1. **Call to Order.** President Ronald J. Thurston called the meeting to order at 3:32 p.m.

2. **Approval of Minutes.** The Faculty Senate Minutes of December 10, 1996 were approved as corrected.

3. **Special Order of the Day -** David Stalnaker, Executive Director of the Commission on the Future of Clemson University, provided an update on the plans for this Commission, and sought recommendations for membership to the Commission from members of the Faculty Senate.

4. **Committee Reports**
   
   a. **Committee Reports**

   **Policy Committee.** Senator Pat Smart announced that the Policy Committee will next meet on January 21, 1997.

   **Research Committee.** Senator Tom Jenkins stated that the Committee will work with Bill Geer on research data access and retention (which may be brought to the full Senate in February, 1997), and will also work with Naomi Kelly to review a chemical hygiene plan by OSHA (Attachment A).

   **Scholastic Policies Committee.** Senator Syd Cross stated that the Scholastic Policies Committee will meet with Stan Smith and Marie Popham regarding the issue of grade inflation. Several concerns regarding the academic calendar have arisen which will be addressed by this Committee.

   **Welfare Committee.** Senator Kathy Neal Headley noted that a few statistics from the 1996 Faculty Survey were shared with the General Faculty and Staff at the meeting in December, and that this Committee continues to work on the completion of the comments. A published report of the results of the Survey is in process. Senate Alternate Robert Campbell then announced that he was to present an analysis of faculty and administration salaries between $30,000-$50,000, but that during his research, inaccuracies were noticed within the information received from the Office of Institutional Research. In his opinion, therefore, a true analysis cannot be performed until this information is presented correctly. A discussion was held regarding definitions of “administrator” and “faculty member” applied to salary analyses.

   **Finance Committee.** Senator Roger Doost submitted and discussed a summary of items addressed by this Committee (Attachment B).
b. University Commissions and Committees

(1) Joint City/University Committee - Vice President/President-Elect Fran McGuire noted that a formal proposal had been presented to change the name of Old Greenville Highway to University Boulevard on the stretch of road through campus. Strong objections or statements of support are to be forwarded to Dr. McGuire.

5. President's Report. Noting that Clemson has made great progress, President Thurston stated that excellence and academics are primary goals. Dr. Thurston further noted, however, that the future of education in this state is of great concern, and encouraged senators to contact Legislators regarding performance funding and to remind them of the importance of education.

6. Old Business (None)

7. New Business

a. Faculty Manual Editorial Consultant, Robert A. Waller, sought to bring two tabled Faculty Manual changes to the floor for consideration. It was decided that since the documents were not available to the Senate at this meeting, they would not be considered today.

b. Senator Michael Morris asked for a Sense of the Senate to propose the creation of a permanent committee on faculty and administration productivity to replace the ad hoc Committee on Accountability. Sense of the Senate was taken and passed. Senator Morris will draft a proposal to submit to Policy Committee for consideration.

c. Senator McGuire questioned the exclusion of graduate education in performance funding indicators. President Thurston suggested that senators do what they can to heighten awareness of such oversights. President Thurston then announced that in response to the Board of Trustees, he is planning to appoint a committee to position Clemson for performance funding.

d. The Advisory Committee submitted nominees for the Grievance Board, and the floor was opened for additional nominations. There being none, nominations were closed and the election of five members to the Grievance Board was held by secret ballot. Elected were: Gordon Halfacre (AFLS); Mike Vatalaro (AAH); Mary LaForge (B&PA); Bill Hare (E&S); and JoAnne Deeken (Library).

e. In response to the President's Newsletter, Senator Martin Jacobi inquired if the Senate would be interested in requesting President Constantine W. Curris to right the wrongs that have been done in the past. Discussion was held.

f. Senator Matthew Saltzman reminded the Senate to complete and return the Faculty Senate Web Page Questionnaire that was distributed at the December meeting.

g. Senator Kerry Brooks questioned for discussion the Faculty Senate's goal regarding salaries; raised the issue of disequity between departments and colleges; and inquired about an appropriate approach to this issue.
8. **Adjournment.** President Thurston adjourned the meeting at 5:17 p.m.

\[\text{Signature}\]
Kathy Neal Headley, Secretary

\[\text{Signature}\]
Cathy Toth Sturkie, Administrative Assistant

The Faculty Senate Finance and Welfare Committees have been struggling with some basic questions in at least the past six years, and the explanations and answers provided by the Administration have not been so far satisfactory. The key questions are:

1) How much of this university's resources go toward teaching, research, and service in Faculty salary and benefits?
2) How much of this university's resources go to administrative salaries and benefits?
3) What are other costs of administering this institution?
4) What has been the trend of the past 10 years?
5) What have we saved from restructuring that can be substantiated through accounting records?
6) Why have the top administrators consistently received raises and benefits exceeding 4 to 5 times as much as those received by Faculty?

In a meeting between the Senate officers and the Provost on November 19, 1996, it was suggested by Provost Rogers to establish a committee on "University Accountability". Dr. Ron Thurston, President of the Faculty Senate, appointed Dr. Gordon Halfacre, Alumni professor of Horticulture and past president of the Senate and previous Chair of Welfare Committee, Dr. James R. Davis, Professor of Accountancy and previous Chair of Finance Committee, and Dr. Roger K. Doost, Professor of Accountancy and current Chair of the Finance Committee to form the Committee on University Accountability.

The Committee reviewed the findings of the Finance Committee, Welfare Committee as well as the financial data provided by the Budget Office in its initial meetings and came to these preliminary conclusions:

1. The administration has not provided specific, verifiable evidence of where the millions of dollars of savings from restructuring are.
2. From the Faculty's perspective, the current system of reporting is confusing and unclear.
3. The breakdown between teaching, research, and public service in current financial reports does not reflect reality.
4. There is no clear breakdown between faculty salaries, administrators' salaries, and other direct and indirect costs.
5. The administration has grown by over 110 percent since 1983. Student population has grown by 36 percent within this time period, and faculty numbers has shrunk during the same time period.
6. The astronomical growth of administration in the past 10 years is hidden within the current accounting system.

The following summary data is based on a digital tape provided by the Budget Office - for Fiscal 1996:

Total faculty salary and benefits $70 million dollars
Total administrators' salary and benefits 72 million dollars
All other costs (supplies, travel, scholarships, etc.) 74 million dollars
Total costs excluding Auxiliary Enterprises and Extension $216 million dollars

The Accountability Committee is meeting with Provost Rogers and Mr. Scott Ludlow, CFO to look into these important Faculty concerns and to find ways of providing better accountability for Clemson University and its constituents.

On its December 10, 1996 meeting of the Faculty Senate, the following three resolutions were introduced and passed either unanimously or by an overwhelming majority vote:

FS96-12-1P: RESOLUTION CONCERNING THE ALLEGED SAVINGS FROM RESTRUCTURING
Whereas, It was claimed that the University savings from restructuring amounts to over eight million dollars annually;
Whereas, These claims do not seem to be substantiated by the financial data in the possession of the Faculty Senate;
Whereas, The only claimed saving in the Colleges seems to be a shift of approximately 4 million dollars from department heads account to faculty salary and benefits account for department chairs and others; and
Whereas, It appears that the work duties of most department chairs is not substantially different from that of previous department heads;
Resolved, That the Senate requests a clear and accurate report of savings from restructuring as substantiated by the University’s accounting records.

FS96-12-2P: RESOLUTION ON ANNUAL FINANCIAL REPORTING TO FACULTY
Whereas, Teaching, research, and service are the main mission of this University;
Whereas, Clear financial reporting and accountability is bound to enhance control and better utilization of resources in the future; and
Whereas, The current financial reports do not reflect how resources are allocated among teaching, research, service, and public service;
Whereas, It appears that the work duties of most department chairs is not substantially different from that of previous department heads;
Resolved, That the Senate urges the administration to take measures to provide the following information to the Senate (in hard copy and in digital format) on an annual basis:
1) Faculty and instructor salary and benefits by department, college, and for the University as a whole.
2) Administrators’ salary and benefits by department, College, other units, and for the University as a whole.
3) Other costs broken down by department, college, other units, and for the University as a whole.
4) Comparative data on above for the past ten (10) years.
Further Resolved, that the Finance Committee of the Senate will cooperate in operationalizing these suggestions.

FS96-12-3P: RESOLUTION REGARDING DISPARITY BETWEEN ADMINISTRATORS AND FACULTY PAY
Whereas, At least over the past five (5) years, top administrators have received raises which, on the average, have been one hundred fifty (150%) percent to three hundred (300%) percent as much as those given to Faculty;
Resolved, That the Faculty Senate deplores these practices and recommends that measures be instituted for a fair distribution of raises in the future.

A fourth resolution dealing with suggestions on how to address the question of equity in raises through a performance based formula was tabled for further elaboration and analysis by the committee.

Provost Rogers and CFO Scott Ludlow will direct the task force which will assist in responding to these long standing questions of the Faculty.

Roger K. Doost, Chair, Finance & Accountability Committees
MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE
FEBRUARY 11, 1997

1. Call to Order. President Ronald J. Thurston called the meeting to order at 3:34 p.m.

2. Approval of Minutes. The Faculty Senate Minutes of January 14, 1997 were approved as corrected.

3. a. Presentation of Slate of Officers. President Thurston presented the slate of officers from the Advisory Committee of the Faculty Senate:

   Vice President/President-Elect: Beth Kunkel (AFLS)
   Pat Smart (HEHD)

   Secretary: Kathy Neal Headley (HEHD)

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

   b. Oral Statement from Nominees - Oral statements were presented to the Senate by each candidate seeking the office of Vice President/President-Elect.

4. Special Order of the Day - As a member of the ad hoc Faculty Senate Web Page Committee, Professor Glenn Birrenkott presented the results of this Committee's work so far. Dr. Birrenkott explained the possibilities for the Web site and requested input from senators. The Faculty Senate Web site can be found by using the URL: http://www/lib.Clemson.edu/fs/fac senate.html.

5. Committee Reports

   a. Committee Reports

   Policy Committee. Senator Pat Smart announced that the Policy Committee will next meet on February 18, 1997 and will submit Faculty Manual changes under New Business. Vice President/President-Elect Francis A. McGuire inquired about the effect on fall semester teaching evaluations of faculty from January to January being actually performed in late December. The Policy Committee will pursue this item.

   Research Committee. Senator Tom Jenkins submitted this Committee's Report (Attachment A).

   Scholastic Policies Committee. Senator Syd Cross submitted the Report on Grade Distribution (this Report is on file in the Faculty Senate Office for perusal).
Welfare Committee. Senator Kathy Neal Headley submitted report (Attachment B) and noted that resolutions from this Committee would be brought forward under New Business.

Finance Committee. Senator Roger Doost submitted and discussed the Report from this Committee (Attachment C) and the Report from the Accountability Committee (Attachment D); and noted that two resolutions will be presented under New Business. Discussion followed during which President Thurston stated that the problems have been identified and that it is now time to find the answers.

b. University Commissions and Committees

(1) Faculty Senate Select Committee on Sabbaticals - Senator John Huffman stated that this Committee had obtained from the appropriate office a list of all faculty members who have received sabbaticals since 1991, but that administrators' names were not included in this information. This Committee will pursue this information and will suggest a timetable for applying for sabbaticals to be uniform across campus.

c. Faculty Senate Select Committee to Study Grievance Procedures - Vice President/President-Elect McGuire submitted and moved for acceptance the Report from this Committee which was seconded (Attachment D). Vote was taken to accept Report and passed unanimously. Discussion was held. Senator Dale Linvill moved that this Committee be instructed by the Faculty Senate to schedule a conference with the provost and appropriate administrators to discuss this Report and develop suggestions to proceed on the adoption of the recommendations. Motion was seconded. Two friendly amendments were offered to and accepted by Senator Linvill. Vote was taken to have the Faculty Senate Policy Committee meet with the Provost to discuss this Report and determine next course of action and passed unanimously. Comments regarding this Report should be forwarded to the Chair of the Policy Committee before the next Senate meeting.

6. Old Business

a. Senator Headley provided a history of Faculty Senate Resolution 96-4-1 P and the response by the Provost at that time (Attachment E), and submitted the Resolution on Development of Program for Faculty Compensation for consideration by the Senate. Motion was made to bring resolution to the floor. Vote was taken to bring to floor and passed. Senator Huffman moved to refer resolution back to Committee for a definition of "representative committee" which was seconded. Vote on motion to refer back to Committee was taken and failed. Following discussion, vote to accept resolution was taken and passed unanimously (FS96-2-1 P) (Attachment F).

7. New Business

a. Senator Smart brought forward six Faculty Manual changes proposed by the Policy Committee for action by the Senate. The changes were discussed and voted on individually. Passed unanimously by the Senate were: Modification of Consulting Policy Approval Route (for information), Financial Aid Representation on Fellowship Committee, Provision for Undergraduate Academic Grievances Committee and Provision for Graduate Academic Grievances Committee. The proposed change regarding the insertion of a paragraph on Mid-Term Grades was also passed. Motion was made and seconded to have the proposed Modification of Coordinator Role in Affirmative Action referred back to Committee for clarification (to be re-considered at the March Faculty Senate meeting) (Attachment G).
b. Senator Doost submitted the Resolution on Fund Pull Backs for consideration. Vote on a friendly amendment was taken and passed unanimously and the vote on the resolution was taken and resolution passed (FS96-2-2 P (Attachment H)).

c. Senator Doost then introduced the Resolution Regarding Better Utilization of University Resources to the Senate for approval. Vote was taken and resolution passed (FS96-2-3 P) (Attachment I).

d. Senator Headley noted that in order to submit the Resolution on the Office of Institutional Research a two-thirds vote to bring to the floor was necessary. Vote was taken and passed. Discussion was held regarding the resolution. The vote to accept resolution was taken and passed (FS96-2-4 P) (Attachment J).

e. Senator Jenkins informed the Faculty Senate that the search for a Vice President of Natural Resources has been re-opened; but that this process will now be open only to previous candidates and any new internal candidates. Senator Jenkins noted that this action will set a dangerous precedent. Senator Huffman made the motion: that the Faculty Senate (1) condems the re-opening of the search to include only the addition of internal candidates and (2) requests the President of the University to re-open the search on a national basis. Call for quorum was raised.

8. Adjournment A quorum of the Senate was not present, therefore, the meeting was adjourned at 5:49 p.m.

Kathy Neal Headley, Secretary

Cathy Toth Sturkie, Administrative Assistant

Absent: S. Gauthreaux, H. Wheeler (M. Worrell for), G. Bautista, M. Jacobi, B. Stephens (R. Campbell for), S. Amirkhanian, T. Taylor
Minutes
Faculty Senate Research Committee
January 23, 1997

Members Present: Kunkel, Gauthreaux, Skipper, Jenkins, and Makram

S. Gauthreaux asked for an update on the proposal to increase the limit on equipment spending from $500 to $5000 without the need for sponsor authorization. The Committee will continue to seek information on the status of this proposal.

Bill Geer from Sponsored Programs attended the meeting to discuss his proposal for a Policy on Retention of Records and Data. He stated that the need for a formal policy covering data and record retention was cited in a review by NSF last year. The deadline for adoption of a formal policy has been pushed back at the request of the University, but is still needed within a couple months. Mr. Geer's proposal was written following review of policies at other institutions. The Committee discussed wording and intent in several sections of the proposed Policy, and submitted written comments to Mr. Geer. Mr. Geer indicated he would make revisions and send a revised copy of the Policy to the Research Committee for its further review. The Research Committee then would pass it along to the Faculty Senate Research committee for their review and approval.

Naomi Kelly from EHS and Dr. Don Henricks, Chair of IBC, attended the meeting to discuss action by the committee on review and approval of a Chemical Hygiene Plan by EHS. The Research Committee was asked in November last year to sign the Plan indicating its approval of the document. The Committee met in a special meeting in December and asked for a meeting of representatives from EHS and IBC. Following discussion of the Plan, including its organization and contents, the Committee decided to sign the document only to indicate that it has been reviewed by the Committee with the agreement that further review and changes be made as problems are identified by either the Research Committee or other faculty.

The next meeting of the Faculty Senate Research committee will be held on Wednesday, February 5 at 3 pm in 104 McAdams Hall.

Submitted by

Tom Jenkins, Chair
Faculty Senate Welfare Committee
January 28, 1997

Attending 1/28/97: Robert Campbell; Kathy Neal Headley, Chair; Clint Isbell; Pat Smith; Frank Tainter

(1) Faculty Survey: Compiling comments from the surveys is in the final stage of completion. Frank Tainter will review the complete document and provide a summary for University distribution. Complete copies of all comments will be forwarded to President Curris and Provost Rogers. The Welfare Committee has also recommended that complete copies of comments should be located in the Faculty Senate Office and Cooper Library, on the Faculty Senate Web page, and with the College Deans' offices.

(2) Salary Data: Provost Rogers, the Accountability Committee (Roger Doost, Jim Davis, and Gordon Halfacre), Robert Campbell, Scott Ludlow, Debra Jackson, David Fleming, and Kaye Lawson have discussed two phases of plans for further analysis of the salary data.
   Phase I - Establishing a job classification system with set job categories for permanent full time employees.
   Phase II - Salary data for 1990-91 forward analyzed according to the new classification system. This should provide more precise information about salaries for faculty, staff, and administration.

Total salary compensation for faculty, staff, and administration is important information that our present computer system cannot process. Upgrades to the system are needed.

Once the two phases are completed, additional salary analyses will be reported later this spring.

(3) The Office of Institutional Research is working to correct data in the salary report published during the 1996 fall semester. With the retirement of Nick Lomax, the Welfare Committee recommends that OIR report to Provost Rogers.

(4) Status of Women Resolution: Pat Smith and Gloria Bautista will update resolution with additional information.

(5) Faculty incentives at other universities: Pat Smith will gather information about this issue from our benchmark institutions.

(6) Faculty sick leave: A person can accumulate up to 180 days of sick leave. Sick leave is not lost, even if you never use it. The only way to lose sick leave is if a person changes to a position which does not offer sick leave. Then, the person would still retain the original accumulation. A person could also lose sick leave if some other change in position occurred and records were not changed. It is important to check your records.

(7) Faculty Service: No discussion at the Jan. 28th meeting.

(8) Next meeting:

The Welfare Committee will meet in the Tillman 102 conference room on Tuesday, February 18 at 3:00pm.

