regard to the rules and regulations governing the University.

Most faculty interaction with the corporate world is positive and beneficial to their professional development, which extrapolates to better education of students. However, there are instances where the potential for personal gain, especially financial, have generated problems. The consulting policy for the University is well established but it is not uniform across departments.

Some faculty are confused about what is required (legally and as concerns adherence to policy) of them when they enter into agreements with corporations. The Office for Sponsored Programs should exercise more control over this issue to prevent the signing of agreements that are not beneficial to the University or which are not in compliance with state, or federal regulations. A standardized form which details all agreements and work relationships between faculty members and corporations should be submitted to this office when faculty are planning to enter into agreements with industry.

The issue of how industry money is given to faculty has created problems also. Gifts do not provide overhead and are easy to manipulate. Grants, which require overhead, are not appealing to some industries. In these times of money shortages, sometimes faculty, who are successful in associating with industry and thereby generating money, are left to do what they please, even if their work habits are slack or, under normal circumstances, unacceptable. This causes poor morale within the faculty as a whole. The ability to generate money should not be an excuse for not performing ones work duties in accordance with the rules and regulations of the University.

E. Critical Success Factor: Administrative Efficiency

19. Percentage of administrative costs as compared to academic costs

19a. General discussion The Faculty Senate has been concerned with this issue for a number of years. The 1996-97 Senate reported that as little as only 25% of total available University monies are used for paying faculty salaries and for teaching supplies. However, this is difficult to document due to the multifaceted functions and costs of the University as a whole. Another concern is that when the cost of the teaching faculty is calculated, does this include the cost of the dean’s offices or other administrative functions? Proper accountability requires that “the right dollar be put into the right category” to match federal and state requirements.

This year, for this criterion, Clemson University was given a score of 71.1 % over 8.1%. The 71.1% is identified as total academic costs divided by total E&G money available; whereas, the
8.1% is administrative costs versus total E&G. The calculation for this year for Clemson did not include the PSA budget. If PSA were included, the percentages for last year would change to 63.4%/6.3% (academic year 95-96). This year's percentage calculated including PSA would be 61.8%/6.4% (for the fiscal year that ended June 30). The denominator includes student services (8.1 million), institutional support (17.7 million), FM&O (18.5 million), scholarships (13.1 million) plus the amount for academic costs. Mandatory transfers of 1.1 million are not in the denominator. The denominator is 279.5 million. Academic costs are 172.6 million dollars. Auxiliary services are not in the denominator (motor pool, post office, agricultural sales, development, Madren Center, Clemson House (53.4 million dollars).

Using the calculation method currently employed by most universities (IPED’S), extension research dollars would count in the research category. The way the federal government is set up, administrative costs are charged to research or public service. Student services are calculated differently, as institutional support.

The "120 account", which includes faculty salaries, supplies, etc., was 83 million dollars for fiscal year 95-96. During this time, approximately $323,312,000 was the total University expenditures. For 96-97, our expenditures increased to $334,107,000. Expenditures on 120 money increased to 86 million dollars. The way the calculation is done for CHE, is that academic costs include 86 million for faculty salaries and supplies, plus 63 million for research, plus academic support which is 22.6 million. Academic support includes the library and other areas. For the year 95-96, the amounts were 83 million, 64.3 million and 21.5 million. Research includes unrestricted and restricted expenses. Although the amount considered as academic expenditures increased, the percentage did not because the total expenditures for the University increased. For example, PSA increased 3 million dollars. This will appear in the denominator of the formula used to calculate academic efficiency. It is not known if dean’s salaries fall into academic or institutional support. It should be noted for this last year that PSA expenses were 48.6 million, 8.1 million was allocated for student services. Revenue for 96-97 from state and local appropriations was 139.8 million, about 86 was E&G, the rest was PSA. From tuition and fees, we brought in 63 million dollars. Federal appropriations (mostly PSA) were 11.2 million; government grants and contracts, 34 million. Private grants and contracts, 20.9 million. Endowments, $608,000; educational activities 5.1 million; auxiliaries, 55.7 million; 10.8 million comes from other funding (patents, etc.).

Management of money in all categories is heavily impacted by mandatory raises from the State, which are not totally funded. This causes money shifts in all areas. One must take into account that although there are about 1000 faculty, there are approximately 3000 other employees.

19b. Questions, comments and recommendations The way academic costs are calculated seems to be misleading as many of the included categories do not impact directly on what happens in the classroom. A university could score well in this category simply by having good research and academic support programs, and still not be supporting classroom instruction. Greater importance should be assigned to just faculty salaries and supplies, exclusive of those assigned to any administrative office, as an indicator of support for academic functions.
A major problem is that faculty and staff salaries are mandated by the state but not fully funded. This causes necessary money shifts from support to personnel, deleting our basic resources. PSA does not get money for pay raises. Faculty who have approved Experiment Station Projects are expected to do the research with limited supply or equipment money (much of the money has been moved to salaries).

What is a good way to show that the money students have invested on their education is coming back to them in the classroom? The CHE is supposed to look at the individual categories, which comprise the academic efficiency calculation, but how they will use this analysis to assess performance funding still is not known.

How can we compare this type of data with similar data from our peer institutions?

What brought about performance funding assessment nationally were parents and other concerned persons complaining that faculty were not in the classroom, and students were being closed out of classes. Grave concern was also expressed about increases in tuition. How can we reconcile this given the fact that we are not a teaching institution per se, but rather are being considered as being a research institution?

20. Use of best management practices

20a. General discussion NARCUBO and IPEDS systems allow freedom in assessment of management systems. A concern is how the interpretation of these reports actually reflects conditions present on campus. The way efficiency is reported using the current IPEDS system can actually cover up for inefficiency. For example, counting administrators as faculty because they also hold faculty titles. We have auxiliary services, student services, PSA, E&G and athletics managed as different budgetary units. Therefore, it is possible to have wealth in areas ancillary to E&G. This creates many hard feelings between the faculty and the administration. Does the public understand this? The opinion of the Committee was that difficulties relative to this situation have hurt Clemson in the past. Another area of concern is that although the over 80 million dollars for E&G has to be properly accounted for, what about the over 60 million in tuition and fees? Faculty often wonder about what happens to the money generated from student fees, i.e., how is the money spent and who determines the priorities?

20b. Questions, comments and recommendations A concern was expressed that the University is often looked at as a singular unit, but in actuality, it is divided into many self-operating units. The lack of cooperation between the different units often results in wealth in one area, poverty in another. This is an area in need of improvement.

The Committee recognized that faculty may have input on important issues, but they often have very little influence. Input is taken just for input sake. This has resulted in the faculty being treated as a common-labor work force rather than recognizing that the professoriate is a body of highly trained individuals. To ignore the potential for decision-making by the faculty is a major mistake. Lack of faculty input would mean negating committee work and giving up advisory boards. This would have a negative impact on the University.
Administrators often define “the lowest cost” as being the best practice. The faculty believe that this has caused difficulties in seeking and determining better management practices that would cost more. **Best management practices should not be defined as lowest cost management priority.**

Another concern is lobbyists. Who chooses their agenda? The focus of the University is often condensed into packages presented to the CHE and legislators for support and funding approval. Often faculty do not have much input in deciding what issues or focus areas money is being sought for, yet the faculty will have to do the work. This creates confusion and difficulties in managing the University and fosters distrust between the administration and the faculty. Lobbyists usually push the agenda of the University administration rather than that of the faculty. Sometimes they push the student agenda, but not often.

The faculty are being told to work faster and be more productive, but are having to get their own money and resources to do so. Given the probability for getting significant extramural funding (less than 15% of all requests are funded), this is a very inefficient way to expect progress out of the faculty as a whole.

Traditionally the faculty have taken issues and information and knowledge and redigested it and measured its worth, and measured its impact, and, by the very nature of the process we do it meticulously and slowly. Now, it seems as if they are being asked to change from a gourmet restaurant to a fast food service.

The Committee strongly agreed that it would be a mistake to impose the corporate style of management upon the University, where a few administrators make most of the important decisions.

21. Elimination of unjustified duplication of and waste in administrative and academic programs

21a. General discussion The Committee viewed this criterion as having both a positive and negative effect. Everyone agreed that any program should be scrutinized using best management practices for cost/benefit assessment. Bad programs should be eliminated. However, **rewarding on the basis of elimination of programs is a negative success criterion;** i.e., reward for becoming less rather than better. This practice may encourage elimination until one is essentially eliminated. The Committee had no problem with this criterion **per se** other than recognition of the fact that in a system already strapped for financial support, waste and inefficiency due to inadequate monetary support could become confused and good programs could be eliminated as the result.

21b. Questions, comments and recommendations Given the political reality of campus decision-making, will realistic assessment be the driving force for eliminating programs, or will the main issues used as reasons for program elimination arise from campus politics? The faculty have been concerned that programs, which are favored by the administration are usually protected, regardless of their cost/benefit ratio.

The University would probably hesitate to ask for reinstatement of programs identified previously as “waste” just to get a good performance rating. This could impact on faculty
positions, etc. Under this system, kingdoms of “richness” would be supported as opposed to impoverished areas, especially those supported by E&G money. What about those areas that are run by administrators (auxiliary services, student services and athletics) which are primarily composed of non-academics versus the academic program? In other words, will administrators eliminate their own programs, or those in which they are remotely-associated with?

This criterion is flawed in principle as administrators who eliminate their own programs will cause a loss of direct impact jobs, maybe even their own. Closing academic programs would impact the faculty and students and not the administration directly.

Academic programs are assessed on a cyclical basis by many internal and external processes (CHE, SACS, internal reviews, etc.) The programs of the administration are not assessed with the same rigor.

Problem: Who is going to do the assessment of what is and what is not waste?

A system needs to be put in place for better evaluation of administrator-driven programs, not just for the purpose of elimination, but to answer the question: “Is there something more effective and beneficial that we could be doing and is there a better way of doing what we are doing”?

The Committee strongly supports getting rid of redundancy and duplication of effort. CHE does not focus on efficiency when it comes to graduate school. Protecting bad programs because of politics has, in the past, also been a problem.

22. Amount of general overhead costs

22a. General discussion Defined as general overhead costs divided by FTE students.

General overhead costs includes institutional support plus restricted and unrestricted research funds.

22b. Questions, comments and recommendations If research expenses, even grant money, are included in the assessment ratio, does this not penalize the institution for spending more money on research while the student FTE remains constant?

Overhead costs for new buildings would be included in this ratio, but what about the cost of maintaining the buildings?

Expanding in the non-academic area can cause problems in the academic area. Hopefully, this indicator will hold excessive non-academic expansion in check.

How will auxiliary units fit into this scenario? For example, the Foundation pays for a lot of faculty awards and salary supplements. How will this contribution be assessed? How will the University be held accountable, or be given credit for spending money wisely which is not allocated by the State?
The quality of the University is not only affected by the amount of money spent, but also by the priorities set for spending this money. Nothing in the performance indicators deals with priorities and selected projects that money is spent on, other than generalities in the University mission statement. Unfortunately, this has led to duplication of effort such as the engineering program at USC which is now in competition with the engineering program at Clemson University.

F. Critical Success Factor: Entrance Requirements

23. SAT and ACT scores of student body

23a. General discussion  SAT and other indicators of student performance at the high school level are an indicator of the quality of the incoming student body. The recruitment of good students is influenced by a multiplicity of factors, the primary ones being the reputation of the institution and the availability of scholarship or other financial aid or deferments. Good recruitment programs can also influence the number of students with good SAT scores who choose to attend a particular institution.

As it currently stands at CHE, it appears that the average SAT score will not be compared with that of USC, but with those of peer institutions. The middle 50% for the freshman class will be used to calculate an SAT midpoint, that is, rank SAT’s from highest to lowest, chop off the bottom and top 25%, and take the midpoint of the remaining range and compare with the same calculations of our peer institutions. Currently, our peers are around 1166, whereas Clemson’s average is 1134. We are about 30 to 40 points below our peers; USC is about 120 points below their peers. We have 86% of our students with over 1000 on the SAT score. The national average is 1013. So, 75% of our students are over the national average.

At Clemson University, which has the highest SAT average of incoming freshman students in the State of South Carolina, the average SAT score is heavily influenced by the ability to select from a large number of applicants and the acceptance of a significant number of out-of-state students with superior academic credentials. Scholarship awards and good recruitment programs are perceived as playing a minor role in attracting outstanding students at the present time.