Please note the earlier time.
The Question of Pay Equity
What happens if top administrators’ raises remain at an average of 6% and average faculty and staff raises remain at 3% - Using 1996 as the base year; then, working backward and forward:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>President’s</th>
<th>Ave. Faculty’s</th>
<th>Janitorial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>$142,276</td>
<td>$42,711</td>
<td>$7,537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>150,813</td>
<td>43,993</td>
<td>7,763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>159,861</td>
<td>45,313</td>
<td>7,996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>169,453</td>
<td>46,672</td>
<td>8,236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>179,620</td>
<td>48,072</td>
<td>8,483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>190,398</td>
<td>49,515</td>
<td>8,738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>199,422</td>
<td>51,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>211,387</td>
<td>52,530</td>
<td>9,270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>224,071</td>
<td>54,106</td>
<td>9,548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>237,515</td>
<td>57,352</td>
<td>9,835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>251,766</td>
<td>59,073</td>
<td>10,130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on these assumptions, if the current trends continue, president’s pay which was about 3.3 times of the faculty pay and 19 times of a janitor’s pay in 1990 will be about 4.3 times of the faculty pay and 25 times of a janitor’s pay by the year 2000. That is why we think that pay parity and pay equity are very important.
Clemson University’s Financial Summary
Based on 1996 data
Some numbers are estimated

| TENURED & TENURE-TRACK FACULTY | 860 | $61 million |
| INSTRUCTORS, ADJUNCTS, EXTENSION, ETC | 483 (EST.) | $18 million |
| Total | 1,343 | $79 million@ |

ALL OTHER SALARIES | 129 million
ALL OTHER COSTS | 71 million
AUXILIARY ENTERPRISES (NET) | 43 million
TOTAL | 322 million

@ 1,100 * $51,000 * 1.4 = $78,540,000

Estimate of Faculty Cost Breakdown:
Teaching | 32 million
Research | 24 million
Service | 16 million
Other | 7 million
Total | 79 million

It is estimated that only 10% of University resources in terms of Faculty pay goes to classroom teaching.

Submitted for future analysis and reflection by the Faculty Senate
better accountability for Clemson University and its constituents.

Additionally, to express its concerns, the Faculty Senate, at its December 10, 1996 meeting passed three resolutions, summarized as follows:

FS96-12-1P: Related to the University's claim of savings from restructuring amounting to over eight million dollars annually; it was Resolved, That the Senate requests a clear and accurate report of savings from restructuring as substantiated by the University's accounting records.

FS96-12-2P: Related to the University's main mission of teaching, research, and service; it was Resolved, That the Senate urges the administration to take measures to provide the following information to the Senate (in hard copy and in digital format) on an annual basis:

1) Faculty and instructor salary and benefits by department, college, and for the University as a whole.
2) Administrators' salary and benefits by department, college, other units, and for the University as a whole.
3) Other costs broken down by department, college, other units, and for the University as a whole.
4) Comparative data on above for the past ten (10) years.

FS96-12-3P: Related to raise differences over the past five years where top administrators have received raises which, on the average, have been one hundred fifty (150%) percent to three hundred (300%) percent as much as those given to Faculty; it was Resolved, That the Faculty Senate deplores these practices and recommends that measures be instituted for a fair distribution of raises in the future.

Ron Thurston, President Faculty Senate
Kathy Headley, Chair, Senate Welfare Committee
Gordon Halfacre, Member, Senate Accountability Committee
James R. Davis, Member, Senate Accountability Committee
Roger K. Doost, Chair, Finance & Accountability Committees

February 1, 1997
Accountability Committee’s Report to the Faculty

Peter Drucker, the well-known management guru in his article "Be Data Literate - Know What to Know," states: "Few executives yet know how to ask: What information do I need to do my job? And from whom should I be getting it? Fewer still ask: What new tasks can I tackle now that I get all these data? Which tasks should I do differently? Practically no one asks: What information do I owe? To whom? When? In what form?" Clemson University is no different. While the faculty has been pleading for years about the need for accountability, it has only recently received attention by the administration.

The Faculty Senate Finance and Welfare Committees have been struggling with understanding some of the basic reporting and organizational responsibilities of the university. This has been in part due to the explanations and answers provided by the University Administration. Some of the key concerns and questions that have been raised include:

1. How much of the university’s resources go toward teaching, research, and service and what are the exact totals for faculty salary and benefits?
2. How much of the university’s resources go to administrative salaries and benefits?
3. What are other costs of administering this institution?
4. What has been the trend of the past 10 years?
5. What have we saved from college restructuring that can be substantiated through accounting records?
6. Why have many top administrators consistently received raises and benefits far exceeding those received by faculty and staff?

In recent months, Senate President Ron Thurston and Provost Steffen H. Rogers agreed that a committee should be established on “University Accountability”. Dr. Ron Thurston, President of the Faculty Senate, appointed Dr. Gordon Halfacre, Alumni professor of Horticulture, past president of the Senate, and previous Chair of Welfare Committee; Dr. James R. Davis, Professor of Accountancy, and previous Chair of Finance Committee; and Dr. Roger K. Doost, Professor of Accountancy, and current Chair of the Finance Committee to form this committee.

The Committee began by reviewing the findings of the Finance Committee, Welfare Committee and data provided by the Budget Office and generally agreed with the concerns of the Faculty Senate Finance and Welfare Committees. The Committee continues to refine the list of concerns and welcomes comments from any university employee.

The Accountability Committee is meeting frequently with Provost Rogers, CFO Scott Ludlow, and others to examine these faculty concerns and to find ways of providing
MEMORANDUM

TO: RONALD J. THURSTON, PRESIDENT
    FACULTY SENATE

FROM: FACULTY SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE TO STUDY GRIEVANCE PROCEDURES

Francis A. McGuire, Chair
Kerry R. Brooks
R. Gordon Halfacre
Kenneth R. Murr
E. Arlene Privette

Alan Schaffer
Horace D. Skipper
Webb M. Smathers, Jr.
Brenda J. Vander Mey
John R. Gentry, Non-Voting, Ex-Officio Member

SUBJECT: FINAL REPORT

The Faculty Senate Select Committee was charged to examine the Clemson University Grievance process and make appropriate recommendations for its improvement. After much debate and deliberation, Committee members were able to agree on fifteen (15) recommendations. The Committee believes these recommendations will strengthen the Grievance process.

There was concern among members that in some cases there is insufficient recognition by administrators for involvement in the Grievance process. The Grievance system requires that faculty be rewarded for service on Grievance Boards and Hearing Panels. It is recommended this matter be attended to as soon as possible.

If accepted, many of the recommendations will need further elaboration. The Select Committee recommends a committee be organized and charged to develop the specific procedures to be followed to implement the recommendations contained within this Final Report.

FAM/cts
Attachment
REPORT FROM THE FACULTY SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE
TO STUDY GRIEVANCE PROCEDURES

February 11, 1997

I. Recommendation Related to a Campus Ombuds

1. The Committee recommends the appointment of a campus ombuds. One role of this individual should be to mediate cases (excluding those concerning promotion or tenure) in which a faculty member is considering filing a Grievance. The ombuds will act in an advisory capacity during the mediation process and faculty will retain the right to file a Grievance at any time. The mediation process will be considered a confidential matter and will only include the involved parties.

II. Recommendations on Grievance Related Communications

2. Guidelines related to all aspects of the Grievance process will be developed and distributed on an annual basis to all faculty and administrators.

3. The Provost will meet annually with all chairs of departmental Promotion and Tenure Committees, department chairs and deans to review Grievance procedures and issues.

4. Promotion and Tenure Committees, or their chairs, shall meet annually with departmental faculty to review Grievance guidelines and procedures. A video should be produced for use at these meetings.

5. All potential Hearing Panel members shall receive training to help prepare them to serve. The training will be provided annually and be coordinated through the Provost’s Office. The training may include information on the Grievance process, appropriate remedies, burden of proof, and other issues necessary to assure a well-informed panel.
III. Recommendations on Grievance Committee Structure and Process

6. The University Grievance Board (which hears Grievance II Procedure Petitions) and the Faculty Senate Advisory Committee (which hears Grievance I Procedure Petitions) will schedule the days for holding Grievance Hearings on an annual basis. This schedule will be distributed to all faculty. The schedule will be set at the first meeting of the newly-seated Grievance Board and at the first meeting of the newly-seated Faculty Senate Advisory Committee. A sufficient number and variety of days to meet the needs of all parties involved should be allowed during scheduling. Petitioners must schedule Hearings for only the designated days.

7. In cases where Grievances are held at times outside the normal academic year, compensation will be provided to members of the Hearing Panels.

8. The Grievance Procedure II process will contain two (2) stages:

First, the Petitioner is to submit a Petition, not to exceed ten (10) pages in length, along with any relevant evidence, to the University Grievance Board. Respondents to the Petition must file a response, not to exceed ten (10) pages, along with relevant evidence to the Grievance Board. The Grievance Board may request additional materials through the Provost’s Office, if needed. Following a review of the submitted materials, the Board may either render a decision or recommend a full Hearing. The second stage during the Grievance Procedure II process will begin only if a full Hearing is required which follows current procedures for Grievance Procedure II Petitions.

9. The Grievance Board shall be expanded to include six (6) academic administrators, one from each college and the Library, to be selected by the Provost from a list provided by the Faculty Senate. One administrator and two faculty representatives shall serve on appointed Hearing Panels for each Grievance II Procedure Petition. (Note: A majority of the Committee was in favor of this recommendation).

10. Grievance I Hearing Panels shall include one (1) administrator and four (4) faculty members. The faculty representatives shall be selected from the Faculty Senate Advisory Committee and the administrator shall be selected from the Grievance Board Administrator List (see Number 9). (Note: A majority of the Committee was in favor of this recommendation).
IV. Recommendations for Pre-Grievance Actions

11. In cases where there is a significant discrepancy in the rationale for retention, tenure, or promotion between a faculty member’s Promotion and Tenure Committee and that of the Department Chair, the Dean (or next level administrator) will meet with the Chair and Committee to discuss reasons for the discrepancy. The Department Chair must make the Dean aware of the discrepancy.

12. If a faculty member files a disclaimer to the annual evaluation (Form 3 or P&T), the Dean will investigate the matter and mediate, if possible. If the dean is unwilling or unable to perform this function, the ombuds will do so.

V. Miscellaneous Recommendations

13. A guideline should be developed to recuse the Provost from a decision-making capacity in the Grievance process when s/he is a named party in a Grievance Petition.

14. In cases in which a Hearing Panel finds in favor of the Petitioner, reasonable costs will be reimbursed by the University (not the Faculty Senate, department, or college) to the Petitioner. (Note: A majority of the Committee was in favor of this recommendation).

15. In cases in which the Provost disagrees with the Findings and/or comments of the Hearing Panel, the Provost’s Report to the President will include a rationale for the decision.

Respectfully submitted:

Francis A. McGuire, Chair
Kerry R. Brooks
R. Gordon Halfacre
E. Arlene Privette
Alan Schaffer
Horace D. Skipper
Webb M. Smathers, Jr.
Brenda J. Vander Mey
Kenneth R. Murr
John R. Gentry, Non-Voting, Ex-Officio
RESOLUTION ON FACULTY COMPENSATION

FS96-4-1 P

Whereas, The average faculty salaries at Clemson University are below those of most peer institutions; and

Whereas, At least in the past seven years, top university administrators have received raises which on the average have been more than twice the average raises given to Faculty; and

Whereas, Insufficient faculty salaries and annual salary increases have jeopardized the ability to recruit and retain key faculty and has resulted in good faculty leaving Clemson University for better salary and benefits, which represents a serious threat to the morale of faculty and thus the quality of education at Clemson University; and

Whereas, By virtue of Clemson University’s accreditation by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, the University must demonstrate good faith to maintain high standards of quality by adhering to the tenets of accreditation set forth in the Proceedings of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (Vol. 43(2): pp 53-58); that is:

"The attraction and retention of able faculty and the maintenance of faculty morale require that an institution provide adequate faculty salaries and benefits. A satisfactory program of faculty compensation must include annual reviews of all salaries based on clearly stated criteria for salary increments" (vide page 58); and

Whereas, There is no program for faculty compensation at Clemson University which includes reviews of salaries based on clearly stated criteria for salary increments.

Resolved, That the Faculty Senate, on behalf of all faculty at Clemson University, strongly recommends to President Curris and the Provost that a program for faculty compensation be developed at Clemson University. The purpose of this program should be to provide a mechanism to adjust faculty compensation so that it is comparable to that of peer institutions, and to assure that annual salary increases are assigned on an equitable and merited basis.

As an example for developing a program for faculty compensation, it is recommended that guidelines from the AAUP Policy Documents and Reports be followed. Specifically, the section entitled The Role of the Faculty in Budgetary and Salary Matters, Part III, Faculty participation in decisions relating to salary policies and procedures. It should be noted that this document was jointly formulated by the American Council on Education, the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, and the American Association of University Professors (Academe 76:45-48).

This resolution was passed unanimously by the Faculty Senate on April 9, 1996.
May 31, 1996

MEMORANDUM

TO: Ronald J. Thurston  
President of the Faculty Senate

FROM: J. Charles Jennett

SUBJECT: Faculty Senate Resolution FS96-4-1 P  
Resolution on Faculty Compensation

This is in response to your memorandum of April 11, 1996, advising that the above resolution was passed by the Faculty Senate on Tuesday, April 9, 1996.

I accept the principle of the resolution with the understanding that the information provided on raises did contain those positions that were in reality a change from a faculty appointment to an administrative appointment. Such raises are, in fact, not based on the merit of the individual but rather a change in job duties and respective responsibilities.
RESOLUTION ON DEVELOPMENT OF PROGRAM FOR FACULTY COMPENSATION

FS96-2-1 P

Whereas, The Faculty Senate passed unanimously the “Resolution on Faculty Compensation” on Tuesday, April 9, 1996; and

Whereas, Then Provost J. Charles Jennett, on May 31, 1996, accepted the principle of the resolution;

Resolved, That the Faculty Senate requests that the Provost proceed with the recommendations outlined in Senate Resolution FS96-4-1 P by appointing a representative committee for the purpose of developing guidelines for faculty compensation.

This resolution was passed unanimously at the February 11, 1997 Faculty Senate Meeting.
22 January 1997

To: Academic Vice President and Provost Steffen H. Rogers

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

Re: Modification of Consulting Policy Approval Route

The August 1996 Faculty Manual (page 69) in describing the route for the approval of college consulting guidelines provides that they be approved "after [being] reviewed by the Provost to ensure consistency with this policy."

With the advent of a "Senior Vice Provost for Research and Chief Research Officer," it makes sense to modify the language so that the review is conducted "by the Provost or designee" (new language underscored) in order to focus that person's expertise on this subject and to spread the workload.

With the endorsement of the members of the Faculty Senate Policy Committee at its meeting on January 21, I am making this editorial change in the Manual effective immediately. Such a minor matter does not need to be referred to the Academic Policy Committee of the Board for its information.

C.c.: Faculty Senate President Ronald J. Thurston
Senate Research Committee Chair Thomas C. Jenkins
Policy Committee Chair Patricia T. Smart
Policy Committee Members
Mesdames Marsha J. McCurley, Betty M. Moore, and Cathy T. Sturkie
To: Professor Patricia T. Smart, Chair  
Faculty Senate Policy Committee

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

Re: Financial Aid Representation on Fellowship Committee

At the December 10th meeting of the Faculty Senate the current Faculty Manual was amended to allow the addition of a "Graduate Fellowships and Awards Committee" to the roster of committees reporting to the Academic Council (page 41).

The suggestion has been made that the Director of Financial Aid should be represented on that committee in a non-voting capacity since that office is now responsible for administering all graduate financial aid. Such an addition would facilitate the implementation of the awards determined by the graduate committee.

As an aid to your committee's consideration of such a recommendation at your January meeting, the paragraph on membership could be modified to read (with new language underscored):

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

The reorganization which was previously accomplished can now be completed with the addition of this sentence.

I ask that you and your colleagues consider this addition when you reconvene in January of next year. Please contact Marvin Carmichael (656-3431) or Farrell Brown (656-5341) if you need further explanation of the cooperation between the Office of Financial Aid and the Graduate School.

c.c.: Academic Vice President and Provost Steffen H. Rogers  
Interim Graduate Dean Farrell B. Brown  
Financial Aid Director Marvin G. Carmichael  
Faculty Senate President Ronald J. Thurston  
Senate Policy Committee Members  
Mesdames Betty M. Moore and Cathy T. Sturkie
To: Professor Patricia T. Smart, Chair
Faculty Senate Policy Committee

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

Re: Provision for Undergraduate Academic Grievances Committee

In the governance changes effected last year the provision for a "Student Academic Grievances Committee" (page 43 of the 1991 Faculty Manual) was inadvertently omitted from the August 1996 version. That omission needs to be corrected. While the current Student Handbook (page 119 ff.) and current Announcements (pp. 23-25) make provision for the adjudication of "Academic Grievances" with attention to the definitions and procedures, it is believed that the charge and composition of this committee needs brief reference in the Faculty Manual.

It is proposed that a new committee be added to those reporting to the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost whose abbreviated charge and redefined membership might be couched in the following language for page 48:

11. Undergraduate Academic Grievances Committee.
This committee hears all appeals concerning undergraduate student academic dishonesty and academic grievances regarding faculty or administrators. In all unresolved cases, the committee makes its recommendations to the President through the Provost. Details as to definitions and procedures may be found in the current Announcements.

Membership of the committee consists of the following: fifteen faculty members (three from each college) elected by the collegiate faculty for three-year rotating terms, the Dean of Student Life (or designee), and ten undergraduate students (two from each college) nominated annually by the Student Body President and approved by the Student Senate. The committee selects its own chair from among the continuing members of the committee. The terms of appointment begin with each Fall registration.

In this fashion the committee would be large enough and representative enough to handle in subcommittee fashion those matters that come before it as a result of allegations of academic dishonesty, discrimination, improper grading, etc.

C.c.: Academic Vice President and Provost Steffen H. Rogers
Vice President Almeda Jacks Rogers
Senior Vice Provost Jerome V. Reel, Jr.
Dean of Student Life Joy S. Smith
Registrar Stanley B. Smith
Ombudsman George E. Carter, Jr.
Faculty Senate President Ronald J. Thurston
Student Body President Theodore J. Swann
Student Senate President Scott Mazyck
Policy Committee Members
Mesdames Betty M. Moore and Cathy T. Sturkie
22 November 1996

To: Professor Patricia T. Smart, Chair
Faculty Senate Policy Committee

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

Re: Provision for Graduate Student Grievances Committee

A matter of increasing concern recently is the need for a regularly constituted Graduate Student Grievances Committee paralleling the one at the undergraduate level. Experience suggests that a representative group of the affected constituencies (graduate students and graduate-level faculty) needs to be formed for the adjudication of the complex issues occasionally arising from grievances involving allegations of plagiarism, discrimination, etc.

The demise of the Commission on Graduate Studies makes a replacement necessary. Given the need, I suggest for your committee's consideration the formation of a parallel grievance committee comparable to but smaller in size to that charged with undergraduate matters. Paragraphs dealing with a charge and membership might be inserted on page 48 of the Manual as follows:

12. Graduate Student Academic Grievances Committee. This committee hears cases alleging academic dishonesty concerning graduate students and grievances (except employment) involving graduate-level faculty and administrators. In all unresolved cases, the committee makes its recommendations to the President through the Provost. Details as to definitions and procedures may be found in the current Graduate School Announcements.

Membership of this committee consists of the following: five faculty members involved in graduate education (one from each college) elected by the collegiate faculty for three-year terms, two graduate students nominated annually by the Graduate Student Government (GSG) and appointed by the Provost, and one representative of the Graduate School serving in a non-voting, advisory role. Each year the chair is elected from among the continuing faculty members. The terms of appointment begin with each Fall registration. All proceedings of the committee are confidential.

In this fashion a representative committee would be readily available to address allegations of impropriety in the conduct of graduate-level affairs.

c.c.: Academic Vice President and Provost Steffen H. Rogers
Interim Graduate Dean Farrell B. Brown
Faculty Senate President Ronald J. Thurston
Associate Graduate Dean Frankie O. Felder
GSG President Melissa L. Major
Senate Scholastic Policies Chair Sydney A. Cross
Senate Research Chair Thomas C. Jenkins
Policy Committee Members: Mesdames Betty M. MocgSfr||jK& Cathy T. Sturkie

VICE PRESIDENT FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS & PROVOST
206 Sikes Hall Box 345101 Clemson, SC 29634-5101
864.656.3243 FAX 864.656.0851
To: Professor Patricia T. Smart, Chair
Faculty Senate Policy Committee

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

Re: Insertion of Paragraph on Mid-term Grades

When the 1991 Faculty Manual was produced, this institution had abandoned the practice of issuing mid-term grades. Subsequently that policy was reviewed and the resumption of mid-term grades was reinstituted. This change was approved by the Commission on Undergraduate Studies and the Academic Council. The Student Senate supported the change enthusiastically and the Faculty Senate raised no objection.

Thus, it seems appropriate that the current Faculty Manual statements on "Examinations and Grading" (pp. 63-64) be amended to reflect present practice. As a point of departure for your deliberations, I suggest consideration be given to the following language to be added on page 64:

Once near mid-term in every undergraduate course the instructor shall make available for each student:
(a) that student’s ranking to date in that course or
(b) that student’s course grade to date, relative to the grading system stated in the course syllabus. This feedback should occur near mid-term, but it shall occur no later than the course meeting prior to the last day to withdraw without final grades. More frequent feedback is strongly encouraged. Both student and instructor are to recognize that this feedback reflects the student’s performance up to that point in time and, as such, that student’s final course grade may change based upon subsequent course work performance(s). This policy includes all undergraduate courses and does apply to summer school.
The incorporation of this or comparable language would serve to highlight the pedagogical importance of informing undergraduate students of their academic progress at a meaningful time in the semester.

On behalf of the staff in the Office of Undergraduate Studies and the Office of the Registrar, I ask that you and your committee favor amending the August 1996 Faculty Manual to reflect this current instructional policy. Representatives of either of those offices can provide further details should more information be desired.

c.c.: Academic Vice President and Provost Stef Rogers
Senior Vice Provost Jerry Reel
Registrar Stanley Smith
Director George Carter
Faculty Senate President Ron Thurston
Student Senate President Scott Mazyck
Student Body President Ted Swann
Policy Committee Members
Mesdames Betty Moore and Cathy Sturkie
RESOLUTION ON FUND PULL BACKS

FS96-2-2 P

Whereas, 2.5% of E&G funds (amounting to about three million dollars) is being pulled back from colleges to the central administration; and

Whereas, Faculty has not been informed of the rationale for this decision on how this money will be spent; and

Whereas, There should be faculty input on these issue; and

Whereas, There are departments with insufficient funds to meet the educational mission; and

Whereas, The University already maintains a reserve fund;

Resolved, That the Faculty Senate expects a clear accounting of how this money is to be spent with a demonstration of how this money will be better spent with the control at the level of central administration than at the school or departmental level;

Further Resolved, That the Faculty requests participation in identification of priorities on how this academic fund is to be spent.

This resolution was passed unanimously at the February 11, 1997 Faculty Senate Meeting.
RESOLUTION REGARDING BETTER UTILIZATION OF UNIVERSITY RESOURCES
FS96-2-3 P

Whereas, The main mission of this University is education; and
Whereas, The number of administrators has substantially increased in recent years; and
Whereas, Academic programs have suffered from serious shortfalls;

Resolved, That the Faculty Senate strongly urges the administration to take measures as required by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) that the academic sector be adequately funded:

a) to institute a zero-based review of all administrative positions as required on the academic side;

b) to commence an operational audit of University administration as already agreed to per an earlier resolution by the Faculty Senate in the prior year; and

c) cutting the number of administrators through attrition.

This resolution was passed at the February 11, 1997 Faculty Senate Meeting.
RESOLUTION ON THE OFFICE OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH
FS96-2-4 P

Whereas, The Office of Institutional Research (OIR) provides important University assessment data, much of which will be used to determine future Educational and General funding allocated in accordance with scores (provided by OIR) relative to performance funding criteria mandated by the Commission of Higher Education; and

Whereas, The information generated and reported by the OIR must be accurate and complete for both internal and external assessment and evaluation of our mission and goals as required by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS); and

Whereas, The Provost must oversee the performance of our University’s academic programs, and will assume major responsibility for the University meeting performance funding standards;

Resolved, That the Faculty Senate recommends that the Office of Institutional Research report to the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost.

This resolution was passed at the February 11, 1997 Faculty Senate Meeting.
MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE
MARCH 11, 1997

1. **Call to Order.** President Ronald J. Thurston called the meeting to order at 3:32 p.m.

2. **Approval of Minutes.** The Faculty Senate Minutes of February 11, 1997 were approved as corrected.

3. **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. Patricia T. Smart was elected Vice President/President-elect and Kathy Neal Headley was elected Secretary.

4. **Announcements.** President Thurston asked for a Sense of the Senate to change the time of the April 8th Faculty Senate Meeting to 2:30 p.m. to cover and complete the business of this Senate session prior to the Spring Reception. Vote was taken and passed. Congratulations were offered to Senator Ray Turner upon his receipt of the Undergraduate Teaching Award from the American Association of Physics. The Faculty Senate was reminded of the visits by the candidates for the position of Chief Research Officer.

5. **Committee Reports**

   a. Ashby B. Bodine, II, submitted and moved for acceptance the Preliminary Report from the Faculty Senate Select Committee on Evaluation of University Administration and requested input from the Senate. Motion was seconded; and vote to accept motion was taken and passed. (Report accepted; please see Agenda Packet.)

   b. **Committee Reports**

      **Finance Committee.** Senator Roger Doost submitted and discussed the Report from this Committee, as did Gordon Halfacre for the Accountability Committee (Attachment A).

      **Welfare Committee.** Senator Kathy Neal Headley thanked Committee members for work on the 1996 Faculty Survey; noted that the Survey Summary (Attachment B) will be mailed to all faculty; and stated that the entire survey results will be housed in the Faculty Senate Office, the Reserves Section of the R. M. Cooper Library, and on the Faculty Senate Web Page. Senator Robert Campbell then briefly discussed the 1996-97 Salary Report (Attachment C). Senator Headley reported that she has contacted Randall Davis regarding the appearance of adjunct faculty on the faculty list and asked if they could be listed separately. Mr. Davis will pursue this inquiry. The issue of faculty incentives is being undertaken by Senator Pat Smith.

      **Policy Committee.** Senator Pat Smart submitted Committee Report (Attachment D) and announced that the Policy Committee will submit Faculty Manual changes under New Business.
Research Committee. Senator Tom Jenkins submitted this Committee’s Report (Attachment E) and stated that a resolution will be brought forward under New Business.

Scholastic Policies Committee. Senator Syd Cross stated that this Committee is working on the issues of student evaluations and required student evaluations for promotion of faculty.

c. University Commissions and Committees (None)

d. Faculty Senate Select Committee on Administrator Award - Senate Alternate Shelley Fones noted that this Committee continues to meet and that for the Senate’s information, the Committee unanimously agrees on the awarding of this award and that the final report will be brought forward at the April Senate meeting.

e. Senator Smart informed the Senate that the search for the Dean of the Graduate School is ongoing, but that the field has been narrowed.

f. Vice President/President-Elect McGuire noted that the newly-established Faculty Development Center Committee will be represented by Kathy Neal Headley, who will also chair this committee. Any input is to be forwarded to Senator Headley.

g. Faculty Senate Select Committee on Sabbatical Policy - Senator Sidney Gauthreaux submitted as information the Report from this Committee and solicited input from members of the Senate.

6. President’s Report President Thurston stated that the faculty have spoken through the 1996 Faculty Survey noting that 30-35% of faculty are happy with the way things are at Clemson University; 25% are non-committed; 50-55% are not happy with the situation at Clemson University and are not happy with restructuring. It was further noted that it is not the faculty’s purpose to set policy and that problems have been identified in many areas that need correcting by the administration.

7. Old Business

a. Senator Headley moved to bring the official document of the 1996 Faculty Survey Summary to the Senate for information and acceptance which was seconded. Vote to accept was taken and passed unanimously. During discussion amendments were offered to condense the summary, the final amendment being to reformat the Summary without changing the content which passed. Vote on the main motion to send to all faculty in a more condensed form was taken and passed unanimously.

8. New Business

a. Senate Alternate Fones stated that the Faculty Senate Select Committee on Administrator Award unanimously recommends the establishment of an administrator award on behalf of the faculty and briefly described details of recommendation. Vote was taken to accept information item for a Final Report at April Faculty Senate meeting and passed.
b. President Thurston reminded the Senate that recommendations to use $50,000 Panther money must be determined soon or failure to do so could result in the loss of this money. The establishment of an endowment for the interest of the Faculty Senate has been recommended by the Faculty Senate Executive/Advisory Committee. Sense of the Senate was requested to proceed with this recommendation and passed unanimously.

c. Senator Smart brought forward eight Faculty Manual changes proposed by the Policy Committee for action by the Senate for which two-thirds vote is necessary. The changes were discussed and voted on individually. Passed unanimously by the Senate were: Deletion of Council of Academic Deans; Abolition of the Fine Arts Committee; Adding Libraries Patent Coordinator to Intellectual Property Committee; Addition of Librarian to Calhoun College Committee; Formation and Dissolution of Departments, Faculties, Schools, and Centers. The proposed changes regarding the reestablishment of the Graduation Ceremony Committee and the Policy Statement on Political Activity were also passed. Much discussion was held regarding the Refinement of Tenure and Academic Rank Descriptions during which an amendment was offered. Vote to accept proposed change to Manual was taken and failed (Attachment F).

d. Senator John Huffman explained the Resolution Concerning Undergraduate Presentations by Faculty Candidates. During discussion, it was decided that the Provost will be informed of the manner in which policies are instituted (Attachment G).

e. Senator Alan Grubb questioned the process/guidelines for distribution of the one-time Affirmative Action monies. On behalf of the Provost, Brett Dalton informed the Senate that instructions were given to deans to work with department chairs and faculty to solicit input and requests for funds. President Thurston and Senator Grubb will talk with the Provost about this issue.

f. A Sense of the Senate was requested regarding the location of the Faculty Meetings - the Madren Center versus the Student Senate Chambers. More senators preferred the Madren Center which will be reported to the 1997-98 Faculty Senate to take under advisement.

g. Senator Gauthreaux moved that the Report from the Faculty Senate Select Committee on Sabbatical Policy be accepted by the Faculty Senate which was seconded. Vote was taken and passed unanimously. Vote to forward this Report to the Policy Committee was taken and passed unanimously. (Report accepted; please see Agenda Packet.)

h. Senator Ted Taylor stated his desire that the Faculty Senate recommend the granting of emeritus status for Professor Gene Haertling, Professor of Ceramic Engineering. Senator Dale Linvill moved to indefinitely postpone this recommendation. Vote was taken to postpone and passed unanimously.

i. At the request of Senator Kerry Brooks, the Policy Committee will bring to the floor of the Senate at the April meeting the proposed Faculty Manual change regarding promotion and tenure.

j. Senator Tom Jenkins requested that the Resolution Concerning Quarter on the Dollar Research Incentive Funds be considered. A two-thirds vote was required and passed unanimously when vote was taken. Discussion was held during which a friendly amendment was offered, seconded, accepted, and passed unanimously. Vote to accept amended resolution was taken and passed unanimously (FS97-3-1 P) (Attachment H).
k. Senator Doost submitted a motion to establish the Accountability Committee as a Standing Committee which will be brought forward at the April meeting. Vote was taken and passed unanimously. (Motion passed; please see Agenda Packet.)

1. Senator Saltzman urged senators to read and respond to recent information from the Department of Computing and Information Technology (DCIT).

8. Adjournment  President Thurston adjourned the meeting at 5:58 p.m.

Kathy Neal Headley, Secretary

Cathy Toth Sturkie, Administrative Assistant

Absent: B. Kunkel, H. Wheeler, G. Bautista, B. Stephens (R. Campbell for), S. Amirkhanian, M. Cooper, K. Murr (P. Tyler for)
Finance Committee’s Comprehensive Report:
March 11, 1997

A. Topics brought to the attention of this committee in the past several years for follow up by this committee, other Senate’s committees, and/or interested Faculty who may be able to do some research in these areas: (Please expand or modify this list as you see fit).

1) How an alert faculty and faculty senate can keep administrators accountable for their actions?
2) How to bring about equity in evaluations and minimize favoritism and administrative abuse in annual evaluations?
3) Administrative abuse in numbers and in dollars - how did it happen at Clemson, how can the faculty take a leading role in stopping the abuse.
4) Restructuring the Clemson way - where it made sense and where it was nonsense.
5) Economics of higher education - is there such a thing?
6) Efficient or effective higher education - what does it include?
7) Performance funding in higher education - an assessment of the current proposal
8) The economics of summer school teaching
9) Departmental assessment: where to expand, where to retract, where to close.
10) Getting a grip on university costs - faculty, administrators, staff, and other
11) How are our resources allocated between teaching, research, and service?
12) Why do official university financial reports hide facts rather than show facts?
13) How can good history assist administrators in better utilization of scarce resources.
14) The use and abuse of university cost allocation
15) A review and assessment of Senate resolutions (Welfare and Finance) in the past decade and the resulting action/nonaction on the part of university administration.
16) Freedom of thought, university debates, and perceptions on provocative and inflammatory statements.
17) Why have university senates often ignored the issue of accountability?
18) Assessment of faculty work in terms of input, output, and outcome - what will be the future trend?
19) Public relations, publicity, the senate, and the role of media in a university setting
20) Proposing a university responsibility accounting system.
21) Student evaluations - how effective are they? How can they become more useful?
22) Budgeting faculty time - how can it become more effective?
23) Faculty evaluation - how effective and how fair are they?
24) Department head, department chair, or none at all - which direction should we go?

B. Files and issues addressed: (more important topics are highlighted). The Senators and all faculty, staff, and administrators are encouraged to consult the committee before making general statements and arriving at conclusions on any of these issues.

1) Restructuring questions
2) Cost studies
3) Salary studies, inequities, and resolutions
4) Bonded indebtedness
5) Retirement funding  
6) Use of credit cards  
7) Tiger Tel cards  
8) Input, output, outcome  
9) Faculty Workload Database System  
10) Travel policy and travel expense  
11) University performance measures  
12) Faculty code of ethics  
13) Clemson & Comparative institutions  
14) University cost allocation  
15) Operational audit  
16) Faculty, staff, administrators - number study  
17) 12/10/96 Resolutions and their aftermath  
18) Response to President’s report to the Board of Trustees  
19) Freedom of thought  
20) Self organization  
21) Accountability issues  
22) Finance Committee issues

C. Assessment of Finance & Accountability Committees’ addressed issues:  
- The Provost has initiated the process of updating university personnel records maintained by the Office of Institutional Research. The committee has received two listings by group (faculty, staff, administrators) and by department and college. The committee provided the Provost with the definitions used by the Senate. Robert Campbell provided further a more refined definition of what we consider as faculty; i.e., all tenure-track employees and instructors who are engaged in full-time teaching, research, and service. **It was suggested to the Provost to send this list with instructions and definitions to appropriate deans and division managers for their review and update.** Dr. Robert Campbell, in the meantime, went beyond the call of duty and provided a detailed exception list that he could come up with to David Fleming in the Office of Institutional Research. It was stated that they are doing this for us. We have emphasized that a correct list is needed for proper accounting of university affairs and that we will assist in spotchecks and further verifications if necessary.  
- The Provost pursued with the Office of Institutional Research the prior year’s established policy of providing a list of salaries above $50,000 with explanations or reasons for raises which exceed 4.5%. This list will remain in the Senate’s office for any faculty member who wishes to go and look through that list. The most interesting comment this year comes from the College of Agriculture, Forestry, and Life Science where the justification for a raise of 5.96% rather than 4% is given to be, **“Typo in departmental records - 95 salary ($53,954); 4% raise was intended but $1,000 error caused an additional 1.96%”**. While we commend this honesty in reporting, we wonder why a correction due to typing error could not be made. The explanations, while better than none at all, do not seem to be of much help. What we need is a policy, directive, or guideline which spells out what the approximate raise either in absolute dollars or in percentage terms should be for fair, good, very good, or excellent performance. Other exceptions such as change in grade level or promotions could also be briefly explained. There has to be more detailed and better justifications for raises which for some 65 employees exceeds 9% of
C. Assessment of Finance & Accountability Committees' addressed issues:

- The Provost has initiated the process of updating university personnel records maintained by the Office of Institutional Research. The committee has received two listings by group (faculty, staff, administrators) and by department and college. The committee provided the Provost with the definitions used by the Senate. Robert Campbell provided further a more refined definition of what we consider as faculty; i.e., all tenure-track employees and instructors who are engaged in full-time teaching, research, and service. It was suggested to the Provost to send this list with instructions and definitions to appropriate deans and division managers for their review and update. Dr. Robert Campbell, in the meantime, went beyond the call of duty and provided a detailed exception list that he could come up with to David Fleming in the Office of Institutional Research. It was stated that they are doing this for us. We have emphasized that a correct list is needed for proper accounting of university affairs and that we will assist in spotchecks and further verifications if necessary.