Student number can influence the average SAT score. If you want more students, your SAT average usually declines. One way to limit the number of undergraduates is to increase the number of graduate students. However, graduate students are expensive to the institution. Most of the CHE’s analysis is based on performance of the institution relative to the undergraduate student body.

23b. Questions, comments and recommendations  Reduction in the number of incoming freshman and increasing the number of transfer students may be a way to improve SAT averages. The SAT scores of transfer students are not considered.

Our scholarship program, especially for national merit scholars, is deficient. The scholarship program needs to be reviewed and novel ways for better funding of scholarships needs to be
Scholarship funding is limited. For example, consider the Palmetto Fellowship, two $5000 grants, which the legislature has provided. Scholarships can only be tuition, room and board, and books (limited by legislative regulation). So, if you offer a 1600 SAT student $5000 to come to Clemson, then later, they are chosen for the Palmetto Fellowship, then they will not get the entire $5000 for the Palmetto Fellowship. Instead, they can only get $2500, as the limit for assistance is $7500. We cannot give a student financial assistance beyond $7500.

The Committee recognized that financial aid can be a good way to attract scholars, and that in recent years, universities have almost assumed a “buyers strategy” to attract good students. The number of national merit scholars, even within the state, is large. Each state has an allotted number of national merit scholars. A national merit scholar in South Carolina may score lower on standardized tests for college admission than national merit scholars from other states. This means if you spend your scholarship funds on in-state national merit scholars, you may get weaker students (based on SAT) than if you had recruited out-of-state students. Nevertheless national merit scholars are excellent students and recruiting them is good for public relations.

The process by which we recruit students is flawed, as they may only know of a menial scholarship at an early date, but later be told of the possibility of significantly more funding. By this time they may have committed to other universities. Parents who have experienced the process of student recruitment often relate how poor the process of attracting bright students at Clemson is compared to other institutions. This begs the question of whether we are depending on the institutional reputation to spontaneously attract good students versus a very active recruitment program? We need creative recruitment programs other than just throwing money at gifted students.

The way the SAT average is computed, you are better off getting 5, 1300 SAT students than one with an SAT of 1600. But, if you don’t go after the top 25% you will end up dropping off middle students. Why spend the money to get the top-level student when you can recruit at the median level and have more effect on increasing our overall SAT average?

24. High school standing, grade point averages, and activities of student body

24a. General discussion The Committee viewed this criterion as adjunctive to SAT scores as an indicator of the quality of students recruited. While it is desirous that entering freshmen have excellent grade point averages concomitant with high class rank, plus experience in student government, this represents an area where the faculty exercise no control. Therefore, no questions, comments or recommendations were put forth for this particular evaluation criterion. However, it was recommended that attempts should be made to identify high school students with outstanding credentials at an early age, and they should be followed throughout their high school years to evaluate their potential as future students. Duke University begins this process for children in elementary schools, and this is a good way to identify outstanding students which can be recruited at a later date.
25. Post-secondary non-academic achievement of the student body

25a. General discussion The non-academic achievement of the student body was deemed to be an ancillary indicator of quality in the academic sector. While the faculty should encourage students to become involved in non-academic endeavors, especially service to the community, whether or not to participate in these kinds of activities is a decision made by the student. However, part of the mission of a land grant university is to encourage students to participate in service activities that are not necessarily related to their academic endeavors. This is usually done through organizations (clubs, etc.) which the students participate in. The rigors of academic life do not normally allow for much participation in non-academic activities. Nevertheless, there are excellent cooperative programs that the students can choose to be involved with.

26. Priority on enrolling in-state students.

26a. General discussion It is recognized that Clemson University is supported by taxes paid by the citizens of this state. However, a major university such as Clemson benefits from the diversity offered by local students interacting with other students from out-of-state and foreign origin. This adds richness and additional cultural experiences to the academic environment. However, there is an agreement with CHE that Clemson will not exceed 35% out-of-state undergraduate students recruited for the freshman class. As it stands now, there is controversy concerning how out-of-state and in-state status is defined. There is not a clear definition on residency code. Presently, it is determined by the geographic origin of the students at the time they apply. Using this criterion, Clemson University may have as high as 35 to 40 percent out-of-state students. What is the best available indicator of out-of-state status?

26b. Questions, comments and recommendations A way to increase SAT scores is to keep the number of out-of-state student’s high, and waving out-of-state tuition for outstanding students. This would attract a significant number of well-qualified students to Clemson. If the state took the position that any out-of-state student with an 1150 SAT could come in at "in-state" tuition levels, this could be a good incentive to attract outstanding students. However, in accordance with performance assessment, priority is to be given toward enrolling in-state students.

Can we offer in-state tuition to out-of-state students at the present time? They must have a recruiting scholarship to receive this offer. A recruiting scholarship is a university-wide scholarship, not a grant-in-aid. Currently we can reward a student with a recruiting scholarship ($500) and then wave out-of-state tuition. The disadvantage is that the scholarship cannot be funded by state revenue, and cannot be tied to a department or major. Two percent of our tuition may be used for undergraduate scholarships. You can waive tuition for holders of general university scholarships. This is important and should be further researched, as it is not well defined.

The Committee recommended that the current limitation of out-of-state students to 35% is reasonable. The number of out-of-state students should not drop below 25%. We should recruit only outstanding out-of-state students to attend Clemson University.
G. Critical Success Factor: Graduate Achievements

27. Graduation rate

27a. General discussion Graduation rate is an important determinant of success in educating our students. This indicator is particularly important for athletes as a low graduation rate among athletes had a negative impact on their chances for success after leaving the University, and generates significant negative publicity for the institution as a whole.

27b. Questions, comments and recommendations The registrar should attempt to keep records as to why students don’t graduate. This could be valuable data to ascertain if the reason for not graduating related to dissatisfaction with the University, academic failure or personal choice. Such information could be a sentinel for problems within the University.

An effort should be made to keep the graduation rate at 70% or better in the undergraduate sector.

28. Employment rate for graduates

28a. General discussion The main mission of a University is to educate, not to prepare individuals directly for jobs. Nevertheless, we live in a real world with high pressure for success. Therefore, attention has to be paid relative to the ability of graduates to become employed. In a free enterprise system such as the capitalistic model of the U.S., it was a concern of the Committee that the faculty do not control this variable. While it was recognized that a University should not offer programs of minimal importance and impact upon the students, the dilemma of resolving the question of education for knowledge or employment, is, and probably will remain a highly debated issue. Many of the issues, which factor into this are student related and generated. On the other hand, if all of the graduates were not getting employed, this should be cause for concern. The question has varied meaning over the disciplines and begs the question in and of itself: Is it o.k. to come to college to get an education or is the bottom line directly proportional to employment and subsequent job success?

28b. Questions, comments and recommendations The university should continue to take an active role in preparing students for success after graduation. This could be expressed as sponsorship of job interviews, better interaction with potential employers, etc. Career days are very important for the students and should not be taken lightly. Faculty should participate in these events as much as possible.

29. Employer feedback on graduates who were employed or not employed

29a. General discussion Employer feedback concerning graduates of particular academic programs can serve as a good indicator of how well students are being prepared to enter into the corporate world. The monitoring of employer feedback is best done at the departmental level by the faculty which are most familiar with the training the students have received.
29b. Questions, comments and recommendations  Departments should have advisory committees which consist of successful, experienced business persons who could offer sound advice on ways in which employment of graduates can best be achieved. This will include advice on curriculum, rigor of training, etc. It should be kept in mind, however, that the academic training of students extrapolates beyond instruction just for the purpose of getting a job.

30. Scores of graduates on post-graduate professional, graduate or employment-related examinations and certification tests

30a. General discussion  This indicator is based on the percentage of students who take the exam and pass on the first attempt, versus the percentage of total students who pass the exam on subsequent attempts. Engineers take the “Fundamentals of Engineering Examination” and this is currently being used in assessment of their programs. Problems arise in scheduling these exams as typically they are given around the time final exams are being taken. Nurses and education graduates also have to be certified.

30b. Questions, comments and recommendations  There is great variability across disciplines concerning who takes certification tests, what agency administers the test and the level of difficulty. Many disciplines do not offer such tests. Thus, it will be hard to standardize this criterion across the entire University.

Exam scores do give valuable feedback on the quality of specific programs. Good students, and quality faculty given adequate resources is the best way to assure that exam scores will be the best they can be.

Who will be required to take the exams? Allowing only top scholars to take the exam could skew this score. Hopefully, this will not lead to within college competition whereby units whose students score better on qualification exams will get more resources. This would be hard to standardize and would affect units such as nursing, engineering and education more than others.

31. Number of graduates who continue their education

31a. General discussion  The decision to continue one’s education is solely the purview of the individual and not the University nor its faculty.

31b. Questions, comments and recommendations  As this was deemed an issue outside of the purview of the faculty, no questions, comments and recommendations are offered by the Committee relative to this particular criterion.

32. Credit hours earned of graduates

32a. General discussion  This is measured by the total hours required to graduate by sector/discipline/degree versus the number of credit hours taken upon graduation.
32b. Questions, comments and recommendations The original mission of a land-grant university was to offer affordable higher education to students of average means and intellect. Some students come as freshman, do poorly, and have to take additional courses to meet the requirements for graduation. This is true of students who need to take remedial courses to “catch up” with students from more progressive secondary schools. Pushing this criterion to excellence will move us away from our mission and hurt the average students.

Many students entering the University do not know what they want to major in. Will courses they took in another discipline area count against them when considering this criterion?

The Committee agreed that students should not be allowed to accumulate excessive credit hours as undergraduates. However, pushing land grant universities to become premier institutions with only highly qualified students will deny students of average means an opportunity to become educated at a major university. This is contrawise to the original spirit of land grant universities.

H. Critical Success Factor: User-Friendliness of Institution

33. Transferability of credits to and from the institution

33a. General discussion This is an area in need of improvement. It is known that during registration, transfer students often have a very difficult time because it is not often clear what courses they took at other institutions will transfer with credit.

33b. Questions, comments and recommendations A better policy for handling transfer credits needs to be developed to improve the efficiency of registration for transfer students.

Increasing the number of transfer students may elevate SAT’s but will not bring in better students. In fact, this may lower student quality. The bulk of our transfer students come from colleges where they took courses in order to qualify to enter Clemson University. Thus, they were not top students to begin with. For 1996-97, over 700 out of a student body of 2550 freshmen were transfer students.

34. Continuing education programs for graduates and others

34a. General discussion As the population shifts toward more aged persons, the need for continued education will grow. Clemson University should capitalize on this by offering strong and varied programs as part of a continuing education effort.

34b. Questions, comments and recommendations The University should encourage the faculty to become more involved in continuing education, but some method for rewarding the faculty for such activities must be developed. Many faculty currently participate in continuing education but are not adequately compensated for their efforts.
Virtual education through electronic communication (especially by the internet) is becoming more popular. Clemson University needs to explore how they can capitalize on electronic communication as a means of offering educational programs.

35. Accessibility to the institution of all citizens of the state

35a. General discussion This indicator is measured as a ratio of an institution's accumulated points for accessibility to maximum points allowed for this measure based on: the percent of other-race undergraduate students enrolled at an institution. The total number of credit hours generated off-campus, and the total number of credit hours generated through distance education are also considered.

35b. Questions, comments and recommendations It is recommended that the University continue to pursue a policy of diversity in accordance with state and federal regulations. As a public institution, we should be accessible to all citizens of this state, regardless of their background.

Clemson should continue to explore ways to offer education programs through distance learning via electronic means. How can we better use the internet through virtual learning?

How does the land grant mission, which requires extension outreach programs, mesh with the concept of “total credit hours generated through distance education?”

How can the University operate special programs for special students yet satisfy the requirements of having a high SAT average and graduation rate?

Given the limited resources of the University, what is our ability to participate in distance education?

I. Critical Success Factor: Research Funding

36. Financial support for reform in teacher education

36a. General discussion Most of the financial support for reform in teacher education is ancillary money often given to support faculty during the summer months. A more stable source of funds to drive established programs for teacher reform should be developed. However, there was some question about which college (unit, etc.) would be in control of such programs.

36b. Questions, comments and recommendations Programs for teacher education need to be redefined. In most cases, persons trained in education teach all of the subjects to potential teachers. We need discipline-orientated educators, i.e., chemists training chemistry and science teachers, etc. Funds to establish such programs should be directed to the appropriate units.