- The Provost pursued with the Office of Institutional Research the prior year’s established policy of providing a list of salaries above $50,000 with explanations or reasons for raises which exceed 4.5%. This list will remain in the Senate’s office for any faculty member who wishes to go and look through that list. The most interesting comment this year comes from the College of Agriculture, Forestry, and Life Science where the justification for a raise of 5.96% rather than 4% is given to be, “Typo in departmental records - 95 salary ($53,954); 4% raise was intended but $1,000 error caused an additional 1.96%”. While we commend this honesty in reporting, we wonder why a correction due to typing error could not be made. The explanations, while better than none at all, do not seem to be of much help. What we need is a policy, directive, or guideline which spells out what the approximate raise either in absolute dollars or in percentage terms should be for fair, good, very good, or excellent performance. Other exceptions such as change in grade level or promotions could also be briefly explained. There has to be more detailed and better justifications for raises which for some 65 employees exceeds 9% of
their salaries and is as high as 38%. There is no explanations for the Athletic group’s raises, some of whom have received raises of upto 30%.
- The Provost also provided through the Office of Institutional Research a total compensation report for fiscal year 1996. According to this list, approximately X employees had total compensation in excess of $90,000 for 1996 fiscal year. It was agreed to redo this list on a calendar-year basis for better comparison. Some employees have received upto X% in additional compensation which could include summer teaching, supplemental teaching, research grant compensations, and other reasons from university resources. Policies need to be initiated to harness the levels, amounts, and full justifications for additional compensation.

- Status of Our Resolutions with the Provost:
  FS96-12-1P: The alleged savings from restructuring?
  FS96-12-2P: Clear annual financial reporting to faculty?
  FS96-12-3P: Disparity between administrators and faculty pay?
  FS96-12-1P: Resolution on fund pull backs?
  FS97-2-2P: Better utilization of university resources?
  FS97-2-3P: Fair distribution of raises?

The action that the Senate expects is a pledge on the part of administration to genuinely move forward in these areas to provide better accountability for our limited resources.

D. President Curris:
FS95-?? - University Operational Audit?
Accountability Committee’s response through e-mail to the president’s e-mail to general faculty?
Accountability Committee’s response to the president’s report to the Board of Trustees?

E. Various updates:
- Another preview of 1995 raises
- Request for travel expense accounting
- Request for cost allocation accounting
- Request for supply account accounting
- $50,000 Endowment for the Senate

F. Accountability:
- Promoting the notion of mutual accountability
- Forging a partnership with administration on accountability
- Recommendation to the Senate on the future of Accountability Committee and its charge

Respectfully submitted,
Finance Committee

Roger K. Doost, Chair
Faculty OKs resolutions on funding, salaries

Clemson panel receives report about pay equity in administration, faculty

By Kimberly Davis
Oconee-Pickens Bureau

CLEMSON — Clemson University's faculty senate passed resolutions regarding funding and compensation and received another report about pay equity in administration and faculty salaries at its Tuesday afternoon meeting.

Some faculty senate members also expressed frustration at the university's data concerning the disparity in raises and the classification of faculty, staff and administration.

Roger Doost, chairman of the finance committee and an accounting professor, submitted a report that projected faculty and administration raises until the 2000. According to the report, the university president's pay is about three times the average faculty pay, and in the year 2000 is projected to be more than four times that of faculty.

"This is an issue that the senate has been working on for 10 years," Dr. Doost said, after giving a brief history of the senate's actions regarding what he said was an increase in administrative positions. "Nobody has challenged any of our numbers over the past six years. Let's correct (the disparity)."

Provost Steffen Rogers said he is challenging the accuracy of the numbers, because the administration does not yet have all of the facts needed to answer the senate's previous resolution regarding the disparity.

"The accountability committee seems to be working very, very well with the administration," Dr. Rogers said. "We're trying to answer the resolution. We're trying to get all the correct information."

In other business, the senate unanimously approved a resolution requesting that Dr. Rogers proceed with a previous recommendation to appoint a committee representative of the faculty to develop guidelines for faculty compensation.

They also passed a resolution regarding better use of university resources and approved a resolution concerning the 2.5 percent pullback of educational and general funds from academic affairs and given to central administration.
The Question of Pay Equity

What happens if top administrators’ raises remain at an average of 6% and average faculty and staff raises remain at 3% - Using 1996 as the base year; then, working backward and forward:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>President’s</th>
<th>Ave. Faculty’s</th>
<th>Janitorial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>$142,276</td>
<td>$42,711</td>
<td>$10,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>150,813</td>
<td>43,993</td>
<td>10,351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>159,861</td>
<td>45,313</td>
<td>10,662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>169,453</td>
<td>46,672</td>
<td>10,982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>179,620</td>
<td>48,072</td>
<td>11,311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>190,398</td>
<td>49,515</td>
<td>11,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>199,422</td>
<td>51,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>211,387</td>
<td>52,530</td>
<td>12,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>224,071</td>
<td>54,106</td>
<td>12,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>237,515</td>
<td>57,352</td>
<td>13,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>251,766</td>
<td>59,073</td>
<td>13,506</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on these assumptions, if the current trends continue, president’s pay which was about 3.3 times of the faculty pay and 14 times of a janitor’s pay in 1990 will be about 4.3 times of the faculty pay and 19 times of a janitor’s pay by the year 2000. That is why we think that pay parity and pay equity are very important.

Upon recommendation of the Accountability Committee these additional comments are provided so that our focus from the main issue would not be unnecessarily diverted:

1) Some have complained that average administrators’ raises (particularly that of the president’s) have been significantly higher than 6%. We have attempted to work with minimal numbers.
2) President’s raise of 6% is based on his reported salary of $150,398 for 1995 and is not inclusive of his supplemental pay of $40,000 from the Foundation account. The backward and forward computations are based on his total pay package.
3) Although there are some staff whose pay for 1996 is in the $9,000 range, based on additional data received, it is believed that $12,000 is more representative of the pay of janitorial staff.
### RAISES OF A SELECT FEW IN 1996

*per GSA newsletter V.10, N.1, 2/96*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Pay 11/95</th>
<th>Pay 3/94</th>
<th>Raise</th>
<th>% Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>Curris</td>
<td>$150,390.00</td>
<td><em>$120,273.00</em></td>
<td>$30,125.00</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provost</td>
<td>Jennet</td>
<td>$134,000.00</td>
<td>$125,460.00</td>
<td>$8,540.00</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP</td>
<td>Ransdell</td>
<td>$122,500.00</td>
<td>$108,048.00</td>
<td>$14,442.00</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP</td>
<td>Jacks</td>
<td>$105,000.00</td>
<td>$90,000.00</td>
<td>$15,500.00</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exec Asst Pres</td>
<td>Anderson</td>
<td>$98,500.00</td>
<td>$89,709.00</td>
<td>$8,791.00</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Keinath</td>
<td>$130,510.00</td>
<td>$120,000.00</td>
<td>$10,510.00</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Fischer</td>
<td>$115,962.00</td>
<td>$106,200.00</td>
<td>$9,762.00</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Webb</td>
<td>$115,000.00</td>
<td>$101,200.00</td>
<td>$13,800.00</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Robinson</td>
<td>$113,900.00</td>
<td>$102,000.00</td>
<td>$11,900.00</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc Dean</td>
<td>Elliot</td>
<td>$113,922.00</td>
<td>$99,590.00</td>
<td>$14,332.00</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Bennet</td>
<td>$112,000.00</td>
<td>$104,000.00</td>
<td>$8,000.00</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Barker</td>
<td>$114,099.00</td>
<td>$95,300.00</td>
<td>$18,799.00</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1,261,780</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,645,501.00</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This pay is the previous president's pay
Not including add'l pay from the foundation account.
January 17, 1997

To : Constantine Curris, President

Through : Stephen Rogers, Provost
Ron Thurston, Faculty Senate President

From : Faculty Senate Accountability Committee

Subject : Response to the President’s Report to the Board of Trustees

Per Faculty Senate President’s instructions, we have met and would like to respond to the President’s report to the Board of Trustees in December on the question of university accountability.

**Item 1. Restructuring:**
The Faculty Senate, in its resolution FS96-12-1P in December questioned the validity of the claimed savings from restructuring particularly with regard to restructuring of colleges as such savings do not seem to be substantiated by the university’s financial reports. The presentation to the Board of Trustees on June 29, 1995 was apparently based on some forecasted data. There is no secret that current format of department chairs cost as much or more than previous department heads. There is also little change in terms of their responsibilities. The supposition that the percentage of a Chair position’s duties for administrative duties has shifted from 75% to 25% with more instructional duties is simply not true. Most if not all departments have maintained their previous structures under new titles. A few department heads and deans who have been redeployed may now be teaching a course or two at a substantially higher cost than we had prior to restructuring. This may be considered a serious mismanagement of resources. Most departmental and college level administrative staff have remained virtually intact. Department chairs who may be on a nine-month contract are paid 25% to 33% extra for their summer work. If we consider financial statements in their totality, there does not appear to be any support for the alleged 5.8 million dollars of savings in colleges as claimed in the report submitted to the Board of Trustees.

**Item 2. Number of Faculty:**
Different counts of the number of faculty by the Senate places the number of full time, tenure-track faculty who are engaged in teaching and research to be approximately at 850. The President’s report shows a total exceeding 1100 which probably includes lecturers and a large number of adjunct professors who rarely teach. The Senate needs the cooperation of the Office of Institutional Research to be able to verify these numbers. But in any case, the number of teaching tenure track faculty remain in the vicinity of 850 which is about 90 less than its peak at 1987. This is at the time when enrollments have increased. During the same time period, university administration has grown by more than 120.

**Item 3. Faculty salaries:**
If we accept the average salary data provided in the president’s report, it shows that the average
faculty pay in 1987 was a little below $50,000 a year and the average for 1996 is slightly over $50,000. This indicates that resources in terms of teaching faculty’s salaries is now substantially less than what it was in 1987 even in nominal terms - as illustrated below:

1987: $46,060,000
1996: $43,452,000

Item 4. Financial statements:
As a proof of increase in the University’s educational base, the President has submitted a copy of the University’s financial summary which indicates that instruction and research has received about 45.8% (147 million dollars) of the university’s resources in 1996 as compared to 1995 where that portion amounted to 44.8% (146 million dollars) of total resources.

These numbers are at best misleading. Through an intricate system of allocation and reallocation and by basing allocation between teaching, research, and services on things other than what actually takes place on campus, the current financial statements distort reality and do not show the true picture of how funds are expended.

We agree with the sentiment of President Curris’s e-mail dated 1/13/97 in that we do not want to dwell on the past. In fact, we already know what the facts are: “1) there is no substantiated savings from restructuring colleges, 2) the number of faculty has kept dwindling at the cost of an astronomical increase in administrative bureaucracy in the past decade, 3) faculty salaries have remained stagnant at the time when administrators increased in numbers and were rewarded handsomely, 4) university accounting system does not reflect reality and at least for the purpose of internal reporting, mechanisms should be put in place to provide needed information by Faculty on an annual basis for a year-to-year comparison by department, by college, and for the university as a whole as follows:

FACULTY SALARY AND BENEFITS (in numbers and dollars)*
ADMINISTRATOR & STAFF SALARY AND BENEFITS (in numbers and dollars)
ALL OTHER COSTS (breakdown as needed)

* This number to be broken down into teaching, research, service, and other based on how Form 3 should be filled out on an annual basis.

It appears that Rhode Island university reporting that the Provost had indicated should be in line with what the Faculty has been seeking. The important sentiment that hopefully we all share is a realization of where we are and taking action with regards to inequities of the past and correcting the future path of Clemson with regards to its primary mission of education and more efficient utilization of its scarce resources.

Signed by Accountability Committee Members:

James R. Davis, Professor, Accountancy
Roger K. Doost, Professor, Accountancy
Gordon Halfacre, Alumni Professor, Horticulture
December 11, 1996

Memo to: Constantine Curris  
Scott Ludlow  
Gary Ransdell  
Stef Rogers

From: Cathy Sams

Subject: Restructuring Dollars

One of the resolutions passed at yesterday's Faculty Senate meeting raised questions about the source of information related to the $8 million in restructuring savings. In news releases and publications, I have always used the attached June 29, 1995, report to the Budget Committee of the Board of Trustees as the official source document. If you add the figures highlighted, they just exceed $8 million. The $100,000 redirected from administrative salaries to the career center and other programs in Student Affairs brings the total to about $8.2 million.

The restructuring summary from last year's President's Report (also attached) is an example of the way we've reported the impact of restructuring to the public. To the best of my knowledge, all publications and releases have been careful to state that the figures refer to money saved or redirected, and to specify whether positions have been eliminated or shifted to different responsibilities. In some but not all cases, we have specified what the money would be used for (for example, deferred maintenance or the Career Center).

I thought you might want to know where the figures originated, especially those of you who weren't here when the report was presented to Trustees. This doesn't answer all the questions raised by the Faculty Senate, but it should be a good starting point.

CS/dg  
Enclosures  
xc: Brett Dalton (with enclosures)  
Ron Thurston (with enclosures)
August 26, 1996

Introduction -- 2 general points

1. Clemson has responded to the public's concerns about productivity, cost-containment and efficiency. We're proud of what we have accomplished. We're proud that our teaching faculty lead all research institutions in credit-hour production. We're proud of the organizational restructuring that saved or redirected almost $8 million and shifted the equivalent of 52 faculty from administrative roles to the classroom.

Because of these initiatives and efficiencies, and because of increased support from the State, we're able to begin the year with a budget that includes no tuition increase -- for the first time in 12 years. We're gratified to be able to do that.

However, there are limits to what Clemson can do on its own. We cannot undertake a major organizational restructuring every year.

2. This is a discussion of investments, not expenditures. The Commission's message to the General Assembly should be that higher education is an investment, not a cost. Higher education is inextricably linked to economic development and personal prosperity.

A 1990 Roper survey shows that Americans today believe that a college degree is as essential to a young person starting out in life as a high school diploma was a generation ago.

"Approaching 2000," the S.C. Commerce Department's strategic plan for economic development, states that "Knowledge is the key to prosperity in an advanced economy, because knowledge is the key to competitive advantage."

That same report further states that "an advanced, knowledge-oriented economy is critically dependent on its skilled and degreed workforce."

South Carolina taxpayers have benefited from recent economic growth, both in terms of available jobs and increased State revenues that have led to tax reductions. But continued economic growth will depend largely on the investment the...
### Fiscal Year 1996
Clemson University Expenditures*

#### Travel Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Amount in Dollars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academics</td>
<td>$2,191,101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension</td>
<td>2,422,344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative areas**</td>
<td>1,170,304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary Enterprises</td>
<td>2,358,576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$8,142,325</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Based on a digital tape provided by the Budget Office.

** Includes Academic Support (deans, library, computer services), Student Services, Operation & Maintenance, and Departmental Administration.

We have asked the Controller to look at these numbers and provide details in terms of registration fees, airfare, hotel accommodations, and other costs as well as travel from funded research and from other sources.

We have also requested for a breakdown and explanation for about 16 million dollars of interdepartmental cost allocations.

We also intend to look at the detail of supplies account which is the other major non-salary account within our list of expenditures.
University Accountability - a Historical Perspective

In the last decade, the Faculty Senate has taken upon itself to bring insight and accountability for the benefit of faculty community and administration’s awareness of some important and critical issues facing this institution.

An ad hoc committee of the Senate reported in October 1988; the administration, faculty, staff, and student breakdown from 1978 to 1987. In October 1991, this study was brought up to date through 1990. The Accountability Committee continued with the work of that committee and updated those statistics. Faculty, administrators, and staff categories were defined in those studies. The report revealed continuous growth of the administration in the past decade at the cost of Faculty.

Between 1991 and 1993, the Assessment Committee showed interest in the University’s financial reporting and sought earnestly to find definitions and better breakdowns for university accounts.

From 1994 to 1995, the Finance Committee of the Senate sought various approaches to understand the lumpsum numbers that are titled as instruction, research, public service, academic support, institutional support, etc. in the annual financial reports. Gradually and painstakingly detail of such data were provided. When asked for a more intelligible reporting of these numbers (primarily in terms of faculty and other costs of instruction, research, and service), the Committee was informed that the Budget and Finance Office does not have the time or manpower to do it, but we were given a chart of accounts and a diskette containing the detailed data to compute the requested breakdown if we so desired.

From 1995 to 1996, the Finance Committee engaged in a systematic analysis of the detail that was provided by the Budget Office. Such analysis in terms of faculty salaries and benefits, administrative and staff salaries and benefits as well as other costs by each major administrative unit was gradually reported and explained to the Senate. This information revealed that except for auxiliary enterprises, there are four categories of costs; $70 million in faculty salary and benefits, $70 million in faculty staff and administrators’ salary and benefits, $70 million in other costs of operation, close to $70 million dollars for the cost of Extension and Public Service, and about $43 million dollars for the cost of Auxiliary Enterprises (before any interdepartmental cost allocation takes place). The analysis further revealed that about 15 to 18 million dollars are shifted annually from administrative accounts to Auxiliary Enterprises, and Instruction and Research accounts in the name of allocation and reallocation. There was never a satisfactory explanation given as proper justification for many such allocations.

From 1996 to 1997, the Committee attempted to understand the logic for the breakdown between instruction, research, and service accounts within the financial statements. In the process, it was discovered that the numbers both for budget and actual are based on some guesstimates that are supposedly provided by the deans and others and is not totally in line with what actually takes place. In fact, no one in the Budget and Finance Office was even aware of our Form 1, 2, and 3 which are used within the academic departments for academic accountability of what Faculty
intended to do (budget) and what they actually did (actual).
From 1996 to 1997, the Committee decided to first inform the Budget and Finance Office formally of our findings and concerns and find ways of addressing these issues for correction and better accountability of our resources. The Committee's concerns and general findings were discussed in the Senate in November 1996, then reviewed and endorsed by the newly formed Accountability Committee resulting in three resolutions which were submitted and passed by the Faculty Senate in December 1996.

Up until October, requested data was provided to the Finance Committee and questions were answered by the responsible staff and/or administrators. From early November until December 17, 1996, all the pending questions and correspondence of the Finance Committee to the Budget and Finance Office remained unanswered in spite of several follow-ups. On December 17, 1996, Provost Rogers called a meeting where the Accountability Committee members (James R. Davis, Gordon Halfacre, Roger K. Doost), Scott Ludlow, CFO, and others were present. In the meeting, the Provost issued new instructions or rules of engagement for the Finance and Accountability Committees. Any questions or data requests that our committees may have should go to the Senate President, the Senate President will then submit them to the Provost, Provost will submit them to the CFO or others as needed, the CFO will submit those requests to his Controller, Budget Director, Fiscal Manager, and others as needed. The same channels of communication will again be traversed in reverse order until the committee received its requested data. In the past several years, we were allowed to receive data from whomever handled those particular data. The same way that other Senate Committees function.

The submitted reports to the Senate have usually stated the source or the reason for a particular report. For management accounting purposes, a higher value is placed on the question of relevancy of the report rather than minute verifiability of numbers. The current financial summary provided in the Senate packet for this month is based on the digital tape provided by the Budget Office for the 1996 fiscal year. The salary breakdown is estimated based on additional data and information that we have received. The purpose of this report is to provide an awareness for the Faculty and hopefully the Administration and institute a dialogue on the importance of accountability in higher education. It is hoped that such a dialogue and total awareness of faculty community will lead to more equity and will result in a higher level of efficiency and effectiveness in utilization of our scarce resources.

Respectfully submitted,

Roger K. Doost, Chair, Finance and Accountability Committees
James R. Davis, Member, Accountability Committee
Gordon Halfacre, Member, Accountability Committee

February 11, 1997
University Growth
Report to the Faculty Senate
October, 1991

Submitted by Kenneth Murr and Robert Kosinski

In 1988, the Faculty Senate initiated an effort to measure and document the numerical changes of administration, staff, faculty and students at Clemson. An ad hoc committee (Kenneth Murr, Mary Ann Reichenbach and chairperson Leo Gaddis), reported in October 1988 on its measurements of the size of the study groups during the 1978-1987 period. This report is a continuation of that study and reports on growth at Clemson for the years 1988 and 1990.

The 1988 committee developed the procedure which was followed to create this report. The primary enumeration for both studies was made by counting entries in the University telephone book for the appropriate year. Mr. Gentry of the admissions office provided data on student enrollment. The rules for classification of positions into faculty, staff, administration, and special categories or deletions which were followed for this report are summarized below:

Faculty-- all on-campus (656 telephone numbers) entries having title of professor, associate professor, assistant professor, instructor, research associate with faculty rank, military science instructor, or librarian are counted as faculty if the title does not also include the term head, dean, or director. Visiting faculty, adjunct faculty and lecturers are not counted in any category.

Administrators-- all on-campus (656 telephone numbers) entries having title of head (except for librarians--only two librarians are administrators), dean (associate or assistant), director (associate or assistant), vice-provost (associate or assistant) or vice-president (associate or assistant), plus specific administrators who could be identified by title (e.g. registrar, president, and general counsel.) Directors of institutes also listed with faculty rank were equally divided between administration and faculty.

Staff-- all on-campus (656 telephone numbers) entries not covered in other categories and intended to be classified personnel. The range of titles is extensive. Some directors were classified as staff (e.g., Lab Dir USDA and Dir of Spec Events).

Omissions-- all athletic people (in Jervey), all off-site (non 656 telephone numbers) personnel, visiting faculty, adjunct faculty and lecturers were not counted in any category. Part-time faculty and staff are not listed in the telephone directory and so are not included.

Table 1.  Size of Study Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>859</td>
<td>887</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>883</td>
<td>946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>1133</td>
<td>1250</td>
<td>1381</td>
<td>1388</td>
<td>1813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>10602</td>
<td>11959</td>
<td>12781</td>
<td>14251</td>
<td>15193</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A number of comparisons and relationships may be derived from these data. Some graphical presentations are given in Figures 1-5.
### Admin Growth 4.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Percent Increase (Sorted)</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Administration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>883</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>946</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>1,388</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>1,813</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Percent Increase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Administration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Ratio of Students to Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Percent Increase in Admin., Staff, Students, Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Admin</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>128%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Admin Growth 4.1**

- Percent Increase in Administration: 19%, 22%, 42%
- Percent of Students: 97%, 10%, 0%
- Percent of Staff: 4%, 9%, 0%
- Percent of Faculty: 2%, 2%, 0%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Administration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Ratio of Students to Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
Mutual Accountability: What It Means and Why It Is Important
March 11, 1997

About three years ago, my wife insisted that I should go for a physical checkup. I countered by saying that I have functioned without it for 33 years of my adult working life, and I have not been sick or absent from my job for even one day...She always wins in the arguments though - you already know this one of my several weaknesses - or is it a strength? Upon thorough examination, the doctor verified that I have a 35-year-old body in a 55-year-old person and asked if I have any problem whatsoever. I said, many times I feel as if I am sick to my stomach because mostly people say something but later I find that they really mean something else; I truly feel sick about it; I feel as if I am developing ulcers because of it. He kindly referred me to a psychologist in town. I was tempted to go and see one except that I thought that he may also tell me something and mean something else! Also as a typical accountant, something that my wife truly detests, “I don’t spend money when I don’t have to!”

Reading Stephen L. Carter’s book Integrity solved this psychological pain - although the physical pain still continues, but I can better deal with it. Allow me to share with you, a few short passages: “... integrity is something I only think about, not something I exemplify. I strive toward it, as I am sure most of us do, but I do not pretend to achieve it very often... I define integrity with some care, to include discerning the right and acting on it, not simply living a consistent life according to some arbitrary set of principles.” p.1; “We are all full of fine talk about how desperately our society needs it, but, when push comes to shove, we would just as soon be on the winning side,”p.4; “if we happen to do something wrong, we would just as soon have nobody point it out... We, the People of the United States, who a little over two hundred years ago ordained and established the Constitution, have a serious problem; too many of us nowadays neither mean what we say nor say what we mean.” p.5; “Integrity is like the weather: everybody talks about it but nobody knows what to do about it... So perhaps we should say that integrity is like good weather, because everybody is in favor of it.”p.6; “A person of integrity lurks somewhere inside each of us: a person we feel we can trust to do right, to play by the rules, to keep commitments. Perhaps it is because we all sense the capacity for integrity within ourselves that we are able to notice and admire it even in people with whom, on many issues, we sharply disagree... No matter what our politics, no matter what causes we may support, would anybody really want to be led or followed or assisted by people who lack integrity?” p.7; “The question is not only what integrity is and why it is valuable, but how we move our institutions, and our very lives, closer to exemplifying it... I see the journey toward a greater understanding of the role of integrity in our public and private lives as one that the reader and I are making together.” p.8; “Integrity implies implicit obedience to the dictates of conscience - in other words, a heart and life habitually controlled by a sense of duty.” p.9; “But one can be honest without being integral, for integrity, as I define it, demands a difficult process of discerning one’s deepest understanding of right and wrong, and then further requires action consistent with what one has learned. It is possible to be honest without ever taking a hard look inside one’s soul, to say nothing of taking any action based on what one finds.” p.10; “But in order to live with integrity, it is sometimes necessary to take that difficult step - to get involved - to fight openly for what one believes to be true and right and good, even when there is risk to oneself....Integrity does not always require following the rules... sometimes, (it) requires breaking the rules...” p.12.
Organizational structures are remnants of the military organizations of prior centuries and earlier decades with their emphasis on authority and responsibility, span of control, chain of command, and blind obedience and high salary differentials between the rulers and the subjects. The enlightened philosophy of management in modern times is quite the opposite with a lot of emphasis on cooperation, communication, autonomy, employee suggestions, and mutual accountability and respect between the different constituents within an organization. Because when workers play by the rules, and the rulers are not held accountable, dictatorship sets in - no matter how benevolent and kind and generous the ruler(s) may be. I know it first hand because I have lost over 100 of my closest friends and relatives who fought for freedom and mutual accountability.

US industries went through a long period of restructuring and revamping of organizations in 1980's by primarily cutting the middle management and widening the span of control. The enlightened model of lateral communication and the top people being in center of things rather than on top of the bureaucracy is widely being implemented in industries during this decade. Organizations are not only moving away from hierarchical structures, they are leaning toward self organization. Universities must be at the forefront of this movement by a) cutting the bureaucracy to its bone, b) eliminating middlemen where-ever possible, c) eliminating huge pay differentials between faculty and administrators, d) promotion of the notion of administrators as facilitators in the community and not primarily as commanders, and e) most importantly, welcoming the notion of mutual accountability.

This mutual accountability brings with it the necessity of loosening up on control and control structure. By nature most of us want to be “in charge” and “in control”. Some people think that they are in control if everything goes through them and a strict chain-of-command rule is followed. In practice, they may unintentionally be promoting the idea of distrust and put a stranglehold on the smooth and natural flow of information within the organization.

Mutual accountability also necessitates mutual respect, understanding, cooperation, and give-and-take. The people within the organization are entitled to know how the resources are being used and whether these resources go toward accomplishing the main mission of the institution. Through this process, the administrators will become better custodians of these funds, and the several constituents (faculty, staff, and students) will join hands and ascertain that funds are efficiently, effectively, and judiciously allocated to promote and achieve the mission of the institution. They will feel a sense of ownership and will complain if university resources which are their resources are not used wisely and judiciously. We must also forge a strong and lasting relationship with the Administration where both sides respect one another as equal partners in this process of accountability.

To promote mutual accountability, the Faculty Senate must be cognizant of possible repercussions for those who speak up and ascertain that responsible, reasoned, and seasoned free speech is not trampled on but rather encouraged. We should in fact promote this dialogue by ascertaining that what we do, what we say, and how we do things are right and seek betterment of the institution rather than narrow-minded self interests. Mark Twain observed, “It is by the goodness of God that in our country we have those three unspeakably precious things: freedom
of speech, freedom of conscience, and the prudence never to practice either of them!” We must speak so that things will get better. If customers had not spoken, we would still have Pintos and Vegas rather than Taurus and Saturn. Alternatively, Ford and General Motors would have gone bankrupt.

The university will function effectively through persuasion and selling of ideas in the market place of ideas. No other tactic will work. Michael Kinsley once observed, “If you accept the necessity of freedom of expression, it follows that in an intellectual controversy any attempt to coerce rather than to persuade... is not merely an offense against the person so coerced, but an erosion of the mechanics which make free expression work, and therefore, make it possible.”

In defense of freedom, the media plays an important and vital role. They are protectors of liberty and truth. In that vein, we must ascertain that our conversation, our charges, our claims, and our motives are honorable and are not tainted by petty and self-serving designs and are free from vendetta and personal grudges or agendas. We, as responsible faculty members, can also influence the media in responsible and accurate reporting and not banking on sensationalism and petty arguments.

The senate must remain independent, free, and a haven for search for truth. We must purify ourselves of self interests and personal egos. We must help each other - faculty, administrators, staff, and students - understand that candor and integrity and clash of ideas with (mutual respect) and MUTUAL ACCOUNTABILITY are worthy - indeed holy - goals to pursue. If there is one goal, in my humble opinion, that we must achieve for the remaining of this session is to emphasize to the senate, to the faculty, and to the administration that the season for mutual accountability has arrived, that there is no way to go back, that there is absolutely no rift between administration and faculty as some faculty and many administrators want themselves to believe, but rather the fact that finding of truth is at many times painful and unsettling ... but my consolation to those who can’t stand the heat is: tough but you will live. I don’t mean this in an insensitive way; because the pain that I have endured during my lifetime has helped me grow and I am sure that it applies to you too - no pain, no gain; and my final reminder is this eastern saying: “those who make you laugh are not necessarily your friends, and those who make you cry are most probably your friends.”

Although I do not agree with many things that I have seen from Sikes Hall particularly within the last six months, I sense and feel a special decency and cooperative spirit in our new Provost which is the prerequisite to integral actions and fighting against entrenched self interests. We do not need or want additional papers. We want correction of books, responsible reporting, open interaction, and more importantly policies which will address serious problems of the past.

With this spirit, I say farewell. I extend my hand of friendship to all the people of goodwill, and invite all of you, the senators, president Curris, provost Rogers, Jerry Trapnell, Alan Winters, Brett Dalton, Scott Ludlow, and my friends, Ron Thurston, Fran McGuire, Gordon Halfacre, Jim Davis, Walt Owens, Budd Bodine, Cathy Sturkie, Gary Ransdell, David Fleming, Kay Lawson, John Newton, Alan Godfry, and Charles Tegen to my humble home for a simple Persian meal on Friday, April 4, 1997.
Program by Program Comparisons with Our "Benchmark Institutions": Assistant Professors' Salaries

Planning and Landscape Architecture [107%]
Environmental Toxicology [100%]
Marketing [107%]
Earth Sciences [106%]
Foundations and Special Education [100%]

100% of Average at Benchmark Institutions

Art [97%]
Construction Science and Management [92%]
English [93%]
Languages [91%]
Speech Communication [90%]
Architectural Studies [90%]
Entomology [93%]
Experimental Statistics [91%]
Accountancy [96%]
Sociology [94%]
Political Science [91%]
Computer Science [97%]
Civil Engineering [95%]
Mathematical Sciences [95%]
Electrical and Computer Engineering [95%]
Chemistry [92%]
Chemical Engineering [91%]

Nursing [99%]
Parks, Recreation, and Tourist Management [97%]
Curriculum and Instruction [91%]
Educational Leadership and Counseling [90%]

****Overall Clemson Salaries: 90% of Benchmark Institution Salaries****

Asst. Prof. Comparison 95-96
90% of Average at Benchmark Institutions

History [85%]
Performing Arts [84%]
Philosophy and Religion [81%]

Biology + Biological Sciences [89%]
Packaging Science + Food Science [84%]
Horticulture [80%]

Psychology [86%]
Management [86%]

Mechanical Engineering [89%]
Industrial Engineering [87%]
Ceramic Engineering, etc.* [86%]
Physics and Astronomy [84%]

Technology and Human Resource Development [89%]

80% of Average at Benchmark Institutions

Based on information compiled by the Office of Institutional Research for 1995-1996, and not guaranteed to be accurate. These are program-by-program comparisons—they allow for the fact that Chemical Engineering professors are paid more than Foreign Language professors at our peer institutions, etc. OIR had a separate category for New Assistant Professors, so Asst. Profs. in their first year of service are not included here.

The following programs either had no Assistant Professors in 95-96 or lack counterparts at our benchmark institutions: Agricultural and Applied Economics; Production Workers and Managers; Animal, Dairy, and Veterinary Sciences; Poultry Science; Agronomy; Soils; Forest Resources; Agricultural Education; Agricultural and Biological Engineering; Bioengineering; Environmental Systems Engineering; Textiles, Fibers, and Polymer Science; Plant Pathology and Physiology; Microbiology; Economics; Graphic Communications; Health Science, Finance; and Legal Studies.

*Ceramic Engineering, Freshman Engineering, and Engineering Graphics were lumped together as "Other Engineering" for comparison purposes.

Our benchmark institutions, as defined by President Curris, are: Auburn, University of California at Davis, Georgia Tech, Iowa State, Michigan State, Mississippi State, North Carolina State, Purdue, Texas A&M, Virginia Tech.
Program by Program Comparisons with Our “Benchmark Institutions”:
Associate Professors' Salaries

Construction Science and Management [104%]
Packaging Science + Food Science [125%]
Economics [106%]
Earth Sciences [111%]
Mathematical Sciences [102%]
Technology and Human Resource Development [102%]
Parks, Recreation, and Tourist Management [102%]
Foundations and Special Education [101%]

100% of Average at Benchmark Institutions

Art [98%]
Architectural Studies [97%]
History [96%]
Languages [94%]
Speech Communications [93%]
Horticulture [97%]
Agricultural and Biological Engineering [95%]
Finance [99%]
Marketing [99%]
Graphic Communications [97%]
Computer Science [97%]
Industrial Engineering [95%]
Mechanical Engineering [95%]
Chemistry [94%]
Civil Engineering [94%]
Ceramic Engineering, etc.* [92%]
Nursing [96%]

****Overall Clemson Salaries: 92% of Benchmark Institution Salaries****

English [91%]
Agronomy [91%]
Agricultural Education [91%]
Plant Pathology and Physiology [90%]

Electrical and Computer Engineering [91%]
Physics and Astronomy [91%]
Textiles, Fiber, and Polymer Science [91%]
Chemical Engineering [90%]
Curriculum and Instruction [90%]

Assoc. Prof. Comparison 95-96
90% of Average at Benchmark Institutions

Performing Arts [83%]
Philosophy and Religion [82%]

Agricultural and Applied Economics [88%]
Biology + Biological Sciences [88%]
Animal, Dairy, and Veterinary Sciences [84%]

Political Science [87%]
Sociology [87%]
Psychology [86%]
Accountancy [85%]
Management [84%]

80% of Average at Benchmark Institutions

Planning and Landscape Architecture [78%]
Educational Leadership and Counseling [74%]

70% of Average at Benchmark Institutions

Based on information compiled by the Office of Institutional Research for 1995-1996, and not guaranteed accurate. These are program-by-program comparisons—they allow for the fact that Chemical Engineering professors are paid more than Foreign Language professors at our peer institutions, and so forth.

The following programs either had no Associate Professors in 95-96 or lack counterparts at our benchmark institutions: Production Workers and Managers; Poultry Science; Soils; Forest Resources; Bioengineering; Environmental Systems Engineering; Microbiology; Environmental Toxicology; Entomology; Experimental Statistics; Health Science; Legal Studies.

*Ceramic Engineering, Freshman Engineering, and Engineering Graphics were lumped together as “Other Engineering” for comparison purposes.

Our benchmark institutions, as defined by President Cúrris, are: Auburn, University of California at Davis, Georgia Tech, Iowa State, Michigan State, Mississippi State, North Carolina State, Purdue, Texas A&M, Virginia Tech.
Program by Program Comparisons with Our “Benchmark Institutions”:

*Full Professors’ Salaries*

- History [105%]
- Art [102%]
- Construction Science and Management [101%]
- Plant Pathology and Physiology [110%]
- Agricultural and Applied Economics [104%]
- Soils [104%]
- Production Workers and Managers [104%]
- Horticulture [102%]
- Agricultural and Biological Engineering [100%]
- Graphic Communications [108%]
- Physics and Astronomy [103%]
- Ceramic Engineering, etc.* [102%]
- Technology and Human Resource Development [107%]
- Parks, Recreation, and Tourist Management [105%]

**100% of Average at Benchmark Institutions**

- Animal, Dairy, and Veterinary Sciences [99%]
- Poultry Science [94%]
- Agronomy [93%]
- Economics [94%]
- Mathematical Sciences [96%]
- Chemistry [95%]
- Computer Science [93%]
- Electrical and Computer Engineering [93%]
- Textiles, Fiber, and Polymer Science [93%]
- Foundations and Special Education [94%]
- Curriculum and Instruction [92%]

****Overall Clemson Salaries: 92% of Benchmark Institution Salaries****

- Packaging Science + Food Science [91%]
- Microbiology [90%]
- English [91%]
- Architectural Studies [90%]
90% of Average at Benchmark Institutions

Planning and Landscape Architecture [88%]
   Performing Arts [87%]
   Languages [84%]

   Entomology [89%]
   Experimental Statistics [87%]
   Biology + Biological Sciences [82%]

   Political Science [87%]
   Marketing [87%]
   Accountancy [86%]
   Management [84%]

   Chemical Engineering [88%]
   Industrial Engineering [88%]
   Mechanical Engineering [86%]
   Civil Engineering [83%]
   Earth Sciences [83%]

   Nursing [87%]

80% of Average at Benchmark Institutions

   Philosophy and Religion [73%]

   Finance [76%]
   Psychology [76%]
   Sociology [75%]

   Educational Leadership and Counseling [73%]

70% of Average at Benchmark Institutions

Based on information compiled by the Office of Institutional Research for 1995-1996, and not guaranteed accurate. These are program-by-program comparisons—they allow for the fact that Chemical Engineering professors are paid more than Foreign Language professors at our peer institutions, and so forth.