Funds for teacher training, especially that defined as continuing education, are not readily available and there is no means to support these programs at the needed level through E&G or
PSA funds. It would be beneficial if the CHE could work with the appropriate State agencies to improve funding for teacher training and improve instruction at a disciplinary level.

37. Amount of public and private sector grants

37a. General discussion The Office Sponsored Programs has appointed a Council of Research Faculty which represents a positive step toward solving the problems having negative impact on the ability of faculty to get extramural funding and perform their research duties successfully.

37b. Questions, comments and recommendations What are our goals and objectives as a research institution? Is it to become a Carnegie I institution? How much will we have to invest to be a research II or I institution? What are the advantages and disadvantages?

Perhaps a more feasible goal is to set a level in which you are going to grow research annually rather than to just aspire to be a Carnegie I institution.

Is Federal grant funding all that matters, especially for a University that emphasizes service to shareholders and cooperation with corporations? What emphasis do we place on contract research versus competitive grant research?

How can we develop a good reward system for researchers?

How can we balance faculty workload if every faculty member is required to teach two or more courses each semester? What does it take to become a good researcher: i.e., how much time is required?

How can we set reasonable requirements for research output given the diversity of our colleges and departments, and therein, different abilities to attract extramural funding?

How can we develop a fair and competitive system of matching grant money if required? We need to better coordinate the way we distribute the money we have, and to slow down, aim for our target and get it.

There was concern that the administration sometimes favors individuals or groups who do popular research, while the general attitude and support of research campus-wide has suffered.

The University is considering hiring faculty with the title of research professor. If this occurs, how will these faculty be treated with respect to tenure, promotion and evaluations? Who will be in charge of these faculty at the level of the upper administration? How can we better integrate the efforts of academic researchers (130 funds) versus those who do research with PSA money (131 funds)?

Clemson University, along with USC and MUSC, has been labeled as research University by CHE. What does this mean with respect to our obligations and expected performance? Good research means having an excellent graduate program, but in recent years the graduate program
at Clemson University has been de-emphasized. A good balance should be maintained between undergraduate and graduate education.

In conclusion, recently the CHE identified Clemson University, along with MUSC and USC-Columbia, as being institutions which should focus on research. In a recent report by the Subcommittee on Research of the Commission on the Future of Clemson University, a Commission comprised of prominent businessmen and other supporters of Clemson University, it was noted that the University ranked last in both total research funding and in per faculty funding compared to the ten peer research institutions examined. The Committee presented recommendations as to how this deficiency could be rectified. It is recommended that the Board of Trustees give serious consideration toward adopting these recommendations. The designation of Clemson University as a research institution by CHE should result the establishment of a Research Committee on the Board of Trustees which regularly receives reports from the administrators responsible for research at Clemson University.
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1. Purpose: To approve the formation of the Committee on Academic Integrity
   which is to be comprised of students, faculty, and administration to research the
   University's current position on academic integrity and to formally decide a
   course of action if any that needs to be taken.

2. Be it enacted by the Clemson University Student Senate in regular session
   assembled the following:

3. That the Student Senate lend its support and approval to the formation of this
   committee on academic integrity.
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Date
I received this response from Matt Dunbar in response to my question about the proposed Academic Integrity Committee. Nancy Ferguson, Chair, Scholastic Policies

1. The Academic Integrity Committee: Our Attorney General, James Wyche, came in to office this year with a goal of pursuing some previous efforts to establish an Honor Code. After looking back over the historical files on this issue, and realizing that there has been a repeated interest from students (at least 2 student senate resolutions) and an endorsement from a university-wide committee (@1994), James and I decided to revive the discussion of this subject. What we've found is that in the past, the administration has endorsed an effort to pursue the establishment of some type of honor code, but until now, that student initiative has fallen short. What we hope to accomplish by establishing this committee is simply to bring people "back up to speed" on the issue--students, faculty and administrators, and to have a group of them discuss and formulate some succinct and official statement about academic integrity on this campus. With that initial framework constructed, we will then convene a group of students to determine if an honor code as such is feasible and appropriate at Clemson. We are all for integrity and honesty, but we will not endorse a system that students have little faith in or respect for--the last thing we want to see is a token system that is taken lightly and regarded by other institutions as simply a "front." We intend for this first 10-member committee to meet only once or twice to officially endorse some type of student initiative to make a statement about our own academic integrity--whether that ultimately appears in the form of an honor code or not.
Faculty Senate Research Committee 1998-1999  
September 15, 1998 Meeting, Report #2

Committee Members in Attendance: K. Brooks (chair), V. Shelburne, R. Singh, S. Anand, M. Ellison, Ted Taylor, C. Voelker

We have selected 4PM on the 3rd Tuesday as our meeting time for the remainder of the academic year. Our next meeting is on October 20. We meet in room 313, Lee Hall;

The agenda for the meeting was:

1) Review August Meeting Report.
2) Old Business: Distribute /discuss final report from 1997/98 Committee.
   a. Potential Senate Resolution: Institutes on campus;
   b. Potential Senate Resolution: Graduate Program Stipends;
3) New Business:
   a. Subcommittee for Data Retention Policy;
   b. Subcommittee for Intellectual Property Issues;
   c. Issues form committee members
4) Adjournment.

Discussion, Actions and Recommendations, by Item Number.

1) No changes to Report#1 were suggested.

2) (a) Institutes: We discussed Institutes on campus at length. The conversation focused on what reasonable and practical actions the Senate might take to understand and provide input regarding Institutes on campus, particularly the formation of new Institutes. Issues discussed included 1) the potential conflict between high senate involvement in the formation of Institutes versus the need for confidentiality, and 2) the ability of groups like the senate to supply faculty with requisite time and substantive knowledge to participate as members of Institute Boards. Therefore, we suggest the following to be placed as a motion before the Senate:

   The Chief Research Officer should inform the Faculty Senate, through its Research Committee, of any Research Institutes in formation.

   In this way, we will be in the loop regarding these initiatives, and will be positioned to institute (sic) actions we deem appropriate, if any.

2) (b) The sense of the committee is that we must deal with the stipend issue at the University Level.

3) (a) A Subcommittee was formed to examine the draft Data Retention Policy. The committee will report at our next meeting.

3) (b) Regarding the breadth and serious nature of Intellectual Property Issues, (e.g., faculty control/ownership of distance learning and/or web based materials, CLE/service learning materials, distance degrees), the Research Committee recommends to that we (the senate) undertake to form a select Committee comprised of faculty and administrators to explore these issues and to craft a draft policy for consideration by the Faculty Senate and by the appropriate administrative entities.

4) Given that no other issues were brought forward by committee members, we adjourned at 4:50 PM. Written by K. Brooks, 24 September 1998.
19 August 1998

To: Policy Committee Chair John W. Huffman
Thru: Faculty Senate President Patricia T. Smart
From: Robert A. Waller, Editorial Consultant for the
Faculty Manual
Re: Nomination Pool for Faculty Senate Officers

The Constitution of the Faculty of Clemson University in Article II (pp. 60-66 of the August 1998 Faculty Manual) prescribes the conditions under which the Faculty Senate operates. Section 3 makes provision for the "Officers" of the Senate. Among the stipulations is the following: "The Senate term of the Vice President shall be extended by one year, if necessary, to permit his or her service as President. Should such an extension of term be necessary, his or her successor shall serve a two-year term" (page 63).

The application of this principle has the effect of limiting the Advisory Committee's submission choices in March to those elected Senators in their second year of service on a three-year term. With a 35-member body, that provision effectively limits the possible candidates to approximately a dozen individuals each year. This number is too limiting and the following language is being proposed to enlarge the pool.

To effect such a change, the following sentences would be substituted for those quoted above:

"The term of a Senator shall be extended one time, if necessary, to permit him or her to initiate or complete his or her service as an officer. Should such an extension of term be necessary, his or her successor will serve a three-year term which will commence at the completion of the officer's term."

Such a change would enlarge the lists of potential candidates to be considered by the Advisory Committee or for nomination from the floor.

Since this change affects the Constitution, following approval by the full Senate it must be approved by "a two-thirds majority vote of the members present" at the December meeting of the University faculty. Following this endorsement, the amendment becomes effective upon approval by the Board of Trustees (page 66).

cc: Academic Vice President and Provost Steffen H. Rogers
1998-99 Policy Committee Members
Librarian Kenneth R. Murr
Mesdames Brenda J. Smith and Cathy T. Sturkie
To: Policy Committee Chair John W. Huffman
Thru: Faculty Senate President Patricia T. Smart
From: Robert A. Waller, Editorial Consultant
Re: Revision in Personnel Review Process

The procedures to be followed in personnel actions are described on pages 24-26 of the August 1998 Faculty Manual. The role of the deparmental chairperson is sketched as three-fold: a resource person for the personnel committee; an independent evaluator of reappointment, tenure, and promotion cases; and then finally the conduit by which the peer committee report reaches the college dean.

In considering the process by which Post-Tenure Review will be conducted, it has been decided that the reports from the post-tenure review committee and the department chair should be submitted separately to the collegiate dean. To maximize the independence and value of the paired review system to the Dean and the Provost, it has been suggested that this separation should also be built into all other personnel reviews as well.

To effect such a change will require these modifications in the Faculty Manual on page 25 (new language underscored; [deleted language bracketed]):

a) Paragraph three which deals with the role of the peer committee and the department chair would be revised to read as follows:

"The chair or director shall ensure that any faculty member eligible for renewal of appointment, tenure, or promotion is given an opportunity to be reviewed. The appropriate committee reviews each case in accordance with departmental procedures and policies, and renders a formal recommendation directly to the dean of the college with a copy to the candidate. The chair or director shall render a separate, [and] independent, and simultaneous recommendation as to the disposition of the case to the dean. The chair or director shall provide the faculty charged with the peer review with a copy of the recommendation. The chair or director shall also insure that the affected faculty member is promptly informed in writing as to the results of and rationale for [both] his/her recommendation[s]. In the cases of promotion or early tenure, consideration, the candidate may withdraw from further consideration at this point."
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b) In paragraph four concerning the role of the department chair/school director, the paragraph needs to be revised to read:

"The chair or director shall forward to the dean [both] his/her recommendation[s], the supporting evaluations, and the candidate's dossier. In cases in which there is a discrepancy in the rationale for retention, tenure, or promotion between a faculty member's Peer Committee and that of the Department Chair/School Director, [that administrator shall make the Dean aware of the discrepancy.] [T]he Dean will meet with the Chair/Director and with the Peer Committee to discuss the reasons for the discrepancy. A request for personnel action form shall be attached to provide a record of the review at all administrative levels."

In this fashion consistency would be brought to personnel decision-making on the campus. Such a change in practice would become effective for academic year 1999-2000 and thereafter following approval by the Faculty Senate, the Provost, and the Board of Trustees.

c.c.: Vice President and Provost Steffen H. Rogers
1998-99 Policy Committee Members
Mesdames Brenda J. Smith and Cathy T. Sturkie
Faculty Senate  
Welfare Committee Report  
September 24, 1998 

Members:  
Joanne Deeken  
Francis Eubanks  
Syble Oldaker  
Elaine Richardson  
Bea Naff  
John Leininger, Chair

Issues addressed:

1. Faculty spouse or dependent tuition waiver.  
The Faculty Senate Welfare Committee recommends no further action on this issue at this time. We believe that the new Life Scholarship program established by the State, would make it difficult to find support for such a benefit change to the employees of the University, since it is agreed that this type of change would have to pass through the State Legislature. We believe that after the “Life Scholarship” program has been in effect for a period of time, this issue should be addressed again.

2. Business office dropping student from classes three days before school starting.  
We are waiting on a meeting with the Registrar, this will be brought back up at our next meeting.

3. Travel Advance Fund Cuts  
The Welfare Committee received a request to look at the change in the “Travel Advance” Policy. We contacted Scott Ludlow, Chief Financial Officer. He stated the new policy was made in response to problems noted by auditors and by the widespread use of the Corporate American Express Card. In a nutshell the policy states that travel advances are to be considered the exception, not the norm. The advances will normally only be for the food portion of projected travel and that no further payments on a trip will be made until the advance is accounted for (paid back or subtracted from the travel reimbursement form). If this policy caused problems, the individual departments have the authority to exceed them.

4. Faculty Evaluation and Disclaimer Procedures  
After meeting with the Provost for a clarification on his request for a flow chart on Faculty Evaluation and Disclaimer Procedures, the committee recommends that a memo and/or email be sent to all faculty timed for delivery around the Form 3 submission date. The memo needs to highlight the specific points that already exist in the Faculty Manual. The Provost expressed concerns that different Deans were not all following the same procedures and wanted to make the particulars clear to everyone. Specifically he wants individuals to know that he can not make judgements concerning disclaimers since he could conceivably be brought in on a grievance that might relate back to the issues covered in the disclaimer. The faculty’s perception on disclaimers seems to be that it should be an action plan and as the Faculty Manual states for the purpose of Form 3 yearly evaluations, it simply becomes part of your record. These issues would be addressed in other forums, such as the promotion and tenure review. The Provost expressed con-
cerns that we do not have a common disclaimer policy that works for both yearly evaluations and promotion, tenure and retention. It is his plan to request a revision in the overall disclaimer process to establish a more uniform process. The Welfare Committee felt that there did not need to be any additional material added to the Faculty Manual, since all of the issues already exist in the current version. Specifically the information can be found on page 26 under Annual Performance Evaluation and on page 100 under Faculty Evaluation Procedures, Form-3 Evaluation Summary item 4 through 7.

5. Parking Complaints
Because Parking Services is a service unit, Dean Paul Shelton and others involved want it to be helpful to the university community. The following suggestions are given to help decrease the amount of frustrations felt in dealing with this facility:

A. Faculty and staff should anticipate needs. For example, if a faculty member needs to deliver something to a building where there is typically a problem in finding a close spot to park legally and unload, he or she should call the police department (656-222) ahead of time and tell them where they are headed. The faculty member should give the car and license information and ask police to alert the parking officer. However, the faculty member should never park even temporarily in a handicap spot, fire zone or where a dumpster is blocked.

B. For departmental visitors, permits can be ordered and sent to the visitor in advance. For those who arrive with short notice, they can stop by the police department or the visitors center to pick up a visitor pass. Or the department can call to order a pass once the visitor arrives. The police should be called and alerted as to where the car is parked and that a visitor pass is being obtained.

C. Finally, it is important that faculty understand the limits of the clerks in the Parking Services office. They must follow procedure.

In addition, in an effort to better serve the university, video cameras were installed in the Parking Services offices about a year ago. The cameras are used to monitor the clerks and the customers. The video tapes are reviewed when complaints are received. Clerks are reprimanded for inappropriate behavior.

6. Scholarship Unbound Conference
Regrettably the request for a member of the Welfare Committee to attend had to be turned down due to scheduling conflicts.

7. Smoking on Campus
Dr. Rose Marie McDonald, Chair of the Campus Air and Water Quality Committee requested an opportunity to speak to our committee. She outlined the plans to make all buildings on campus smoke free since there was a change in the wording of the law. This would eliminate smoking in offices. More information will follow.
Report on the Activities of the Senate Finance Committee During September, 1998

The Senate Finance Committee met on September 15. In attendance were John Warner, John Bednar, and Carolyn Brown. The committee discussed the various activities to be addressed by this committee this year. The various categories for investigation include:

1. travel and supplies money: how much are colleges given by the university; how much are departments getting; how much variation is there across colleges & departments; how much should faculty members be getting to do their jobs (compare with peer institutions)?
2. graduate student funding: again, how much are graduate student budgets determined and how much are the various departments given in E&G funding for graduate students; how far is Clemson behind other peer institutions in graduate student funding; has funding (or lack of it) affected the number and quality of graduate student applications?
3. computer equipment and software: how funded; how should it be funded; any plans for recurring replacement of computer equipment; shouldn't faculty equipment be funded out of student technology fees; shouldn't faculty be kept current with equipment/software available to students?
4. Number and funding of sabbaticals
5. Resources for Professional development/professional growth: similar problem to 1.
6. Telephone pricing: why is the university paying 18 cents/minute for phone calls; surely we can get a better deal than this.
7. Travel contract with Small World & Holiday Travel: is it working; would the university get a better deal just letting everyone book their own tickets?
8. Martin Inn and golf course: will these activities have shortfalls; can these activities adversely impact academic programs?
9. PSA/E&G intersection. It was recommended at the September 24 meeting of the Faculty Senate Advisory Committee that the Finance Committee look at the impact of PSA activities on academic programs. The Accountability Committee is looking at this as well -- who gets paid out of PSA accounts, what percentage of the salary comes from various E&G accounts, and what percentage comes from various PSA sources. Robert Campbell has suggested that this committee look at PSA from another angle, such as operating budgets, what goes to support on-campus activities vs. extension offices and regulatory operations, etc.

Brett Dalton of the provost's office will make uniform budget reports from the colleges and departments data available for this committee at some date in the near future. These reports will be essential for the analysis of some of the items listed above.

Carolyn Brown volunteered to begin looking at the graduate student issue. John Bednar is going to begin investigation of issues surrounding the Martin Inn and Madren Center.

Elizabeth Dale has notified the committee of several of her concerns regarding stipends and health care coverage for graduate students. The committee will address her concerns in its analysis of graduate student funding.

John Warner attended the September meeting of the Board of Trustees Finance Committee meeting in Columbia. Among other things, the committee heard a presentation regarding a new proposal emanating from the CHE staff for allocating money among the universities and tech schools that would dramatically adversely impact the research universities. Fortunately, that proposal has subsequently been squashed.

The committee will meet again on October 20 at 2:30 PM in 222 Sirrine Hall.

John Warner
October 12, 1998
MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
OCTOBER 13, 1998

1. **Call to Order:** President Patricia T. Smart called the meeting to order at 2:36 p.m.

2. **Approval of Minutes:** The Faculty Senate Minutes dated September 8, 1998 were approved as written.

3. **Special Order of the Day:** Linda Nilson, Director of the Office of Teaching Effectiveness and Innovation, highlighted the services of this office which include: workshops for faculty members and teaching assistants; teaching or curriculum consulting; individual services such as class interviews (Attachment A).

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

5. **Committee Reports**
   
a. **Welfare** - John Leininger, Chair, briefly described this Committee's Report dated September 24, 1998 (Attachment B). Additional items to undertake include: compensation for Post Tenure Review for an “excellent” rating and summer school pay for faculty.

b. **Scholastic Policies** - Senator Nancy Ferguson noted that she attended the Scholarship Unbound Conference which addressed ways to redefine, evaluate, and validate “scholarship”. Senator Ferguson stated that this Fall Student evaluations will be undergoing validation subsequent for use this Spring and that the existence of online evaluation systems at other universities is being pursued. Discussion held.

c. **Finance** - Senator John Warner submitted the Finance Committee Report dated September, 1998 (Attachment C). It was suggested that this Committee survey faculty who pay their own travel expenses.

d. **Policy** - John Huffman, Chair, noted that the Policy Committee met on September 29th. Senator Huffman informed the Senate that items will be brought forward during both Old and New Business.

e. **Research** - Senator Kerry Brooks submitted this Committee Report (Attachment D)

**University Commissions and Committees**

1) Francis A. McGuire, Faculty Representative to the Board of Trustees, reported on the approval of two action items by the Board of Trustees on October 9, 1998: the plan to merge the Department of Agricultural Education and the Biology Program (which did go to faculty first), and a proposal, in principle, on University Centers and Institutes. Dr. McGuire reminded the Senate of the potential computer problem in the year 2000; expressed his concern that occasionally a Board Agenda item concerning policy is approved without first being addressed by faculty; assured the Senate that he will monitor such action and inquire about faculty involvement; stated the importance of attendance by Senate representatives to Board Committee meetings; and shared his belief that the Board of Trustees is listening, but only if faculty speak up.
2) Traffic and Parking - Senator Jerry Christenbury announced: that more faculty are needed on the Parking Advisory Committee which hears appeals; the decision to retain hang tags, but not stickers; that the Traffic and Parking Office will build a new building in order to improve facilities; and that parking fees will be raised in order to raise money. Comments are to be forwarded to Senator Christenbury.

6. President's Report: President Smart:
   a. shared with the Senate the establishment of two (2) Faculty Senate Select Committees to address the possibility of a faculty club and intellectual property issues.
   b. thanked those Senators who attended the Board of Trustees Breakfast hosted by the Senate.
   c. noted that about two hundred faculty attended the Faculty Gathering hosted by the Senate, the Provost, and the Alumni Association.

7. Old Business
   a. Senator Huffman explained and submitted for approval the Constitutional change to the Faculty Manual regarding the Nomination Pool for Faculty Senate Officers. Discussion followed. Vote to accept was taken and passed with the required two-thirds vote. This change will be brought to the General Faculty in December, 1998 (Attachment E).

8. New Business
   a. Vote was taken to bring Revision in Personnel Review Process (Attachment F) to the floor for consideration by the Faculty Senate was taken and passed with the required two-thirds vote. Senator Huffman read, provided an explanation, and moved acceptance of revision. Discussion was held. Following Call to Question vote was taken on motion to accept revision which failed. Senator and Secretary Elizabeth Dale recommended the creation of an ad hoc committee to consider the Annual Review Committee Report of the 1997-98 Senate Session and this revision. President Smart will appoint this ad hoc committee.
   b. Senator Ted Taylor requested that parking fees structure be brought to the floor for discussion which was seconded. Vote to bring to floor was taken and failed.

9. Announcements
   a. Congratulations to Joe Culin, recently named the South Carolina Professor of the Year by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
   b. Thanks to Marsha McCurley, Cataloging Unit Head of the Clemson Libraries, for putting the August, 1998 Faculty Manual on the Web.
   c. Faculty Senate Party, October 24, 1998 at 6:00 p.m. at the Sturkie residence.

10. Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned by President Smart at 4:24 p.m.

   Elizabeth Dale, Secretary

   Cathy Toth Sturkie, Administrative Assistant

Absent: P. Skewes, M. Allison (A. Grubb for), S. Hedetniemi, R. Singh, S. Oldaker (Potts for)
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Mission Statement

Above all else, the Office of Teaching Effectiveness and Innovation (OTEI) is a safe haven for all members of the Clemson University teaching community to come to discuss any issue related to teaching. Within this guiding framework, OTEI defines the following as its primary missions:

1. To keep Clemson University on the cutting edge of teaching excellence and innovation, both by bringing in the best ideas and strategies for enhancing teaching and learning from the outside and by providing forums for Clemson faculty to share their teaching approaches and experiments across the disciplines.

Over the past three decades college-level teaching has blossomed into an exciting field of research and practice. Drawing on scholarship in learning and cognition, this research has generated a vast repertoire of highly effective techniques and technologies. OTEI collects and disseminates the latest developments in the field and encourages Clemson instructors to open their classroom doors and to exchange their wealth of teaching experience.

2. To foster communication, understanding, and a sense of community between teachers and learners by helping instructors to view their teaching through their students' perspective and to involve their students more actively in the learning process.
OTEI offers several confidential services to help individual faculty and teaching assistants assess their effectiveness during the semester, while instructors can still modify their methods and material. One of these services directly surveys the students for their opinion of how well current teaching strategies are helping them learn.

3. To help faculty and teaching assistants select the most effective teaching methods from an ever-broadening repertoire of instructional formats, techniques, and technologies; in addition, to make their implementation as easy and successful as possible.

OTEI advises in comprehensive course and curriculum design, including the most effective selection — in cost, time, and student learning — of instructional activities. As these activities encompass computer-based technologies, OTEI coordinates with the Division of Computing and Information Technology (DCIT) to help instructors learn about, select, and adapt the latest options for classroom use. Instructional applications include presentation software, CD-ROM-based multimedia, the Collaborative Learning Environment (CLE), which bundles easy-to-use software for all courses, including: a Web-based syllabus template; an electronic mailing list; Web-based discussion groups; folders for reserved materials, learning resources, and student assignments; and multiple formats for student-to-student collaboration. While DCIT offers hands-on training in using various applications, OTEI advises instructors on the most learning-effective implementations and the expected impact on student learning. As necessary, OTEI links instructors with the most appropriate support units on campus.

4. To help ensure that teaching and learning are assessed by valid and reliable means that encourage and reward improvement.

While OTEI will not participate in faculty review, tenure, or promotion, it can advise academic units on their procedures for evaluating teaching, such as their student evaluation instruments and valid ways to integrate peer assessment into the process. It is also available to help colleges and departments hone their student assessment strategies.

5. To sustain a vision of teaching as an intellectual activity essential to the overall professional goals of Clemson faculty members and the mission of Clemson University.

Clemson prides itself on being a premier research and teaching institution, and it expects its faculty and teaching assistants to dedicate themselves to teaching excellence. OTEI fosters this dedication and provides the resources for instructors to meet the University’s rigorous standards for teaching effectiveness.