The following programs either had no Full Professors in 95-96 or lack counterparts at our benchmark institutions: Forest Resources; Speech Communications; Agricultural Education; Bioengineering; Environmental Systems Engineering; Environmental Toxicology; Health Science; Legal Studies.

*Ceramic Engineering, Freshman Engineering, and Engineering Graphics were lumped together as “Other Engineering” for comparison purposes.

] OIR’s salary figures for Sociology have been corrected.

Our benchmark institutions, as defined by President Curris, are: Auburn, University of California at Davis, Georgia Tech, Iowa State, Michigan State, Mississippi State, North Carolina State, Purdue, Texas A&M, Virginia Tech.
Mutual Accountability: What It Means and Why It Is Important
March 11, 1997

About three years ago, my wife insisted that I should go for a physical checkup. I countered by saying that I have functioned without it for 33 years of my adult working life, and I have not been sick or absent from my job for even one day... She always wins in the arguments though - you already know this one of my several weaknesses - or is it a strength? Upon thorough examination, the doctor verified that I have a 35-year-old body in a 55-year-old person and asked if I have any problem whatsoever. I said, many times I feel as if I am sick to my stomach because mostly people say something but later I find that they really mean something else; I truly feel sick about it; I feel as if I am developing ulcers because of it. He kindly referred me to a psychologist in town. I was tempted to go and see one except that I thought that he may also tell me something and mean something else! Also as a typical accountant, something that my wife truly detests, "I don’t spend money when I don’t have to!"

Reading Stephen L. Carter’s book Integrity solved this psychological pain - although the physical pain still continues, but I can better deal with it. Allow me to share with you, a few short passages: "... integrity is something I only think about, not something I exemplify. I strive toward it, as I am sure most of us do, but I do not pretend to achieve it very often... I define integrity with some care, to include discerning the right and acting on it, not simply living a consistent life according to some arbitrary set of principles." p.1; "We are all full of fine talk about how desperately our society needs it, but, when push comes to shove, we would just as soon be on the winning side." p.4; "if we happen to do something wrong, we would just as soon have nobody point it out... We, the People of the United States, who a little over two hundred years ago ordained and established the Constitution, have a serious problem; too many of us nowadays neither mean what we say nor say what we mean." p.5; "Integrity is like the weather: everybody talks about it but nobody knows what to do about it... So perhaps we should say that integrity is like good weather, because everybody is in favor of it." p.6; "A person of integrity lurks somewhere inside each of us: a person we feel we can trust to do right, to play by the rules, to keep commitments. Perhaps it is because we all sense the capacity for integrity within ourselves that we are able to notice and admire it even in people with whom, on many issues, we sharply disagree... No matter what our politics, no matter what causes we may support, would anybody really want to be led or followed or assisted by people who lack integrity?" p.7; "The question is not only what integrity is and why it is valuable, but how we move our institutions, and our very lives, closer to exemplifying it... I see the journey toward a greater understanding of the role of integrity in our public and private lives as one that the reader and I are making together." p.8; "Integrity implies implicit obedience to the dictates of conscience - in other words, a heart and life habitually controlled by a sense of duty." p.9; "But one can be honest without being integral, for integrity, as I define it, demands a difficult process of discerning one’s deepest understanding of right and wrong, and then further requires action consistent with what one has learned. It is possible to be honest without ever taking a hard look inside one’s soul, to say nothing of taking any action based on what one finds." p.10; "But in order to live with integrity, it is sometimes necessary to take that difficult step - to get involved - to fight openly for what one believes to be true and right and good, even when there is risk to oneself... Integrity does not always require following the rules... sometimes, (it) requires breaking the rules..." p.12
Organizational structures are remnants of the military organizations of prior centuries and earlier decades with their emphasis on authority and responsibility, span of control, chain of command, and blind obedience and high salary differentials between the rulers and the subjects. The enlightened philosophy of management in modern times is quite the opposite with a lot of emphasis on cooperation, communication, autonomy, employee suggestions, and mutual accountability and respect between the different constituents within an organization. Because when workers play by the rules, and the rulers are not held accountable, dictatorship sets in - no matter how benevolent and kind and generous the ruler(s) may be. I know it first hand because I have lost over 100 of my closest friends and relatives who fought for freedom and mutual accountability.

US industries went through a long period of restructuring and revamping of organizations in 1980's by primarily cutting the middle management and widening the span of control. The enlightened model of lateral communication and the top people being in center of things rather than on top of the bureaucracy is widely being implemented in industries during this decade. Organizations are not only moving away from hierarchical structures, they are leaning toward self organization. Universities must be at the forefront of this movement by a) cutting the bureaucracy to its bone, b) eliminating middlemen where-ever possible, c) eliminating huge pay differentials between faculty and administrators, d) promotion of the notion of administrators as facilitators in the community and not primarily as commanders, and e) most importantly, welcoming the notion of mutual accountability.

This mutual accountability brings with it the necessity of loosening up on control and control structure. By nature most of us want to be “in charge” and “in control”. Some people think that they are in control if everything goes through them and a strict chain-of-command rule is followed. In practice, they may unintentionally be promoting the idea of distrust and put a stranglehold on the smooth and natural flow of information within the organization.

Mutual accountability also necessitates mutual respect, understanding, cooperation, and give-and-take. The people within the organization are entitled to know how the resources are being used and whether these resources go toward accomplishing the main mission of the institution. Through this process, the administrators will become better custodians of these funds, and the several constituents (faculty, staff, and students) will join hands and ascertain that funds are efficiently, effectively, and judiciously allocated to promote and achieve the mission of the institution. They will feel a sense of ownership and will complain if university resources which are their resources are not used wisely and judiciously. We must also forge a strong and lasting relationship with the Administration where both sides respect one another as equal partners in this process of accountability.

To promote mutual accountability, the Faculty Senate must be cognizant of possible repercussions for those who speak up and ascertain that responsible, reasoned, and seasoned free speech is not trampled on but rather encouraged. We should in fact promote this dialogue by ascertaining that what we do, what we say, and how we do things are right and seek betterment of the institution rather than narrow-minded self interests. Mark Twain observed, “It is by the goodness of God that in our country we have those three unspeakably precious things: freedom
of speech, freedom of conscience, and the prudence never to practice either of them!” We must speak so that things will get better. If customers had not spoken, we would still have Pintos and Vegas rather than Taurus and Saturn. Alternatively, Ford and General Motors would have gone bankrupt.

The university will function effectively through persuasion and selling of ideas in the market place of ideas. No other tactic will work. Michael Kinsley once observed, “If you accept the necessity of freedom of expression, it follows that in an intellectual controversy any attempt to coerce rather than to persuade... is not merely an offense against the person so coerced, but an erosion of the mechanics which make free expression work, and therefore, make it possible.”

In defense of freedom, the media plays an important and vital role. They are protectors of liberty and truth. In that vein, we must ascertain that our conversation, our charges, our claims, and our motives are honorable and are not tainted by petty and self-serving designs and are free from vendetta and personal grudges or agendas. We, as responsible faculty members, can also influence the media in responsible and accurate reporting and not banking on sensationalism and petty arguments.

The senate must remain independent, free, and a haven for search for truth. We must purify ourselves of self interests and personal egos. We must help each other - faculty, administrators, staff, and students - understand that candor and integrity and clash of ideas with (mutual respect) and MUTUAL ACCOUNTABILITY are worthy - indeed holy - goals to pursue. If there is one goal, in my humble opinion, that we must achieve for the remaining of this session is to emphasize to the senate, to the faculty, and to the administration that the season for mutual accountability has arrived, that there is no way to go back, that there is absolutely no rift between administration and faculty as some faculty and many administrators want themselves to believe, but rather the fact that finding of truth is at many times painful and unsettling ... but my consolation to those who can’t stand the heat is: tough but you will live. I don’t mean this in an insensitive way; because the pain that I have endured during my lifetime has helped me grow and I am sure that it applies to you too - no pain, no gain; and my final reminder is this eastern saying: “those who make you laugh are not necessarily your friends, and those who make you cry are most probably your friends.”

Although I do not agree with many things that I have seen from Sikes Hall particularly within the last six months, I sense and feel a special decency and cooperative spirit in our new Provost which is the prerequisite to integral actions and fighting against entrenched self interests. We do not need or want additional papers. We want correction of books, responsible reporting, open interaction, and more importantly policies which will address serious problems of the past.

With this spirit, I say farewell. I extend my hand of friendship to all the people of goodwill, and invite all of you, the senators, president Curris, provost Rogers, Jerry Trapnell, Alan Winters, Brett Dalton, Scott Ludlow, and my friends, Ron Thurston, Fran McGuire, Gordon Halfacre, Jim Davis, Walt Owens, Budd Bodine, Cathy Sturkie, Gary Ransdell, David Fleming, Kay Lawson, John Newton, Alan Godfry, and Charles Tegen to my humble home for a simple Persian meal on Friday, April 4, 1997.
Respectfully submitted,

Roger K. Doost,
A servant for Faculty, the Faculty Senate, and the Student body

You are invited:

Friday, April 4, 1997 - 7 till midnight; a simple meal and drinks will be provided. Spouses are welcome.

No ties, please!

313 Lancelot Drive, Clemson (Camelot subdivision - dead-end street where you enter).

Optional: bring a dessert or a salad if you wish.

RSVP (droger or 656-4882 by Apr.1)

PS1/ My wife may not attend; she thinks my cooking is shameful!
PS2/ Various sources have informed me that some people have charged that my behavior in the past six months has been somewhat impatient, harsh, intimidating, provocative, and emotional.
These charges give me a sense of relief and gratitude. I have with me about 100 of recent class evaluations which, although some disagree with me on several factors, more or less unanimously confirm that I am the most patient, the most tolerant, and good natured person with a good sense of humor.
Friends! I was only acting to make a point. Now that the point is made, we can relax and enjoy our growth as a result of this process. Thanks, again.
Accountability Committee’s Report to the Senate
March 11, 1997

Upon the instruction of the Senate President, the Accountability Committee (Roger K. Doost, Gordon Halfacre, James R. Davis) met several times since November 1996. They reviewed and endorsed the main concerns and reports of the Welfare and Finance Committees that led to several resolutions dealing with growth of the administration at the cost of the faculty, huge salary differentials between administrators and faculty, huge raises given to administrators as compared to faculty during the past several years, the question of alleged savings from restructuring, and the question of addressing and correcting the pitfalls of the past.

The committee has met several times with Provost Rogers and several members of the administration as well as Robert Campbell from the Welfare Committee in an attempt to update the university’s employee database for a more refined breakdown between administrators, faculty, staff, and lecturers. A comprehensive salary list based both on calender-year and fiscal year for 1996 was also prepared and submitted to the Senate president and others who were present.

The committee also thoroughly reviewed president Curris’s report to Board of Trustees in December 1996 and provided a written response to the president’s report through the Senate’s president and the provost. The committee also provided a response along the same lines to the president’s e-mail of 1/13/1997 to the general faculty.

The committee hopes that the administration will take positive steps in establishing policies and procedures which will address and correct the several entrenched problems of the past. The provost has indicated his interest in continuation of this committee until these problems are addressed and resolved to the satisfaction of the Faculty.

Respectfully submitted,

Roger K. Doost, Chair, Accountability Committee
James R. Davis, Member, Accountability Committee
Gordon Halfacre, Member, Accountability Committee
INTRODUCTION

Faculty are most concerned with faculty and administrative salaries and the evaluation of administrators.

In the eyes of many faculty, restructuring has failed and administration has actually increased. The collective effect has seriously degraded faculty morale and has caused much confusion as to what is the role of faculty.

While most faculty are aware of the Faculty Senate, many faculty appear divided as to its role and effectiveness. Many agree that its most important current function is to serve as a forum for communications from the faculty. It would be more effective with the administration if it chose to focus on only a few important issues.
FACULTY SENATE SURVEY

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In Part I of the Faculty Senate Survey, respondents were asked to indicate their level of satisfaction with and the level of importance that each of twenty-five issues should have for the Faculty Senate. The responses were statistically analyzed to produce a "need" value which prioritized the issues.

The faculty are most concerned with faculty and administrative salaries and the evaluation of administrators.

Based on a grouping of similar "need" values this is a summary of what we found:

HIGHEST PRIORITY
"Adequacy of salary increases for faculty", closely followed by "Salary increases of administrators", and "Procedures for evaluation of administrators".

NEXT HIGHEST PRIORITY
"Adequacy of support for undergraduate instruction", "Inclusion of faculty input in decision making processes", and "Adequacy of support for graduate instruction".

MIDDLE PRIORITY
"Adequacy of support for research activities", "Adequate availability of classroom technology", "Relationships between faculty and University administration", "Suitability of classrooms for instructional purposes", and "Tuition reduction/waiver for employees' dependents attending Clemson".

LOW PRIORITY
"Faculty evaluation procedures", "Adequacy of laboratory equipment", "Consistency between faculty evaluations by administrators and faculty peer evaluations", "Availability of adequate classroom space", and "Adequate availability of research laboratory space".

LOWEST PRIORITY
"Parking fees", "Tuition reduction/waiver for non-faculty employees attending Clemson", "Adequacy of support for service/outreach/Extension activities", "Parking enforcement", "The University's commitment to diversity of faculty/staff", "University's commitment to diversity of students", "Availability of parking", "University-provided dependent care", and "Availability of a Faculty Club".
CLEMSON UNIVERSITY
FACULTYSENATE
FACULTY SURVEY

RANKING OF ISSUES

The faculty of Clemson University were asked to indicate their opinions as to their current level of satisfaction with twenty-five (25) campus issues that have been brought to the attention of the Faculty Senate in the past few years. Faculty were also asked to indicate the level of importance that they felt that each issue should have for the Faculty Senate. To identify those issues that need to be priorities for the Faculty Senate, Misanchuk's Proportionate Reduction in Error (PRE) Index of Need model was applied to the satisfaction and importance data from the faculty survey for those twenty-five items. Misanchuk's PRE statistic, $V_N$, yields a single value which concisely describes a "need" as defined on both dimensions, satisfaction and importance, simultaneously. The higher the value of $V_N$, the greater is the priority placed on the issue.

The PRE statistic should not be interpreted as representing the value of services or programs. A service or program that is very important and is adequately perceived as being at a satisfactory level will, by definition, receive a lower $V_N$ value than an issue that is perceived to be important and currently at an unsatisfactory level.

The following list are the twenty-five issue items ranked in descending order in priority using the PRE Model. The $V_N$ value is also displayed for each issue item.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANK</th>
<th>ISSUE ITEM</th>
<th>$V_N$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Adequacy of salary increases for faculty.</td>
<td>0.633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Salary increases of administrators.</td>
<td>0.576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Procedures for evaluation of administrators.</td>
<td>0.533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Adequacy of support for undergraduate instruction.</td>
<td>0.489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Inclusion of faculty input in decision making processes.</td>
<td>0.425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Adequacy of support for graduate instruction.</td>
<td>0.420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Adequacy of support for research activities.</td>
<td>0.390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Adequate availability of classroom technology.</td>
<td>0.377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Relationships between faculty and University administration.</td>
<td>0.367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Suitability of classrooms for instructional purposes.</td>
<td>0.338</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11 Tuition reduction/waiver for employees' dependents attending Clemson. 0.319
12 Faculty evaluation procedures. 0.299
13 Adequacy of laboratory equipment. 0.257
14 Consistency between faculty evaluations by administrators and faculty peer evaluations. 0.236
15 Availability of adequate classroom space. 0.232
16 Adequate availability of research laboratory space. 0.210
17 Parking fees. 0.195
18 Tuition reduction/waiver for non-faculty employees attending Clemson. 0.183
19 Adequacy of support for service/outreach/Extension activities. 0.147
20 Parking enforcement. 0.129
21 The University's commitment to diversity of faculty/staff. 0.124
22 University's commitment to diversity of students. 0.080
23 Availability of parking. 0.056
24 University-provided dependent care. 0.027
25 Availability of a Faculty Club. 0.019
CLEMSON UNIVERSITY
FACULTY SENATE
FACULTY SURVEY

The Clemson University Faculty Senate wants your input about a number of issues facing the University now and, perhaps, in the near future. The following items have been designed to give the Faculty Senate information as to Faculty opinion about the importance of these issues. Please complete this survey by giving us your honest opinions. Your specific comments will be especially helpful. When you have completed the survey, please return it to: Faculty Senate Office, R. M. Cooper Library.

PART I.

The following issues have been brought to the attention of the Faculty Senate in the past several years. For each of the issues, we would like to know your level of satisfaction with the current state of affairs at Clemson University related to that issue and the relative importance that you give that as being an issue that needs to be addressed by the Faculty Senate. For each issue:

1. In Column A, indicate your current level of satisfaction with the current state of affairs at Clemson University related to that issue. Use the following scale for LEVEL OF SATISFACTION: 1 = VERY DISSATISFIED, 2 = DISSATISFIED, 3 = NEITHER SATISFIED NOR DISSATISFIED, 4 = SATISFIED, 5 = VERY SATISFIED.

2. In Column B, indicate the level of importance that you feel the issue should have for the Faculty Senate. Use the following scale for IMPORTANCE: 1 = NOT IMPORTANT AT ALL, 2 = SOMEWHAT UNIMPORTANT, 3 = NEITHER IMPORTANT NOR UNIMPORTANT, 4 = SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT, 5 = EXTREMELY IMPORTANT.

RESULTS SHOWING VALID %'s FOR RESPONSES, N, MEAN AND SD

In Part I, many respondents entered comments to questions, even though they were not requested to do so. Comments were rated as to whether they were positive or negative to the question. After each issue in the survey, a sample response is included along with the number of respondents generally agreeing with that particular response.

LEVEL OF SATISFACTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL OF SATISFACTION</th>
<th>IMPORTANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VERY</td>
<td>NOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISSATISFIED</td>
<td>IMPORTANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SATISFIED</td>
<td>EXTREMELY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES</th>
<th>LEVEL</th>
<th>IMPORTANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Relationships</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>between faculty and</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>37.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>administration</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=680</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>(.97)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

POSITIVE (8) -- "This is slowly beginning to change."

NEGATIVE (36) -- "Lost trust, lack of honesty."

NOT APPLICABLE (12)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL OF SATISFACTION</th>
<th>IMPORTANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VERY Satisfied</td>
<td>NOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIS- Satisfied</td>
<td>IMPORTANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.3 12.9 52.1 10.7  8.9</td>
<td>19.7 14.1 32.5 22.1 11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=587 2.85 (1.09)</td>
<td>N=630 2.92 (1.27)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**POSITIVE (21) -- "A university that provides degrees in early childhood education with no child care facility as a service and teaching lab is ridiculous."**

**NEGATIVE (12) -- "Private care centers all around."**

**NOT APPLICABLE (40)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL OF SATISFACTION</th>
<th>IMPORTANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VERY Satisfied</td>
<td>NOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIS- Satisfied</td>
<td>IMPORTANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.4 19.9 23.0 31.7 13.0</td>
<td>6.2 13.1 28.9 34.1 17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=700 3.13 (1.23)</td>
<td>N=696 3.44 (1.11)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**POSITIVE (8) -- "It's better than it has been."**

**NEGATIVE (39) -- "There should be a space if we've paid for one."**

**NOT APPLICABLE (12)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL OF SATISFACTION</th>
<th>IMPORTANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VERY Satisfied</td>
<td>NOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIS- Satisfied</td>
<td>IMPORTANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.8 24.5 27.7 13.6 8.3</td>
<td>6.2 12.8 35.5 29.6 15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=697 2.54 (1.24)</td>
<td>N=693 3.36 (1.09)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**POSITIVE (6) -- "One of the cheapest of any land grant university. Should not be based on income, but location."**

**NEGATIVE (48) -- "Why should I have to pay the University to come to campus to do their work?"**

**NOT APPLICABLE (6)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL OF SATISFACTION</th>
<th>IMPORTANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VERY Satisfied</td>
<td>NOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIS- Satisfied</td>
<td>IMPORTANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.5 22.9 34.5 20.4 6.7</td>
<td>6.3 10.0 36.8 33.0 13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=690 2.80 (1.13)</td>
<td>N=687 3.38 (1.04)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**POSITIVE (0)**

**NEGATIVE (39) -- "It would be nice to get non-faculty out of the limited number of spaces - including guests!"**

**NOT APPLICABLE (6)**
LEVEL OF SATISFACTION

VERY DIS- VERY SATISFIED SATISFIED ISSUE

1 2 3 4 5 6. Faculty evaluation procedures.
14.0 24.8 28.7 27.7 4.8
N=686 2.85 (1.12)

POSITIVE (8) — "Our department has been OK in the past 2 years — since undesirable administrators."

NEGATIVE (47) — "This is a joke-it's all political."

NOT APPLICABLE (16)

12 3 4 5 7. Consistency between faculty 12 3 4 5 13.9 15.4 39.7 24.3 6.8 evaluations by administrators 1.3 3.0 18.5 38.4 38.9 and faculty peer evaluations. N=635 2.95 (1.11) N=638 4.11 (.89)

POSITIVE (7) — "In my experience this has worked fine. The potential is there for real problems because of the system."

NEGATIVE (16) — "Where/when is this happening?"

NOT APPLICABLE (18)

12 3 4 5 8. Procedures for evaluation 12 3 4 5 38.5 27.5 25.1 6.6 2.3 of administrators. 1.2 2.2 12.1 34.7 49.8 N=650 2.07 (1.05) N=651 4.30 (.85)

POSITIVE (4) — "The dual process is a bit unwieldy but not so bad once you get used to it. In my college it works well."

NEGATIVE (67) — "Have not had opportunity for input on any administrator above me!!"

NOT APPLICABLE (6)

12 3 4 5 9. Adequacy of salary increases 12 3 4 5 45.7 30.7 15.4 6.6 1.6 for faculty. 0.1 1.9 5.7 27.8 64.4 N=687 1.88 (1.00) N=686 4.55 (.70)

POSITIVE (2) — "Especially for us going up through the ranks as opposed to hired from the outside."

NEGATIVE (59) — "When one is promoted from one rank to another pay raises are peanuts since Lennon's era."

NOT APPLICABLE (9)
LEVEL OF SATISFACTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VERY</th>
<th>DIS-</th>
<th>NOT</th>
<th>VERY</th>
<th>SATISFIED</th>
<th>SATISFIED</th>
<th>ISSUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Salary increases of administrators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=668</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N=668</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

POSITIVE (3) -- "Good administrators would be worth paying."

NEGATIVE (74) -- "Administrators are important, but they are not all-important as one would gather from salary increases over last ten or so years. This remains a scandal."

NOT APPLICABLE (14)

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 11. Adequacy of support for undergraduate instruction. |
| 23.2 | 34.6 | 27.9 | 12.7 | 1.6 |
| N=677 | 2.35 | (1.02) |

POSITIVE (4) -- "Recently we received computers from Panthers games. This has helped."

NEGATIVE (35) -- "Despite rhetoric, not a top priority."

NOT APPLICABLE (10)

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 12. Adequacy of support for graduate instruction. |
| 19.6 | 30.0 | 34.9 | 14.6 | 0.9 |
| N=659 | 2.47 | (.99) |

POSITIVE (1) -- "Much more than undergraduate."

NEGATIVE (23) -- "Graduate education seems to be totally ignored in restructuring administration. Maybe we should be Clemson College."

NOT APPLICABLE (22)

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 13. Availability of adequate classroom space. |
| 9.2 | 24.6 | 32.9 | 26.1 | 7.1 |
| N=674 | 2.97 | (1.08) |

POSITIVE (4) -- "It appears to me that space is available but it might not always be conveniently located."

NEGATIVE (14) -- "Many classrooms crowded and poorly designed."

NOT APPLICABLE (5)
## LEVEL OF SATISFACTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPORTANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPORT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXTREM.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT ALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPORT.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUE</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14. Suitability of classrooms for instructional purposes.</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=676</td>
<td>4.28 (.81)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**POSITIVE (3)** -- "Mine are fine except for temperature regulation."

**NEGATIVE (36)** -- In my building you can talk about dangerous classrooms (Hardin).

**NOT APPLICABLE (5)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUE</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15. Adequate availability of classroom technology.</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>42.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=673</td>
<td>4.21 (.83)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**POSITIVE (8)** -- "Getting better."

**NEGATIVE (26)** -- "Need more computer access."

**NOT APPLICABLE (9)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUE</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16. Adequacy of support for research activities.</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>45.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=668</td>
<td>4.24 (.83)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**POSITIVE (7)** -- "OK."

**NEGATIVE (31)** -- "State support for research infrastructure is not adequate."

**NOT APPLICABLE (17)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUE</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17. Adequate availability of research laboratory space.</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>30.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=612</td>
<td>3.82 (1.00)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**POSITIVE (4)** -- "I’m in a new building."

**NEGATIVE (15)** -- "Our graduate program has tripled in last 10-15 yrs, and undergrad doubled. Same number of faculty, same space."

**NOT APPLICABLE (34)**
LEVEL OF SATISFACTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPORTANCE</th>
<th>NOT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IMPORT.</td>
<td>EXTREM.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT ALL</td>
<td>IMPORT.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUE</th>
<th>1 2 3 4 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18. Adequacy of laboratory equipment.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.3 22.2 48.3 13.1 4.1</td>
<td>4.0 2.0 27.8 32.0 34.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=603 2.75 (.97)</td>
<td>N=607 3.91 (1.02)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

POSITIVE (3) -- "OK."

NEGATIVE (12) -- "Only because I paid for 90% of it myself."

NOT APPLICABLE (36)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUE</th>
<th>1 2 3 4 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19. Adequacy of support for service/outreach/Extension activities.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.3 16.6 51.8 16.5 4.9</td>
<td>7.3 6.3 34.1 32.3 20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=595 2.89 (.96)</td>
<td>N=601 3.51 (1.10)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

POSITIVE (2) -- "MUCH improved."

NEGATIVE (15) -- "This has suffered numerous cutbacks."

NOT APPLICABLE (29)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUE</th>
<th>1 2 3 4 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20. Inclusion of faculty input in decisionmaking processes.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.0 32.1 27.1 14.5 2.4</td>
<td>1.6 1.9 11.4 38.2 46.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=676 2.39 (1.07)</td>
<td>N=675 4.27 (.86)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

POSITIVE (7) -- "OK at department level, poor at university level."

NEGATIVE (42) -- "Don't think faculty's viewpoint is seriously considered in decision-making level or higher."

NOT APPLICABLE (12)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUE</th>
<th>1 2 3 4 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21. The University's commitment to diversity of faculty/staff.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.2 14.9 43.2 23.1 7.6</td>
<td>6.5 8.1 31.5 30.5 23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=658 3.01 (1.07)</td>
<td>N=666 3.56 (1.13)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

POSITIVE (5) -- "I think commitment is there although intensity is quite variable."

NEGATIVE (39) -- "I see few women, Hispanics, or Asian Americans in leadership positions at Clemson."

NOT APPLICABLE (21)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL OF SATISFACTION</th>
<th>IMPORTANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VERY Satisfied</td>
<td>NOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIS- Very Satisfied</td>
<td>AT ALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4 13.4 44.7 28.3 8.1</td>
<td>5.5 5.5 30.9 40.7 17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=664 3.20 (.96)</td>
<td>N=669 3.59 (1.02)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**22. University's commitment to diversity of students.**

**POSITIVE (3) --** "Progress has been made with minority scholarships, etc."

**NEGATIVE (17) --** "We should strive to get the best academically able students."

**NOT APPLICABLE (20)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 2 3 4 5</th>
<th>23. Tuition reduction/waiver for employees' dependents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37.9 15.0 35.9 5.7 5.4</td>
<td>9.2 7.7 27.8 29.0 26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=646 2.26 (1.18)</td>
<td>N=662 3.55 (1.22)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**POSITIVE (34) --** "There are few perks for faculty and this would be a nice one and is done elsewhere."

**NEGATIVE (6) --** "$ better spent on salary."

**NOT APPLICABLE (30)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 2 3 4 5</th>
<th>24. Tuition reduction/waiver for non-faculty employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18.2 18.2 49.7 8.7 5.3</td>
<td>9.3 8.8 36.6 27.8 17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=622 2.65 (1.04)</td>
<td>N=636 3.35 (1.15)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**POSITIVE (17) --** "Should be the same as for faculty."

**NEGATIVE (2) --** "Not in line with other institutions."

**NOT APPLICABLE (24)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 2 3 4 5</th>
<th>25. Availability of a Faculty Club.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19.4 15.9 51.3 5.7 7.7</td>
<td>29.1 11.9 32.8 16.3 9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=635 2.67 (1.09)</td>
<td>N=670 2.66 (1.31)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**POSITIVE (16) --** "It's rare to see or know faculty from other Dept.'s. There's no such thing as "down time" anymore."

**NEGATIVE (30) --** "If you worry about this you're not working hard enough."

**NOT APPLICABLE (27)**
PART II.

Over the last two years, Clemson University has undergone a restructuring process. The following items are related to your opinions about various aspects of the University's restructuring. Please respond to each item by circling the letter of the response that BEST represents your opinion about that item.

In Part II, comments were solicited after the question had been answered. The comments were read to determine if any general response theme(s) were evident. Sample responses are listed along with the number of respondents agreeing with that particular response.

In the eyes of many faculty, restructuring has failed and administration has actually increased. The collective effect has been to seriously degrade faculty morale and has caused much confusion as to what is our role.

AS A RESULT OF THE UNIVERSITY'S RESTRUCTURING:

1. The overall efficiency of the University has:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th>N=683</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>A. INCREASED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>B. STAYED THE SAME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>C. DECREASED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>D. NOT SURE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments: INCREASED (11) -- "It varies from college to college. It has improved in the College of Engineering & Science."

DECREASED (135) -- "The system is still not sorted out even after two years! Much noise and change, little real action/benefit."

STAYED THE SAME OR NOT SURE (28)

2. The levels of University administration have:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th>N=684</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>A. INCREASED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>B. STAYED THE SAME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>C. DECREASED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>D. NOT SURE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments: INCREASED (69) -- "Additional level at school level has increased administration."

DECREASED (10) -- "Four deans offices and attendant personnel were eliminated."

STAYED THE SAME OR NOT SURE (15)

3. Faculty involvement in University affairs has:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th>N=692</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>A. INCREASED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>B. STAYED THE SAME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>C. DECREASED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>D. NOT SURE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AS A RESULT OF THE UNIVERSITY'S RESTRUCTURING:

Comments: INCREASED (11) -- "At least on paper."

DECREASED (37) -- "We were ignored."

STAYED THE SAME OR NOT SURE (10)

4. Communication between faculty and administration has:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th>N=694</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>A. INCREASED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>B. STAYED THE SAME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>C. DECREASED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>D. NOT SURE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments: INCREASED (26) -- "Flow down to the faculty has improved. Flow up from the faculty seems harder."

DECREASED (48) -- "It has gotten less and worse."

STAYED THE SAME OR NOT SURE (6)

5. The University's accountability to stakeholders (e.g., students, legislators, public) has:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th>N=687</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>A. INCREASED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>B. STAYED THE SAME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>C. DECREASED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>D. NOT SURE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments: INCREASED (15) -- "Significantly."

DECREASED (38) -- "If the public only knew the scam going on, they would be upset."

STAYED THE SAME OR NOT SURE (15)

6. My level of trust in University administration has:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th>N=692</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>A. INCREASED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>B. STAYED THE SAME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>C. DECREASED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>D. NOT SURE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments: INCREASED (25) -- "If efficiency and accountability hasn't improved after all the hoopla about reorganization, something is wrong."

DECREASED (61) -- "It can't get much worse."

STAYED THE SAME OR NOT SURE (14)
AS A RESULT OF THE UNIVERSITY'S RESTRUCTURING:

7. My ability to perform my job has:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th>N=689</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>A. INCREASED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>B. STAYED THE SAME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>C. DECREASED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>D. NOT SURE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:  
INCREASED (5) -- "Mostly due to larger class sizes."

DECREASED (71) -- "I have fewer tools and support with which to accomplish more tasks."

STAYED THE SAME OR NOT SURE (13)

8. My level of satisfaction with working at Clemson has:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th>N=692</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>A. INCREASED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>B. STAYED THE SAME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>C. DECREASED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>D. NOT SURE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:  
INCREASED (16) -- "Increased, yes, but not very much. There are glaring inconsistencies in application of the process and still examples of waste and favoritism and rottenness."

DECREASED (59) -- "After 30 years, sadly, the Clemson "family" is a faint memory."

STAYED THE SAME OR NOT SURE (10)

In your opinion, what have been the major benefits of the restructuring process at Clemson?

There have been none (244). -- "It has increased the level of (expletive deleted) on how to lie about saving money."

It has improved working relationships (103). -- "We got a better guy as dean."

It has reduced administration (61). -- "Got rid of incompetent department heads."

No opinion or not applicable (47).

It has resulted in cost savings (11). -- "Significant monies have been diverted from administration to instructional activities, for example, the investments in IT."

It has increased administration (10). -- "We have more people being paid as administrators (a benefit to those new administrators)."
In your opinion, what are the major problems at Clemson that are a result of the restructuring process?

It has caused confusion and lack of direction (273). "Our unorthodox structure has made us a laughing stock in higher education. There is no relationship between institutional mission, strategy, and organizational structure at Clemson University."

It has increased administration (103). "More layers of administration, too big colleges, more centralized functions, duplicated job functions between directors and departmental chairs."

Not applicable (34).

It has resulted in lack of staff support (29). "Too few people doing too much work."

There are none (26). "It has cost us a lot money with no apparent payoff."

The lack of faculty input (7). "Communications, lack of faculty input into decisions, increased administration even to the faculty level."

It has reduced administration (4). "Reduction in secretarial and accountant assistance at the departmental level."

PART III.

The Faculty Senate is the representative body of the Faculty of Clemson University. The following items relate to your opinions about the Faculty Senate. Respond to each item by circling the response that best represents your level of agreement with that item. Use the following scale: 1 = STRONGLY DISAGREE, 2 = DISAGREE, 3 = NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE, 4 = AGREE, 5 = STRONGLY AGREE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>STRONGLY DISAGREE</th>
<th>NEITHER AGREE</th>
<th>STRONGLY AGREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I am aware of the activities of Faculty Senate.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=692</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>29.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Faculty Senate communicates its activities to faculty members.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=695</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Faculty Senate is an effective organization.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=688</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>43.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Faculty Senate represents the interests of University faculty members.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=693</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>30.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. The Faculty Senators from my college represent the interests of our college's faculty.
   \( N = 688 \) 3.44 (1.03)  
   1 2 3 4 5
   5.7 8.0 38.2 33.0 15.1

6. Faculty Senate is relevant to me as a faculty member.
   \( N = 688 \) 3.27 (1.23)  
   1 2 3 4 5
   10.8 16.1 25.7 30.4 17.0

7. Faculty Senate works for the legitimate concerns of Faculty.
   \( N = 691 \) 3.53 (1.05)  
   1 2 3 4 5
   4.9 10.6 29.2 37.6 17.7

8. Faculty Senate serves an important role in the University.
   \( N = 689 \) 3.71 (1.19)  
   1 2 3 4 5
   6.0 10.7 21.0 30.6 31.6

9. Faculty Senate should be given additional authority and responsibilities.
   \( N = 683 \) 3.43 (1.25)  
   1 2 3 4 5
   10.7 9.2 31.6 23.9 24.6

In Part III, respondents were quired as to how the Faculty Senate might improve its responsibility to the faculty.

While most faculty are aware of the Faculty Senate, many faculty appear divided as to its role and effectiveness. Many agree that its most important current function is to serve as a forum for communications from the faculty. It would be more effective with the administration if it chose to focus on only a few important issues.

In your opinion, what does Faculty Senate do currently that provides the greatest benefit to the University?

- It acts as a watchdog on the administration (83). "Keeps the administration on its toes."
- It communicates on important issues (210). "Provides a strong voice in all areas."
- It does nothing (38). "Can't think of a thing."
- Not applicable (29).

In your opinion, what could Faculty Senate do to improve its importance to the University?

- Keep communications open (132). "Continue to function despite resistance in many areas. Without a strong Faculty Senate - we have no voice."
- Focus on important issues (145). "Reinforce the point that a university is its faculty, not its administration."
- Nothing (16). "If the trustees and administration don't care what you think, I expect there is little that can be done."
- Not applicable (23).
Part IV involved demographics and generated few comments.

1. What is your current faculty rank?
   %  
   N=692
   7.8 A. LECTURER
   3.0 B. INSTRUCTOR
   15.6 C. ASSISTANT PROFESSOR
   25.6 D. ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR
   43.4 E. PROFESSOR
   4.3 F. OTHER

2. Which of the following categories includes how many years you have been in a faculty position at Clemson?
   %  
   N=690
   25.1 A. 5 YEARS OR LESS
   22.6 B. 6-10 YEARS
   15.8 C. 11-15 YEARS
   14.6 D. 16-20 YEARS
   21.9 E. MORE THAN 20 YEARS

3. No question #3 appeared on Survey.

4. What is your current tenure status?
   %  
   N=689
   19.0 A. UNTENURED
   67.2 B. TENURED
   13.8 C. NON-TENURE TRACK POSITION

5. What is your gender?
   %  
   N=678
   25.2 A. FEMALE
   74.8 B. MALE

Part V. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Please include any additional comments that you would like to make related to the items in this survey or other topics you feel Faculty Senate should address. Use back of form is more space is needed.