Services of the Office of Teaching Effectiveness and Innovation

Services to Academic Units and the Clemson Teaching Community

Orientation Sessions on Teaching

Every August, OTEI conducts sessions on teaching at the New Faculty Orientation, which is sponsored by the Office of Undergraduate Studies, and offers additional sessions for faculty and teaching assistants on the request of a college dean, program or school coordinator, department
chair, or TA coordinator. These programs provide overviews of the most fruitful activities for
the first day of class, student-active teaching techniques, student and institutional expectations of
instructors, student relations, and other introductory teaching topics.

Faculty and TA Workshops on Teaching

On the request of a dean, director, chair, or TA supervisor, OTEI conducts and sponsors
teaching workshops for colleges, schools, program, and departments throughout the academic
year. Unless an outside expert is the most viable alternative, the workshops are designed
carried out in-house by the OTEI director or an expert Clemson faculty member. The requesting
unit need only arrange for the room and refreshments and publicize the event internally.
Workshop topics can address any teaching topic including designing courses by objectives, leading
discussions, interactive lecturing, testing and assessment, grading writing, interpreting student
evaluations, questioning techniques, instructional technology, classroom equity, learning styles,
classroom assessment, the case method, problem-based learning, and cooperative learning.

Consultation to Academic and Administrative Units

Colleges, schools, programs, departments, and committees are invited to request
information and advisement on a wide range of teaching-related issues including curriculum
revision, student evaluations (reliability, validity, biases, and form revisions), the role of peer
assessment of teaching in promotion and tenure reviews, and faculty and TA training needs.

The Teaching Forum

Throughout the year OTEI organizes a series of forums for Clemson faculty to share the
wealth of their teaching experience and expertise.

Teaching at Its Best

OTEI makes available to the Clemson faculty one of the most comprehensive and best
researched books on teaching in the nation, *Teaching at Its Best: A Research-Based Resource for
the College Instructors* (Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing, 1998). Written by OTEI Director Linda B.
Nilson, it summarizes, in an easy-to-read style and format, not only the most effective methods
but also the scholarly research behind their effectiveness.

Services to Individual Instructors

Class Interviews

Through this method, faculty and TAs learn how their students view their teaching
strengths, weaknesses, and effectiveness during a semester, while there is still time to make
adjustments and improvements. A class interview solicits specific, useful assessments and
recommendations for improvement more effectively than do end-of-semester student evaluations.
The service takes the first or last 20 minutes of class time and requires that the instructor
leave the room. The OTEI director or a trained consultant starts off in smaller classes by initiating
a discussion and in large classes by breaking the students into small groups to fill out a brief,
open-ended questionnaire, followed by a discussion. Student anonymity is assured. The director
or consultant later meets privately with the instructor to share and interpret the results. As these results are confidential and advisory only, they should not be used for faculty or TA reviews.

Classroom Videotape Review

Since it allows us "to see ourselves as others see us," a classroom videotaping is effective in helping faculty and TAs assess their presentation style, public speaking skills, use of visual aids, and social interaction with their class. It can be especially useful for instructors to view it privately with the OTEI director or a trained consultant, as these sessions often help them identify overlooked teaching strengths and devise novel ways to enhance their presentation. DCIT and the Communications Center will videotape classes on the instructor’s request.

Classroom Observations

Some departments encourage their instructors to observe each other’s classes for the dual purposes of providing advisory feedback and seeing different approaches to teaching similar material. However, at those times when faculty and TAs want the feedback of an outside expert, the OTEI director or a trained consultant will observe and take notes on an instructor’s lecture style, discussion skills, questioning techniques, class rapport, use of technology, and other performance dimensions.

Teaching Library

The OTEI maintains an extensive library of books, journals, newsletters, articles, and videotapes for browsing and borrowing. Organized by subject, the collection includes material on not only college-level teaching techniques, but also academic careers, learning theory, student life, teaching evaluations, and faculty and TA development programs across the nation.

Individual Teaching Consultations

OTEI invites all members of the Clemson teaching community to schedule private consultations on any and all aspects of university teaching. We are happy to help faculty and TAs design courses, develop syllabi, devise new ways to teach material, integrate technology into a course, assess student learning, elicit student feedback, conduct classroom research, interpret student evaluations, and assemble teaching portfolios. We can also furnish information on upcoming teaching conferences and outside workshops.
MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
NOVEMBER 10, 1998

1. Call to Order: President Patricia T. Smart called the meeting to order at 2:36 p.m.

2. Approval of Minutes: The Academic Convocation Minutes of August 19, 1998 were approved as corrected; the Faculty Senate Minutes dated October 13, 1998, as written.

3. Class of '39 Award for Excellence - President Smart appointed Horace Skipper to count ballots for this Award with the Provost or his designee. The election of the 1998 Class of '39 Award for Excellence was held by secret ballot and ballots were collected.

4. "Free Speech": Provost Steffen H. Rogers informed the Senate of Governor-Elect Jim Hodges' priorities for higher education: freezing the cost of attending college for students by increasing state allocations annually by the rate of inflation; using a state lottery to fund the state's scholarship programs including the LIFE and need-based scholarships; continuing to support tenure; helping South Carolina create a national research university through higher faculty pay tied to post-tenure reviews; and increasing the funding for the Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research, in which federal matching funds help states develop research facilities and programs (South Carolina's yearly contribution from $2.5 million to $5 million).

Roger Doost, Professor of Accountancy, presented a brief history of requests by the Senate during his tenure on the University Finance Department for understandable and useful information regarding the University cost breakdown from the "Faculty's perspective". Dr. Doost concluded by stating his hope that the Faculty Senate consider the issue of accountability which was one of the reasons why the Budget Accountability Committee was established a few years ago (Attachment A).

Rose Marie McDonald, M.D., Chair of the Campus Building Air and Water Quality Committee, informed the Faculty Senate of a proposed change in the University Smoking Policy in response to environmental tobacco smoke concerns by faculty and staff. Currently, Clemson University allows no smoking in buildings except in enclosed private offices, designated smoking areas, and theatrical performances. The proposed change, based on the 1996 amended South Carolina Clean Indoor Air Act, would make all Clemson University buildings smoke free. Dr. McDonald welcomes and encourages input from the Faculty Senate.

Chief and Director Lonnie Saxon shared and explained the Department of Law Enforcement and Safety Organizational Chart (Attachment B); answered questions from the Senate floor; and provided an update of unsolved incidents involving Clemson University students.

Kenneth R. Murr, Reference Librarian, presented a document received from the Classified Staff Commission which shows the Parking Services Budget and particularly noted that ten percent of the University Budget goes directly to teaching and twenty percent of the Parking Services Budget goes to parking (Attachment C).

5. Committee Reports

a. Welfare - Chair John Leininger stated that this Committee continues to pursue the issue of compensation for an "excellent" rating on the Post-Tenure Review and invited
b. **Scholastic Policies** - Nancy Ferguson, Chair, noted that the Committee will next meet at 10:00 a.m. on November 16th to discuss electronic student evaluations and plans to submit a resolution at the December Senate meeting. A discussion regarding student evaluations of faculty ensued which included evaluation instructions received by faculty of different colleges; *Faculty Manual* violations; scheduled week of student evaluations; and the evaluation return process. The Senate was reminded by Senator Ferguson that student evaluation of teaching is only one component of this process. Senators Kerry Brooks, Francis Eubanks, Elizabeth Dale, and John Leininger will meet with the Provost and Dori Helms, Faculty Administrative Intern, to further this discussion and determine appropriate directions.


d. **Policy** - John Huffman, Chair, noted that the members of this Committee met on October 20th and will meet again on November 17 with Nancy Ferguson, Chair of the Scholastic Policies Committee, and Dori Helms. Items under consideration were shared.

e. **Research** - Kerry Brooks, Chair, submitted the Committee Report (Attachment E) and informed the Senate of the scheduled meeting with the Chief Research Officer and the Executive/Advisory Committee.

**University Commissions and Committees**

1) In response to a question from Senator Brooks regarding the Parking Advisory Committee Report, a discussion was held during which a possible conflict of interest was noted by Senator Robert Campbell - the maximizing of parking violations rather than the minimizing of them in order to raise funds to pay for a new building.

6. **President's Report**: President Smart stated the following:

   a. Departmental visits by the Senate’s President and Vice President have proven successful in regard to communication and the Faculty Senate reaching out to faculty. A report will be prepared which will contain information compiled from these meetings to be shared with the Board of Trustees Educational Policy Committee and the Provost. Vice President Skipper noted that attendance at these meetings is good and that it has been stated that this is the first time the Faculty Senate has come out and talked with faculty.

   b. The Board of Trustees has donated $250 to the Faculty Senate Operating Fund for which we are very thankful.

   c. Thanks to Cathy and Kinly Sturkie for hosting the Faculty Senate BBQ in October.

   d. A few Faculty Senate tee-shirts are available for those Senators who have not yet made a request.

7. **Old Business**

   a. Senator Elaine Richardson submitted for endorsement a Statement on Academic Integrity (Attachment F). Receiving the required two-thirds vote to bring to floor, vote to endorse was taken and passed unanimously. Senator Richardson will share this endorsement with members of the committee who developed the proposed statement.
8. **New Business**

a. President Smart introduced the Resolution on the Attacks on African-American Students. Secretary Elizabeth Dale then explained the resolution and made a motion to accept. Vote to accept resolution was taken and passed unanimously (FS98-11-1 P) (Attachment G).

b. Secretary Dale then submitted for consideration the Resolution on the Review of the Clemson University Libraries Dean which was seconded. A short discussion followed. Vote to accept resolution was taken and passed unanimously (FS98-11-2-P) (Attachment H).

c. Senator Huffman submitted, explained, and moved for acceptance a Revision in Sabbatical Leave Policy (Attachment I). Vote was taken and passed unanimously.

d. The Definition of Faculty for Senate Allocation Purposes (Attachment J) received the required two-thirds vote to bring to floor following a request by Senator Huffman. This Faculty Manual change was then introduced for acceptance by the Senate. Following discussion, vote was taken and passed with required two-thirds vote. This definition will also include Extension Associate Professors with tenure or who are in a tenure-track position as regular faculty for this process to serve in the Faculty Senate.

e. Following the required two-thirds vote to bring to floor, Clemson University Faculty Senate Faculty Senator Responsibilities (Attachment K) were submitted for approval by Senator Huffman to be incorporated into the Faculty Senate Handbook. Vote to accept was taken and passed unanimously.

f. Senator John Bednar volunteered to pen a resolution endorsing the proposed changes to the University Smoking Policy to be brought to the Senate at the December meeting.

g. President Smart will appoint an *ad hoc* committee to respond to Senate concerns regarding the proposal to raise funds and build a Municipal Services Facility.

h. Senator Jim Zimmerman informed the Senate of a twelve-page proposed general education document and further noted that Senators may contact Committee members or respective department chairs for perusal of document.

9. **Announcements**

a. The Celebration of the Class of ‘39 will be held at the Madren Center from 6-8:00 p.m. on January 11, 1999. Invitations will soon be mailed.

10. **Adjournment:** The meeting was adjourned by President Smart at 4:50 p.m.

[Signature]
Elizabeth Dale, Secretary

[Signature]
Cathy Toth Sturkie, Administrative Assistant

Absent: M. Bridgwood (Westall for), M. Ellison, C. Voelker (Grubb for), T. Taylor, J. Deeken (D. Taylor for), P. Skewes (J. Zimmerman for), S. Saha, S. Oldaker, B. Naff
Clemson University's Financial Summary
Based on 1996 data
(Unofficial estimates)

Tenured and tenure-track faculty  860  $53 mm
Instructors, adjuncts, etc.  360  17 mm
Total  1,220  70 mm

All other salaries  3,178  133 mm
All other costs  71 mm
Auxiliary enterprises (net)  43 mm
Grand total  322 mm

Estimate of Faculty cost breakdown:
Teaching  45%  32 mm
Research  35%  24 mm
Service  15%  10 mm
Administrative  5%  4 mm
Total  70 mm

It is estimated that about 10% of University resources in terms of Faculty pay goes to classroom teaching. It appears that non-faculty costs excluding Auxiliary enterprises are approximately 3 times of the Faculty pay. Note that these costs do not include cost of the buildings. Overhead includes departmental administration, college administration, university administration, student services, libraries, police services, computers, building maintenance, transportation, utilities, and debt service. We suggest that such information with trend analysis is useful for the Faculty Senate as well as for University Administration.
Key questions asked in the past several years:

* How much of this university’s resources go toward teaching, research, and service in Faculty salary and benefits?

* How much of this university’s resources go to administrative salaries and benefits?

* What are other costs of administering this institution?

* What has been the trend of the past 10 years?

✓ * What have we saved from restructuring?

✓ * What have the top administrators consistently received raises and benefits exceeding 4 to 5 times as much as those received by Faculty?
Parking Services
1997 - 98 Administrative Operations Budget

Salaries and Fringe Benefits: 57%

Supplies & Miscellaneous: 6%

Data Services & Supplies: 27%

Office Facilities: 6%

G&A Charges: 6%

Postage & Printing

Utilities

Insurance

Dues & Publications

Travel: 0.5%
Parking Services
1997 - 98 Budget

- Transit Operations Support: 13%
- Parking Permit Sales: 6%
- Parking Facilities Maintenance: 15%
- Parking Facilities Construction: 5%
- Parking Enforcement: 27%
- Department Administrative Operations: 34%
Faculty Senate Finance Committee Report for October 1998

The Faculty Senate Finance Committee met on October 20 in 222 Sirrine Hall at 2:30 PM. In attendance were John Bednar, Michael Bridgwood, Carolyn Brown, Kin Sturkie and John Warner.

The committee has identified a number of topic areas for investigation (see September report). Discussion at this meeting included the following:

1. Report from Carolyn Brown about graduate student stipends. Carolyn has collected data on graduate student stipends from a number of departments on campus (broken down by MA/PhD & TA/RA). The committee needs to collect data from peer institutions to determine competitiveness of CU graduate assistance.

2. The committee discussed how to get started on its analysis of the adequacy of travel and supplies funding for departments. It was decided that we know little about what faculty spend out of pocket on their research and travel. So, the committee will do a survey of the faculty to find out how much people are spending out of pocket on these items. Kin Sturkie is drafting a survey, which will probably be done on-line.

The provost’s office has provided the committee with 1998-99 budgets of all departments in the university. The committee will be examining these data along with data from previous years to determine current levels as well as trends in S&T funding. (Robert Campbell has provided the committee with 1996 travel expenditure data for all departments in the university & Elizabeth Dale has provided it with 1997 departmental-level budget data from CAAH.)

3. John Bednar is continuing his investigation of Martin Inn and golf course and linkages between these activities and foundation funding of chairs to see whether shortfalls in these activities could adversely impact academic programs.

4. One potential area of investigation for the Senate Finance Committee is the intersection in CAFLS between E&G and PSA. Given the other items on this committee’s agenda, there is little interest among committee members in pursuing this item at this time.

The committee will meet next Tuesday at 2:30 in 222 Sirrine Hall.

John T. Warner
November 9, 1998
Faculty Senate Research Committee 1998-1999

Report #3: October 20, 1998 Meeting

Committee Members in Attendance: K. Brooks (chair), V. Shelburne, R. Singh, S. Anand, M. Ellison, Ted Taylor

We have selected 4PM on the 3rd Tuesday as our meeting time for the remainder of the academic year. Our next meeting is on November 17. We meet in room 313, Lee Hall.

The agenda for the meeting was:

1) September Minutes.
2) Old Business: Data Retention Policy;
3) New Business:
   a. Select committee for Intellectual Property Issues (membership);
   b. CRO's Institute Proposal;
   c. Issues from committee members.
4) Adjournment by 5 PM.

Discussion, Actions and Recommendations, by Item Number.

1) No changes to Report#2 were suggested.
2) Data Retention: we received editorial comments on the Data Retention Policy draft. Brooks will produce the edited version for discussion at the next meeting;
3) (a) Brooks reported on the formation of a Select Committee on Intellectual Property by Dr. Smart. (As we had recommended). Brooks solicited volunteers for this committee and M. Ellison volunteered.
   Research Committee members had the following suggestions for the Select Committee to consider: Internet; Patents policy -- time limits for the University to indicate participation on patents; Suggestion that the committee examine the policies of major research institutions including Stanford and MIT.
3) (b) CRO's Institutes Proposal; We discussed the fact the CRO had presented a policy to the CU Board of Trustees; We agreed to request a copy of this document and to examine it in light of faculty research interests.
3) (c) No additional issues were presented by committee members.
4) We adjourned at 4:50 PM.

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY COMMITTEE REPORT

At the September 8, 1998, meeting of the Faculty Senate, a request was put forward by Matt Dunbar, the Student Body President and James Wyche, the Attorney General, that a committee be established to develop a student-driven statement on academic integrity. The proposal to establish said committee was endorsed by the Faculty Senate at the September meeting. Senator Elaine Richardson was asked to serve as the Faculty Senate representative on the Academic Integrity Committee.

The committee met over the past two months and drafted the following statement:

Statement of 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 can not 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.

The statement is now presented to the Faculty Senate at the November meeting for endorsement.
RESOLUTION ON THE
ATTACKS ON AFRICAN-AMERICAN STUDENTS

WHEREAS, There have been in this past semester several attacks on African American students on Clemson's campus;

WHEREAS, The attacks seem to have been motivated by the race and sex of the students; and

WHEREAS, Attacks of any sort which are motivated by racism or other forms of intolerance and hatred are wrong under any circumstances, but are especially inappropriate in a university community which must foster understanding and a sense of common humanity as part of its commitment to furthering knowledge;

RESOLVED, That the Faculty Senate condemns these attacks on our students; and

FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Faculty Senate urges the Administration to continue its efforts to investigate these attacks, with an eye towards discovering and punishing the person or persons behind them, and with the intention of preventing any similar acts in the future.

This Resolution was passed unanimously by the Faculty Senate on November 10, 1998.
RESOLUTION ON THE REVIEW
OF THE CLEMSON UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES DEAN

FS98-11-2 P

WHEREAS, The Dean of the Clemson University Libraries is up for periodic review in Academic Year 1998-99;

WHEREAS, The position of Dean of the Clemson University Libraries is one which has an impact far beyond the Library as a College; and

WHEREAS, The quality of the Library has a direct influence on research and scholarship done by students and faculty in all the colleges of the University;

RESOLVED, That the Faculty Senate requests that the committee appointed to review the Dean of the Clemson University Libraries be directed to solicit input from faculty and students in all colleges of the University as part of that review; and

FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Faculty Senate requests that the University Administration take that feedback from faculty and students into account in determining whether to renew the present Dean of the Clemson University Libraries in his position.

This Resolution was unanimously passed by the Faculty Senate on November 10, 1998.
REVISION IN SABBATICAL LEAVE POLICY

This Faculty Manual revision was approved by the Policy Committee at the meeting held on October 20, 1998.

Rationale: The current dates for submission of sabbatical leave applications have caused problems in planning teaching assignments in some departments. The changes in dates in the revised policy have been designed to alleviate these problems. The proposed changes in the policy, which is found on page 76 of the Faculty Manual, are in bold. The current wording, which will be changed, is in italics.

* Normally the proposal for a sabbatical leave should be submitted to an elected departmental committee, chaired by the Department Chair, for review no later than January 31 (for sabbaticals beginning in the fall semester) or no later than May 31 June 30 (for sabbaticals beginning in the spring semester).

* The departmental committee’s written recommendation shall be forwarded directly to the Dean of the College with a copy to the applicant. The departmental committee will take no longer than two weeks to submit their recommendation.

* The Dean of the College will forward his or her recommendation to the Provost and the applicant no later than February 28 or June 30 July 31, as appropriate.

* By March 15 or July 15 August 15, the Provost will forward his or her recommendation to the President and inform the applicant, the Dean of the College, and the Chair of the Department of his or her recommendation.
To: Policy Committee Chair John W. Huffman  
Thru: Faculty Senate President Patricia T. Smart  
From: Robert A. Waller, Editorial Consultant  
Re: Definition of Faculty for Senate Allocation Purposes

An ambiguity exists in the Constitution of the Faculty of Clemson University as to who shall be counted in the allocation of the 35 Senate seats among the five colleges and the Library (page 63 of the August 1998 Faculty Manual). The present language provides for the exclusion of emeritus faculty in determining the allocation, but it does not define which faculty members are to be included in the count.

To clarify the situation, it is proposed in paragraph one at the top of page 63 in the section on "Membership" that the second sentence, i.e. "Emeritus faculty are excluded from the Faculty count for the purpose of Senate seat allocation." be replaced with the following (new language underscored):

"For the purpose of Senate allocation, only regular faculty who are eligible to serve in the Faculty Senate (with the exception of emeritus faculty) shall be counted."

The remainder of the paragraph would be unchanged.

Elsewhere in the section on membership there is a definition of those eligible to serve in the Faculty Senate, to wit: "Any member of the Faculty may be eligible for membership on the Faculty Senate except department chairs, school directors, deans, the provost, vice provosts, vice presidents, the president, and others with primarily administrative duties." (page 62).

In this fashion the uncertainty about the numbers of faculty in each college should be clarified by the acceptance of the above language.

Since this change represents an amendment to the Faculty Constitution, it must be presented by the Provost at the next regular meeting of the University faculty in December where a two-thirds vote of those present is required for passage. Any amendment passed by the faculty would then become effective upon approval by the Board of Trustees. Assuming acceptance by all parties, this policy would effect the allocation of Senate seats in February of 1999 for the election in March.

C.C.: Vice President and Provost Steffen H. Rogers  
1998-99 Policy Committee Members  
Mesdames Brenda J. Smart and Cathy T. Sturkie
CLEMSON UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE

FACULTY SENATOR RESPONSIBILITIES

(This is to be inserted in the Senate Handbook, item 5, under Procedural By-laws, after the section on "Assumption of Office")

In order for the Clemson University Faculty Senate to fulfill its duties and responsibilities specified within the Faculty Constitution of the Faculty Manual and Procedural By-laws, individual Senators are expected to:

- Promote and support the mission of the Faculty Constitution
- Abide by the policies and decisions of the Senate
- Advocate the policy positions of the Faculty Senate at all University governance levels
- Communicate effectively with their constituents
- Recommend and assist in recruiting prospective Faculty senators
- Serve as a liaison from the Faculty Senate to the University by attending events of importance to the mission of the Faculty Senate
- Develop and maintain a working knowledge of the Faculty Senate and its programs, as well as current issues of higher education, in general, and Clemson University, in particular.
- Serve on committees and/or task forces voluntarily or as requested
- Prepare for each Senate meeting by reviewing meeting materials and formulating questions and responses to issues
- Attend meetings regularly. Absence from two [2] regularly scheduled meetings during the Senate year (April to March), without prior notice may be grounds for dismissal from Senate membership. Senators who will be unable to attend a meeting should notify the Senate office and their alternate.
MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
DECEMBER 8, 1998

1. Call to Order: President Patricia T. Smart called the meeting to order at 2:37 p.m.

2. Approval of Minutes: The Faculty Senate Minutes dated November 10, 1998, were approved as corrected.

3. “Free Speech”:

Craig Storey, Student Body Vice President, explained students’ views regarding the publishing of syllabi on the Collaborative Learning Environment in order to provide undergraduate students with more information about the courses for which they wish to register. Following this explanation, many questions and answers were exchanged which provided Mr. Storey with his requested input from Faculty.

Olivia Shanahan and April Warner, Representatives from the Classified Staff Commission, announced that this Commission and the Office of Human Resources will hold an open annuity enrollment in April and provided general information on accepted annuities at Clemson University.

4. Committee Reports

a. Welfare - Senator JoAnne Deeken stated that this Committee had met and looked at the idea of dropping students far in advance if fees are unpaid. The Committee believes a better way would be to treat electronic payments as paper payments. The Welfare Report was submitted (Attachment A).

b. Scholastic Policies - Nancy Ferguson, Chair, announced that she will relinquish her duties as Chair of this Committee to begin a Sabbatical and that Senator Fred Switzer will proceed with this honor. Senator Switzer then noted that the most salient issue is the need to rethink the student evaluation form.

c. Finance - Chair John Warner noted that the Finance Committee met on December 3rd to continue discussions on several subjects. This Committee’s Report was submitted and briefly explained by Senator Warner (Attachment B). Senator John Bednar met with Jeff Martin of the Martin Inn to discuss possible financial impacts on the University’s academic programs. A meeting will be held on November 9th among a few Senators and members of the Martin Inn Staff and Board. Senator Kinly Sturkie is preparing a survey to be presented to Faculty seeking information on how much out-of-pocket money they are spending on travel. The Committee is also working on a database on department-by-department budgets.
d. **Policy** - John Huffman, Chair, stated that the Policy Committee met on November 17th to discuss: the Provost's evaluation; draft copy of a tentative resolution regarding a change in the *Faculty Manual* on student evaluations; other methods of teaching evaluations be used and given at least equal weight; rotation and evaluation of department chairs; and the Undergraduate and Graduate Councils. The next meeting will be December 15th at 3:30 p.m. in the Cooper Library.


e. **Research** - Kerry Brooks, Chair, submitted the Committee Report (Attachment C).

### University Commissions and Committees

**Commission to Plan the Future of Clemson University** - Senator Deeken informed the Senate that a group had been formed to look at the recommendations contained within the Final Report from the Commission to Plan the Future of Clemson University. Senator Deeken further noted that this group wants faculty input; that outsiders looking at Clemson was valid, but that it is now time to hear from the faculty. Input is to be forwarded by December 14th.

**Dr. Fran McGuire, Chair of the Ombudsman Subcommittee**, provided a brief report of this Subcommittee which has been operating since last spring. The original intent was that the Ombudsman would deal with issues related to faculty before they became big. Based on volume, this position has been successful: 225 visits or telephone calls; 8-1/2% faculty contact; most concerns regard allocation of department workload, salary, disclaimers, evaluations, reappointment, promotion and tenure. The establishment of this position has proven that it is better to handle situations one-on-one rather than publicly. Gordon Halfacre, University Ombudsman, further noted that faculty compensation, workload, and the evaluation system represent the majority of the 39 different concerns brought to him. Senator Syble Oldaker asked if the establishment of this position had reduced the number of Grievances, to which Dr. Halfacre responded that those statistics were not available at this time.

**ad hoc General Education Committee** - Dr. McGuire announced that Minutes of the *General Education Review Committee* will be released on the Internet and urged Senators to look at them and respond.

Senator Brooks, a member of the *ad hoc Committee on Faculty Evaluations*, stated that he and Senators Eubanks and Leininger met with the Provost and others on November 19th. The decision was made that a memo will be sent stating that evaluations will be returned to faculty only and that the interpretation of "Best Practices" is that a permanent record of summaries needs to be maintained; therefore, a digital record that is accessible will be retained.
5. **President’s Report**: President Smart stated the following:

a. Thanks to Provost Rogers for his quick action and response to concerns regarding the distribution of faculty evaluations.

b. Meeting with Y. T. Shah, Chief Research Officer, was a candid discussion with members of the Executive/Advisory Committee during which Dr. Shah shared his research focus.

c. Departmental visits by the Senate’s President and Vice President continue to provide good information. President Smart encouraged Senators to schedule meetings for their department. A report will be prepared and submitted to the Educational Policy Committee of the Board of Trustees at their request.

d. Grievance Board nominations will be made by the Executive/Advisory Committee to be elected at the January Faculty Senate meeting at which time nominations may also be made from the floor.

e. Larry Bauer, Professor of Agricultural and Applied Economics, was selected by the Senate as the 1998 Class of '39 Award for Excellence recipient.

f. Donations will be accepted towards the Walter T. Cox sculpture and scholarship fund to be presented by the Senate to Dean Cox at the Class of '39 Celebration.

g. Congratulations to Senator Deeken upon her acceptance of a position at Indiana University.

6. **Old Business**  (None)

7. **New Business**

a. Senator John Bednar presented the Resolution Regarding the Proposed University Smoking Policy for acceptance. Following the acceptance of friendly amendments, vote to accept resolution was taken and passed unanimously (FS98-12-1 P) (Attachment D).

b. A Resolution to Improve the Clemson University Telephone Directory was submitted by Senator Robert Campbell for acceptance. There being no discussion, vote to accept was taken and passed (FS98-12-2 P) (Attachment E).

c. Senator Campbell introduced a revised Resolution on Improving the Faculty Activity System at Clemson University for acceptance. Discussion followed. Vote to accept resolution was taken and passed unanimously (FS98-12-3 P) (Attachment F).

d. Senator Campbell withdrew a Resolution on Reducing and Improving the Administration of Clemson University (Attachment G).

e. The Resolution on Electronic Student Evaluations was submitted by Senator Ferguson for adoption. There being no discussion, vote to adopt was taken and passed unanimously (FS98-12-4 P) (Attachment H).

f. Senator Brooks submitted and explained a draft Clemson University Research Data Access & Retention Policy for adoption by the Senate. Vote to adopt draft policy was taken and passed unanimously (Attachment I). This policy will be forwarded to the Editorial Consultant of the Faculty Manual for incorporation.
8. **Announcements**

   a. The Celebration of the Class of '39 will be held at the Madren Center from 6-8:00 p.m. on January 11, 1999. Please respond to invitation.
   
   b. Bell Tower Ceremony to honor Larry Bauer, the 1998 Recipient of the Class of '39 Award for Excellence will be held at 10:00 a.m. on January 12, 1999.
   
   c. President Smart informed the Senate of the inclusion of a faculty member on the Academic Advisory Committee of the CHE thanks to the intervention of Alex Sanders, President of the College of Charleston.
   
   d. Reminder to all by Bob Waller to attend the General Faculty & Staff Meeting at 1:00 p.m. on December 17, 1998 where two amendments to the Faculty Constitution will be considered for approval.

9. **Adjournment:** The meeting was adjourned by President Smart at 4:35 p.m.

   [Signature]

   Elizabeth Dale, Secretary

   [Signature]

   Cathy Toth Sturkie, Administrative Assistant


(Apologies to Bill Gates-cts)
John,

I am truly sorry for the delay in report and also in missing the meeting. I found out Thursday nite that my mother (in a nursing home in Columbia) had fallen and so Friday morning I left early to check on her and to evaluate what needed to be done. Didn’t get back until about 5:pm. (She fell again last nite, this is a real problem)

I met with Stan Smith about 10 days ago to discuss the problem of early drops from registration. He had his burser there who was quite helpful also. We talked about an hour. This is a summary of proceedings.

1. This program of automatic drops from registration for non-payment was instituted about 3 years ago as consequence of approximately 50% of students enrolling without paying fees.

2. The president put pressure on the registrars office to "do something" related to this problem.

3. In the registration materials distributed to students (schedule books) is printed a clear time table (registration calendar p. 3 in fall 98. Notice of cancellation for non-payment is five class days before classes begin. There is the opportunity to re-enroll the day before class and three days later to do the same. This was more of a problem this year because of the weekend which intruded into the first non-pay drop.

4. Stan Smith and the burser both were relatively sympathetic with faculty but also state that since this was instituted the non-payment percentage has dropped significantly each year so that this past year 87% of students had paid prior to first day of class.

5. This has resulted in decreasing administrative positions in the bursers office also.

6. The registrars office continues to be pressured to obtain fees. They are also working to provide students information about how to avoid these problems.

7. They will work with us in any way to diminish the impact on faculty. Got any ideas?

Thanks, John
The Senate Finance Committee met on December 3 at 2:30 in 222 Sirrine Hall. In attendance were John Bednar, Carolyn Brown, Mike Bridgwood, Mike Hammig, Kin Sturkie, and John Warner.

Old Business:

1. John Bednar met with Jeff Martin to discuss questions the Finance Committee has about whether revenue shortfalls at the Martin Inn and golf course could negatively impact academic programs. Mr. Martin’s assessment of the debt and revenue situation of the Martin Inn and golf course is that the chance of negative spillovers is very remote. Pat Smart and John Warner will be meeting with Mr. Martin tomorrow for further discussion. A conference inn financing sheet is attached for informational purposes.

2. Kin Sturkie presented the committee with a draft survey of faculty regarding travel. The purpose of this survey is to find out how often faculty travel, purpose of travel (professional meetings, fundraising, etc.), and how much faculty pay out of their own pockets for these activities. The committee recommended broadening the survey to include categories of faculty expenditure that don’t fall under travel – memberships in professional associations, journal subscriptions, computer software necessary for job, support of student organizations, etc. It is hoped that this expanded survey will give a broad assessment of the ways in which faculty contribute to the university mission out of their own pockets. The committee hopes to administer this survey in February or March.

3. Carolyn Brown is continuing to collect data on graduate student stipends and stipends available at other institutions.

4. John Warner is assembling a database on budgets department by department using the data made available from the Provost. He intends to also include information about number of faculty, number of courses taught, graduate and undergraduate SHEs, etc. Once assembled, the database should prove useful for analysis of questions about the adequacy of funding levels and their allocation across the university.

New Business:

1. Mike Bridgwood inquired whether anyone knew about clearing of Clemson forest land adjacent to the Oconee Airport and whether the university intends to trade that land or other property. Developers apparently have an interest in it, and such an exchange might adversely impact local property owners. Mike Hammig suggested that Mike contact Stassen Thompson for information re management of Clemson Forest land.

The meeting adjourned at 3:30 pm.

John T. Warner
December 4, 1998
The Conference Center and Inn at Clemson University

The Clyde V. Madren Center
- 5 million -- 1986 Capital Improvement Bond Allocation (State Money)
- 1.3 million -- ARAMark Corporate Investment
- 1.5 million -- Federal HUD Grant for Upstate Economic Development
- $450,000 -- Auxiliary Bond Issuance (Clemson University Dining Services)
- $275,000 -- Gift in Kind Estimate
  -- Burlington Industries -- Carpet @ $100,000
  -- Southern Bell -- Technology @ $75,000
  -- Mt. Vernon Mills -- wall covering and fabric -- @ $100,000
Total Estimated Investment: $8,525,000

The John E. Walker Sr. Golf Course
- 2.86 million loan to Finance Corporation -- Wachovia Bank
- $700,000 membership initiation fees (estimate)
- $400,000 naming opportunities (four holes -- IPTAY)
- $1,000,000 John Walker Naming
- $300,000 -- GIK Estimate
  -- Sod Nimmer Turf and Palmetto Turf (1.5 million sf of sod and delivery)
Total Estimated Investment: $5,260,000

The James F. Martin Inn
- 6 million loan to Finance Corporation -- Wachovia Bank
- $200,000 Microban Investment (estimate)
- $65,000 Park Place Corporation
Total Estimated Investment: $6,265,000

The Class of 47 Southern Green and Owen Pavilion
- $417,000 Class Gift
- $83,000 Finance Corporation Investment
Total Estimated Investment: $500,000

Hotel/ Golf Investment: $11,525,000
Project Investment: $24,390,000
Wachovia Bank Current Loan Value: $9,100,000
Committee Members in Attendance: K. Brooks (chair), V. Shelburne

We have selected 4PM on the 3rd Tuesday as our meeting time for the remainder of the academic year. Our next meeting is on January 18, 1999. We meet in room 313, Lee Hall;

The agenda for the meeting was:

1) Old Business: Data Retention Policy;
2) New Business: Meeting with YT Shah, CRO, in conjunction with FS Executive Advisory Committee

Discussion, Actions and Recommendations, by Item Number:

1) Brooks edited the revisions received earlier, and distributed a draft on November 16, 1998. At the meeting two additional changes to this draft were suggested. They are reflected in the November 18, 1998 draft. That draft, as amended, was approved in the meeting. This draft is attached with this report, to be forward to the FS Policy Committee and subsequently to the Senate as a whole for approval. We suggest that reference to this policy be included in the Faculty Manual in the Part VIII. Summary of Selected Campus Policies. As is the case with the Research Ethics Policy we suggest that the Data Retention and Access Policy be housed in Sponsored Programs.

2) The meeting with Dr. Shah was cordial and productive. Of direct relevance to the Research Committee was agreement that the chair of the FS Research Committee serve on the subcommittee of the Provost's Advisory committee that is charged with discussing Institutes on Campus. Dr. Shah appears to have a sound plan in place to achieve growth in research productivity and funding. No dissatisfaction to his objectives were voiced during our meeting. Concern was expressed regarding Institutes developing academic programs. Dr. Shah appears to share our concerns, as expressed in the meeting, that the faculty are receiving conflicting messages regarding the relative importance of research versus teaching. It was agreed that this issue needs broader discussion involving the faculty, the provost and other concerned parties.

3) We adjourned at 2:30 PM.

Written by K. Brooks, 18 November 1998.
RESOLUTION REGARDING
THE PROPOSED UNIVERSITY SMOKING POLICY AND INDOOR AIR QUALITY
AT CLEMSON UNIVERSITY

FS98-12-1 P

WHEREAS, The following proposal has been made by the Campus Building Air and Water Quality Control Committee:

PROPOSED UNIVERSITY SMOKING POLICY

1. PURPOSE
The purpose of this policy is to protect overall health and air quality within Clemson University buildings (new word, facilities was word used on 11-5-98) and thereby to foster a healthful and safe working environment within those buildings (new).

2. REFERENCE
South Carolina Clean Indoor Air Act as subsequently amended.

3. POLICY
All Clemson University buildings (new) are smoke-free environments. Smoking is not allowed inside any Clemson University buildings (new). The possession of lighted smoking material in any form is prohibited in all areas of buildings (new) operated by or under control of Clemson University. Within the guidelines of the South Carolina Clean Indoor Air Act, residence halls may have separate policies governing the use of lighted smoking materials.

RESOLVED, That the Faculty Senate enthusiastically supports the above policy; and

FURTHER RESOLVED, That Clemson University undertakes efforts to abate or eliminate other threats to indoor air quality with comparable vigor.

This resolution was passed unanimously by the Faculty Senate on December 8, 1998.
A RESOLUTION TO IMPROVE

THE CLEMSON UNIVERSITY TELEPHONE DIRECTORY

FS98-12-2-P

WHEREAS, The rank of Adjunct Professor or Biomedical Professor is essentially honorific at Clemson University, and does not entail teaching or research activity on campus, even on a part-time basis;

WHEREAS, Adjunct Professors and Biomedical Professors are currently listed in the Faculty and Staff section of the Clemson University Telephone Directory, creating the misleading impression that they are regular employees of the University;

RESOLVED, That all Adjunct Professors and Biomedical Professors be removed from the Faculty and Staff section of the Telephone Directory and listed in a separate section between the Faculty and Staff section and the Student section; and

FURTHER RESOLVED, That telephone numbers on campus not be given for Adjunct or Biomedical Professors who have no office on campus, and that off-campus telephone numbers in the Telephone Directory be listed with the appropriate area code, instead of being treated as though they originate within the 864 area code.

This resolution was passed by the Faculty Senate on December 8, 1998.
RESOLUTION ON IMPROVING THE FACULTY ACTIVITY SYSTEM
AT CLEMSON UNIVERSITY
Revised 12/8/98
FS98-12-3 P

WHEREAS, The Faculty Activity System Manual currently states that Sponsored Research (not Research, in general) is part of Clemson University's mission;

WHEREAS, The Faculty Activity System counts writing grant and contract applications as Sponsored Research, even though writing applications brings in no revenue;

WHEREAS, The Faculty Activity System and its documentation clearly separate Non-Sponsored Research from Sponsored Research but do not clearly signal the importance of Non-Sponsored Research;

WHEREAS, Information derived from the Faculty Activity System could be used to punish productive faculty members whose research is not expensive enough to justify applying for grants and contracts, or whose research can be affordably supported by the University while its subject matter is not being accorded priority by government agencies or industry sources; and

WHEREAS, Most faculty members who aim to carry out Sponsored Research will not be competitive for grants or contracts until they have already compiled a track record of Non-Sponsored Research;

RESOLVED, That the Faculty Activity System and its documentation be revised so that both Non-Sponsored Research and Sponsored Research may be included within the first 9 Credit Hour Equivalents of a faculty member’s activity;

FURTHER RESOLVED, That the documentation for the Faculty Activity System make clear that Non-Sponsored Research is part of the University’s mission; and

FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Faculty Activity System record no activity as Sponsored Research unless it is supported by grants and contracts during the semester or academic year in question.

This resolution was passed unanimously by the Faculty Senate on December 8, 1998.
A RESOLUTION ON REDUCING AND IMPROVING
THE ADMINISTRATION OF CLEMSON UNIVERSITY

Revised 11/30/98

WHEREAS, Clemson University exists to provide instruction, research, and public service, not to guarantee employment for managers;

WHEREAS, Clemson University cannot reasonably anticipate substantial increases in State funding;

WHEREAS, Clemson University is now failing to maintain its academic operations and must spend substantially more on them to restore them to health;

WHEREAS, Restoring the Library alone to an adequate standard of performance will cost an additional $5 million per year;

WHEREAS, Clemson University doubled its administration between 1985 and 1992, while the number of full-time faculty remained constant during this period and student enrollment increased about 40%;

WHEREAS, No coherent functional rationale has ever been given for this massive administrative expansion, or for the fundamental reordering of the University's priorities that it implied;

WHEREAS, a 40% increase in the number of administrators over the 1985 level (which was approximately 190) would be more than sufficient to accommodate increases in enrollment;

WHEREAS, Clemson University has resisted downsizing its administration even in the face of severe financial constraints, perpetuating the consequences of past expansion and burdening the University with approximately 380 administrators in Academics, Extension, and the Central Administration (since there are around 950 full-time faculty, this means that there is 1 administrator for every 2.5 full-time faculty members); and

WHEREAS, The direct cost of keeping 100 unnecessary administrators at Clemson is upwards of $6 million a year in salary and benefits-money that could be going to restore the Library and to begin to address other urgent academic priorities;
RESOLVED, That Clemson University properly reorganize its administration by making a permanent net reduction of 100 administrative positions in Academics, Extension, and the Central Administration (this would be a 26% reduction in administrative positions from the current level);

FURTHER RESOLVED, That a list of the current administrative positions in Academics, Extension, and the Central Administration be compiled by the Budget Accountability Committee, using its standard job categories;

FURTHER RESOLVED, That President Curris appoint a special Commission, consisting of faculty, administration, and staff representatives, with the charge of identifying the specific administrative positions to be cut from this list;

FURTHER RESOLVED, That this Commission produce, by January 1, 2000, a public report specifying each of the 100 administrative positions to be cut and the functional reasons for cutting them;

FURTHER RESOLVED, That this list be submitted to the Board of Trustees for approval;

FURTHER RESOLVED, That if the cuts are approved by the Board, all of the positions to be eliminated will be terminated no later than January 1, 2001;

FURTHER RESOLVED, That no non-managerial staff positions be proposed for cutting except as necessitated by the proposed closure or consolidation of administrative units, and that no numerical targets be set for reductions in staff positions;

FURTHER RESOLVED, That no academic Department Chair positions be included in the 100 administrative positions to be cut;

FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Commission not transfer units from one of the five academic Colleges to another, nor propose cutting any of the five academic Dean positions;

FURTHER RESOLVED, That any administrator whose position has been cut shall, if rehired in another position, be paid a salary truly commensurate with the responsibilities of the new position;

FURTHER RESOLVED, That any administrator who possesses a tenured faculty title and chooses to return to faculty work shall carry a full faculty workload by the standards of the receiving department, and shall receive a base salary no greater than the average base salary for faculty members at the same rank in the same department plus 10% (except when the administrator has previously done faculty work in the same
department, in which case his or her last base salary for doing faculty work plus 10% may be used to set the limit;)

FURTHER RESOLVED, That no new administrative positions be created in Academics, Extension, or the Central Administration between January 1, 2001, and January 1, 2011, without at least an offsetting reduction in existing administrative positions; and

FURTHER RESOLVED, That after administrative positions are permanently reduced in number by 100, increases in base salary for administrators in a given academic year shall henceforth be allowed to attain the same average percentage of base salary as increases in base salary for faculty members.

This resolution was withdrawn from consideration by the Faculty Senate.
RESOLUTION ON
ELECTRONIC STUDENT EVALUATIONS

FS98-12-4 P

WHEREAS, A survey of universities and colleges thought to be using electronic student evaluations campus-wide has found only electronic surveys done for web-based classes and for individual classes;

WHEREAS, At least two of these schools indicated that, in their opinion, going to a campus-wide electronic system of teacher evaluation was a serious mistake; and

WHEREAS, The Faculty Senate does not want to discourage any kind of pilot study or proposal to determine the effectiveness of electronic student evaluations;

RESOLVED, That Clemson University discontinue plans for making University-wide student evaluations of instructors electronic.

This resolution was passed unanimously by the Faculty Senate.
INTRODUCTION
In the exacting pursuit of meritorious research where honest challenges toward research findings are encouraged; when charges of fraudulent scientific processes may be encountered; and when legislative mandates are received, the University must focus its efforts toward policy development concerning administration of research in order to establish clear ownership and to ensure the integrity, access, and preservation of the University's research records.

DEFINITION OF RESEARCH DATA
Information of a scientific or technical nature that is created, assembled, or accumulated and which, as a standard practice, is recorded in the course of a university supported research project is defined as research data. The terms “research record(s)” or “record(s)” or “research data” are considered interchangeable within the context of this policy statement.

The meaning of the term may vary from field to field, and the University will rely upon the standard practices of the relevant field to serve as the guiding principle.

For the purpose of this policy, the term “research data” does not include financial, business or management records or pertaining to award administration.

RESEARCH DATA OWNERSHIP & RETENTION
Except when expressly provided otherwise by contractual agreement, ownership of research data resides with the University. Individuals responsible for the generation of research data (e.g., faculty, students, staff) have a legal obligation, as well as potential future benefits, to ensure that such data are properly cared for and retained. To this end, the Principal Investigator of a research project is primarily responsible for:

1. The proper recording, retention and preservation of all original research records as expected within the standard operational practices of the relevant field;

2. The careful supervision and education of all relevant project personnel concerning these necessary procedures;
3. The timely reporting to the immediate supervisor, upon discovery, of significant instances of non-compliance of this policy statement.

Research records should include sufficient detail to permit examination for the purposes of replicating the research; to respond to questions that may result from unintentional error or misinterpretation; to establish the authenticity and origin of research data, and ultimately to confirm the validity of the project’s conclusions and/or published findings.

In general, if the retention period for research data is not otherwise established by the contractual terms of a sponsored project, a period of no less than five years, either after professional publication of final research findings, or after project completion (whichever is longer) may be adequate unless an extended period is necessary in connection with other project related matters, e.g., inquiries concerning scientific misconduct that are underway or impending. Regarding patent data, the period of retention should extend at least through the life of the patent, and longer if considered necessary to protect against a claim of interference, infringement, or liability.

**RESEARCH DATA CUSTODY AND ACCESS**

The responsibility for a project’s research data retention and preservation lies with the Principal Investigator, and accordingly the Principal Investigator is considered the custodian of research data, unless circumstances require assignment of custodial responsibilities to another appropriately qualified University academician. Transfer of custodian responsibility for whatever cause will be formally recorded as an approved action by the department chair, director, or dean in accord with college policy. If the project is supported by grant or contract funds, a copy documenting the custodian transfer will also be provided to the Senior Vice Provost for Research for record filing.

**FREEDOM OF INFORMATION (FOI)**

The opinion of the Principal Investigator will be consulted and considered upon receipt of FOI requests, although the University, as owner of those records, reserves the right to seek the judgement of University legal counsel to ultimately determine rights of access under FOI circumstances should differences of opinion rise.

**CONFIDENTIAL DATA**

The University’s responsibility to safeguard research data from unauthorized disclosure must be recognized as a priority by the individuals entrusted with those records. Any data generated as confidential shall be treated as such in perpetuity.

**PHYSICAL LOCATION**

The physical location of original research records is expected to be within the premises of the University facilities. Circumstances will arise that will justify reasonable exceptions to this practice;
however, as long as proper control and oversight is maintained by the University, the custodian in consultation with their supervisor may determine the appropriate measures for administration of this policy and the security of original records.

Faculty that retire, or terminate their employment and transfer to another institution may negotiate with the department chair, director or dean as appropriate (and Chief Research Officer if a sponsored project is involved), and enter into a "transfer agreement" that specifically describes the extent of original research data (notebooks, lab records, etc.) to be transferred or otherwise relinquished, to the faculty member, or their new institution. In such agreements the University will be guaranteed the full and prompt access (without cost or fee) to any original records transferred to an external party. Prior to the departure of the faculty member, affected research records remaining with the University must be inventoried and custodial responsibility reassigned.

DESTRUCTION OF DATA
Scheduled destruction of research records archival control may take place without further notice, review, or approval. Any other proposed action that would render those records unusable or, in effect, destroyed is unauthorized and cannot occur without advance notice to and approval by the department head, director, or dean responsible for the safeguarding of the project's research records.

RECORD KEEPING
While it is not the intent of, nor deemed necessary for this policy statement to require extraordinarily detailed record keeping of the specific whereabouts of research records, their prompt access by individuals seeking to conduct purposeful research, appropriate administrative reviews, or legal inquiry must be assured.

For further information contact Clemson University Records Management.
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