Topics addressed reinforced those identified earlier, with accountability of administration, failure of restructuring, and the need for Faculty Senate to have a greater voice.

Additional comments

Press for accountability of administration (36). "Real accountability of upper administration of the reasons for restructuring. Their statements of cost savings and streamlining seem to be smoke screens, because neither was done."

Restructuring ills (30). "The "school" concept is a joke what have we achieved but lip service. The entire restructuring process was a unilateral decision by the Board of Trustees to improve appearances only. A total ignoring of the faculty input. This University is a joke and going backwards by leaps and bounds compared to our peers."
Teaching loads and support have declined (30). -- "Instructional videos are almost nonexistent."

Faculty Senate needs greater voice and support (21). -- "The administration should be held accountable for their activities, many of which interfere with equity and a sense of justice at the public institution. By its very nature there should be give and take between the Faculty Senate and the Administration. The Faculty Senate should be a strong support for faculty concerns."

Not applicable (15).

The small envelope (7).

Pay differentials and issues and benefits (6). -- "Pay raises are almost always politically arranged. If the news media ever got hold of some of the stories about how certain faculty were given tenure and/or promotion it would make the football scandals look like nothing."

Provide more oversight to athletics (5). -- "Misconduct of student athletes should be addressed."

Lack of mission in Faculty Senate (5).

Problems with Trustees (3). -- "I worry that the Trustees, in a good faith effort to benefit Clemson, will guide the University into a worse position nationally by misreading what it is that truly makes a University stand out...."

There was one additional comment that the Welfare Committee felt should be included in this Summary Report. The respondent prepared a very concise and thoughtful discourse which, in the the Committee's estimation, addresses most of the problems presently facing Clemson University. This response is long but is included in its entirety.

"Thank you for allowing me to participate in the Faculty Senate survey. In addition to the comments made on the survey form, I would like to address the following issues. I believe these issues represent serious problems at Clemson University.

(1) Clemson University has no viable mission or strategic plan. The university suffers from an identity crisis that stems from a lack of leadership and planning. The so-called strategic planning that has been accomplished is little more than window dressing and consists of a poorly-worded mission statement and a few other items. It makes no sense to undertake a major reorganization without a well-designed strategic plan; that is, structure follows strategy, not vice versa. Not one reputable university in the U.S. has an organization structure that resembles ours. If we created this new structure so that other institutions could follow suit, then we are suffering from delusions of grandeur. Not long ago, I was on an air flight. By chance, I sat next to a dean from another university who appeared to be a
very tactful, polished, and articulate man. When I described our new organization structure to him, he could barely hide his amusement and disbelief. He found the whole thing so incomprehensible that I had to describe and redescribe it to him several times before he finally understood.

When a car needs a tune-up, there is little need to rebuild the entire engine. The same can be said of our previous organizational structure. Over a period of time, all large organizations gain a little weight and become somewhat inefficient. I double seriously that we generated any real savings from the reorganization (I realize that we can use creative accounting practices to demonstrate cost savings when the need arises). I see no evidence of increased organization efficiencies, cost savings, or performance. Some minor retrenchments would probably have resolved most of our problems. What makes the reorganization even more puzzling is that it was done hurriedly under the direction of an interim president rather than waiting until the new president was on board.

(2) Clemson University is not a hospitable place for the serious academic. I recently attended the Clemson-North Carolina football game. Before the game, I spent several hours walking around the campus, libraries, alumni building, and dining halls. I sat in the dining hall and struck up a conversation with several UNC students. I have done similar things on my football trips to UVA, Duke, and Georgia Tech. Although most of the orange-clad fans left disappointed by the 45-0 defeat, I saw something even more depressing—our library, facilities, and student body quality are vastly inferior to those of most other ACC schools.

Unlike the schools that receive national attention for their academic prowess, the organizational culture at Clemson puts the budding bureaucrat-university administrator on a pedestal. I believe firmly that any university needs top-flight administrators. I also believe that top people should be paid first-rate salaries. We at Clemson, however, are willing to pay BMW prices for administrators who are of Ford Pinto quality. These individuals are adept at using the latest jargon, scurrying from one meeting to another, and generating dozens of reports. Alas, none of this "busyness" culture seems to have improved the status of our university. We have slipped from the second tier to the third tier of the U.S. News and World Report rankings, we are conspicuously absent from any of the Chronicle of Higher Education doctoral program rankings, and our football program (scandals notwithstanding) has reached a level of mediocrity that is on par with the rest of the institution. To add to these problems, we have had several students who have been disciplined or dismissed for arson, and we now have gang-rape lawsuit that will generate even more bad publicity for our institution. These incidents cannot possibly inspire much confidence in the eyes of perspective Clemson students or their parents.

A further irony of all of this is that our pay surveys indicate that we are pleased to pay Ford Pinto salaries to our faculty even though our current promotion and tenure policies demand more BMW-like performances. In our college, faculty (many of whom have extensive publications and are excellent performers in the classroom) have received pay raises that are, on the average, less than the amount needed to maintain pace with the cost of living (usually in the 2 percent to 3 percent range). In one Clemson department that ranks among the top ten nationally in terms of research productivity, salaries for full professors lag between $12,000 and $14,000 behind those of our official peer institutions. The administration and board of trustees might conclude that such pay levels are acceptable as long as we have minimally-qualified applicants waiting in the wings to fill faculty slots at Clemson. The cost of low faculty and staff morale coupled with the possibility that Clemson will be regarded increasingly as an academic backwater should provide reason to pause and reflect. Does the board of trustees and central administration really want to compete in the same
academic league with Western Carolina, Georgia Southern, and East Tennessee State? Will Clemson continue to be the academic step child among ACC schools? Right now, that's where we are headed.

It appears that our faculty, students, and administration are reading from different pages. Faculty want competitive salaries, decent research and teaching facilities, and a modicum of respect for their scholarly activities. Our students want to earn their degree and enjoy a good social life (some are very about learning although most think that learning is OK as long as it does not require too much stress). Overall, our students are a pretty good bunch who are being forced to pay inflated tuition to subsidize the neglectful lack of funding by the state as well as our high administrative overhead.

(3) I would suggest the following:

* We need to do a complete strategic plan for the university that includes a mission statement, a concrete set of objectives (e.g., end-result targets for student body size, graduate-undergraduate mix, SAT score objectives, funding objectives, etc.), an assessment of our institutional strengths and weaknesses, the environmental threats and opportunities that we face, and the strategic posture that the university expects to follow over the next decade (research emphasis, teaching emphasis, marketing efforts, the role of intercollegiate athletics, sources of funding, etc.). This effort may require hiring outside consultants, and we must be prepared to hear some frank and disturbing commentaries (as was the case with the consultants report on our computer facilities).

* We need to recruit the best faculty and students that money can buy. Duke, UVA, Vanderbilt, UNC, and other top southern universities have been willing to do this for years, and this strategy has paid handsome dividends for these institutions. Good faculty attract money and prestige. Good students become generous alumni and generate favorable publicity for the university. In short, we need to take the same aggressive attitude toward faculty and student recruitment that we do toward recruiting blue-chip football players (and the NCAA has no regulations to constrain us when it comes to recruiting these groups!). In our department, we have lost promising faculty candidates (who really liked our department and the Clemson community) to other schools who were willing to offer $15,000 to $20,000 more that we could offer. The State of South Carolina, the Clemson board of trustees, and the central administration should view this situation as totally unacceptable.

* We must stop fighting with each other. Faculty and student morale had declined on this campus over the past decade. Students and their parents feel pressured by escalating college costs and growing doubts as to whether they are getting a good return on their investment. The administration surely feels the pressure of funding shortages and stirrings of unrest by faculty, student, alumni, and other groups. Faculty are often quick to accuse the administration of being preoccupied with their personal pay, power, and perquisites. Students accuse the faculty and administration of being uncaring and aloof. The administration often regards faculty and students as not understanding the "big picture" or of being naive about what is required to run a large university. Of course, infighting usually serves to exacerbate rather than to resolve these problems. A good strategic planning effort that involves all these groups as well as a commitment to hiring and rewarding the best faculty, students, and administration that we can possibly find represents the quickest fix in my opinion. Clemson has potential. The community provides a good quality of life for prospective faculty and students. If we can establish a strong academic infrastructure, we can develop Clemson into a first-rate institution."
A document of the complete survey with all comments will soon be available for review in:

the R. M. Cooper Library,
the Faculty Senate Office, or on the Faculty Senate Web Page
96-97 Salary Report

Robert L. Campbell

March 11, 1997

- New group and category system this year improves job classifications notably
  a. sorts out different levels of Classified Staff
  b. separates different areas within the University to fit the Finance Committee’s budgetary analysis
- Every employee with salaries of $30K or above was included this time—there are plenty of faculty and administrators who are paid less than $50K base salary
- The system that OIR used from 1992 to 1996 to code employees as faculty and administrators relied too much on State job classifications
  a. overcounted faculty by about 10%
  b. undercounted administration by not considering any classified staff to be administrators, even those who managed other employees
  c. the old Faculty Senate procedure of using the telephone book undercounted administrators slightly, but was more reliable

[259 admins. in academic or central admin areas
+ 239 elsewhere
= 498
- 154 extension agents or associates
= 343 total administrators vs. 328 by phone-book count for 96-97]

- Estimated faculty numbers are consistent with OIR’s enumeration of 942 people eligible to vote for Faculty Senators in 95-96
- They are not consistent with OIR’s public declaration that we had 1221 faculty members in 95-96 and 1235 in 96-97
Salary Trends:

• As previously reported, it was a good year for new Department Chairs, new School Directors, and people working in Deans' Offices

• Also as previously reported, raises for Vice Presidents, sitting Department Chairs, and other conspicuous administrators were held down in percentage terms, though not in absolute dollars

• A more careful analysis of Upper-level Staff and regular Staff salaries in comparison to faculty salaries shows that Faculty did not fare well on the whole, in percentage or dollar terms

• Are Clemson Faculty civil servants with three pay grades?
  
a. Most faculty were not eligible for raises above 5% without being promoted
b. In AFLS, ENST, and on a few occasions in BPA, faculty got larger raises without being promoted—where did the funds come from?

Coming next:

• A complete analysis of base salaries from 90-91 to 96-97, for all full-time University employees, using the new groups and categories

• A digest of the Calendar Year 1996 total salary analysis, showing averages for Faculty Members and Chairs by Department, and for administrators

• A new printout of all $50K-plus total salaries for Calendar Year 1996
1. Employees on CU payroll in both 1995-1996 and 1996-1997, who earned $30,000 or more in base salary in 1996-1997

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Academic</th>
<th>Central Admin</th>
<th>Extension</th>
<th>Athletic</th>
<th>Auxiliary</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pres/VP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean-level</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair-level</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair/12to9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Staff</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Infotech</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infotech</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>751</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fac/12to9</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaches</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1217</strong></td>
<td><strong>177</strong></td>
<td><strong>332</strong></td>
<td><strong>58</strong></td>
<td><strong>106</strong></td>
<td><strong>1890</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. A comparison of the old job codes used by OIR with the new category system—for employees with $30,000 or more in base salary for 96-97

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Pres/VP</th>
<th>Deans</th>
<th>Admin/12to9</th>
<th>Acad</th>
<th>Admin</th>
<th>Fac/12to9</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Coaches</th>
<th>Extension</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pres/VP</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean-level</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair-level</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair/12to9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Staff</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Infotech</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infotech</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>781</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fac/12to9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaches</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>107</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>878</strong></td>
<td><strong>55</strong></td>
<td><strong>189</strong></td>
<td><strong>619</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>1890</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Average 96-97 base salary, for employees making $30,000 or more, by group and category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Academic</th>
<th>Central Admin</th>
<th>Extension</th>
<th>Athletic</th>
<th>Auxiliary</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pres/VP</td>
<td>106755.00</td>
<td>122084.40</td>
<td></td>
<td>123000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>120025.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean-level</td>
<td>99324.78</td>
<td>82329.38</td>
<td>96383.67</td>
<td>73858.29</td>
<td>119048.00</td>
<td>91126.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair-level</td>
<td>73838.62</td>
<td>53561.00</td>
<td>66025.35</td>
<td>47662.00</td>
<td>75771.43</td>
<td>70895.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair/12to9</td>
<td>71963.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Staff</td>
<td>47519.28</td>
<td>47792.07</td>
<td>40674.73</td>
<td>54154.00</td>
<td>50277.11</td>
<td>44176.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Infotech</td>
<td>53623.81</td>
<td>52465.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>32503.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>52390.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>36282.04</td>
<td>36248.06</td>
<td>38496.27</td>
<td>36286.58</td>
<td>38890.30</td>
<td>37246.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infotech</td>
<td>38566.83</td>
<td>35685.50</td>
<td>33985.00</td>
<td>34436.00</td>
<td>38247.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>56041.14</td>
<td></td>
<td>59935.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>56228.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fac/12to9</td>
<td>61225.03</td>
<td></td>
<td>67867.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>61432.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>53977.68</td>
<td>45458.92</td>
<td>45599.47</td>
<td>57142.47</td>
<td>43829.34</td>
<td>51236.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Robert L. Campbell / Welfare Committee/ March 11, 1997
4. Average dollar raise between 1995-1996 and 1996-1997, for employees making $30,000 and over in 96-97

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Academic</th>
<th>Central Admin</th>
<th>Extension</th>
<th>Athletic</th>
<th>Auxiliary</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pres/VP</td>
<td>19408.00</td>
<td>4904.80</td>
<td>3000.00</td>
<td>3000.00</td>
<td>6704.57</td>
<td>6704.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean-level</td>
<td>6155.44</td>
<td>2533.13</td>
<td>3808.67</td>
<td>2727.43</td>
<td>5126.00</td>
<td>4505.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair-level</td>
<td>3981.87</td>
<td>1811.00</td>
<td>3524.68</td>
<td>2706.80</td>
<td>1767.00</td>
<td>3699.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair/12to9</td>
<td>1035.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1035.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Staff</td>
<td>2552.95</td>
<td>2600.01</td>
<td>2227.55</td>
<td>3091.75</td>
<td>3634.61</td>
<td>2464.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Infotech</td>
<td>2745.69</td>
<td>1724.50</td>
<td></td>
<td>1068.00</td>
<td>2549.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>2287.79</td>
<td>1933.55</td>
<td>2307.97</td>
<td>1484.17</td>
<td>2058.64</td>
<td>2153.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infotech</td>
<td>2192.20</td>
<td>2403.50</td>
<td>3010.00</td>
<td>1131.67</td>
<td>2193.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>2424.37</td>
<td></td>
<td>2249.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2415.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fac/12to9</td>
<td>-3000.19</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>-2906.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5531.00</td>
<td>5531.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>2443.68</td>
<td>2308.19</td>
<td>2412.58</td>
<td>3900.03</td>
<td>2300.36</td>
<td>2462.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Robert L. Campbell / Welfare Committee / March 11, 1997
5. Average percentage raise from 95-96 to 96-97, by group and category, for employees with base salaries over $30,000 in 96-97

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Academic</th>
<th>Central Admin</th>
<th>Extension</th>
<th>Athletics</th>
<th>Auxiliary</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pres/VP</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean-level</td>
<td>7.15</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>5.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair-level</td>
<td>6.12</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>5.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair/12to9</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Staff</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>5.92</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>8.14</td>
<td>6.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Infotech</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>5.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>7.01</td>
<td>5.76</td>
<td>6.48</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>6.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infotech</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>9.77</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fac/12to9</td>
<td>-4.07</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-3.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.78</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>7.73</td>
<td>5.84</td>
<td>5.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
POLICY COMMITTEE
FEBRUARY MEETING

The Policy Committee of the Faculty Senate met on February 18, 1997.

Provost Rogers met with the committee to discuss inclusion of Dean’s involvement in Search Committee membership appointments. The committee felt that Department Heads and Chairs were well aware of Affirmative Action rules and regulations and would assure Search Committee compliance. However, the committee decided to revisit the wording before sending it to the full Senate.

The Policy Statement on Political Activity for the Manual was reviewed and discussed. Guidelines regarding holding office for national versus a state/local office were discussed. The Committee also discussed guidelines for determining action related to adverse effects on fulfillment of responsibilities to the University. To quote actual text (this relates to running for office), “In essence, any employee who desires to run for public office at the state or federal level will be required to take leave without pay if it is determined by the immediate supervisor that such activity interferes upon the fulfillment of the employee’s University responsibilities. Appeals of such determinations may be made within one week to the appropriate Vice President. Further appeal may be made within one week by either party to the President. Regarding holding public office—employees elected to serve at the state or national level will request either a leave without pay for the period or to resign his or her position prior to assuming office. However holding a county, municipal, and other local office is permitted unless it has an adverse affect on University responsibilities. Appeals are grievable under University grievance procedures.

The Reestablishment of Graduation Ceremony Committee was discussed. Reflects an omission in the new Faculty Manual. Functions as an oversight body composed of representative administrators, faculty members, and undergraduate/graduate students. This body would formulate and recommend policy relating to academic ceremonies and would report to the Academic Council.

The Formation and Dissolution of Departments, Faculties, Schools, and Centers was discussed. Relates to the issue of procedures to be followed in the formation and/or dissolution of academic departments, etc. It previously had been omitted in previous manuals. The recommendation regarding formation/dissolution etc would come from the collegiate deans. Previously formation of new departments etc was handled on an ad hoc basis with the assumption that the Provost would be involved. By placing this issue into the Faculty Manual, the decision process would be established.

After much discussion, telephone tag experiences, and time lapse, the Committee finally put the Fine Arts Committee to rest-in terms of faculty involvement and inclusion in the Faculty Manual. After talking to the former Chair, Mike Ellison, the Policy Committee is convinced that duties once conducted by faculty members and other F.A. Committee members are now being conducted out of the Brooks Center.

A policy regarding Redefining Time in Rank for Promotions was discussed briefly. However, Committee members felt the issue required more time than was available. Therefore, it will be discussed at the next meeting which will be held on March 4th, at 11:00 AM.

Respectfully submitted,

Pat Smart, Chair
Minutes
Meeting of Faculty Senate Research Committee
February 5, 1997

Members present: Jenkins, Gauthreaux, Linvill, Makram, and Wheeler

The Committee discussed responses from Deans and Directors regarding expenditure of monies from the 25 cent on the dollar research incentive. The general response was that incentive money has just been incorporated into operating money for the Colleges, and Deans are now dependant on these funds to meet operating expenses for the College. Very little, if any, of these funds are being returned to PI’s as a research incentive.

The Committee then met with Charles Tegan, W. C. Hallums, Clint Carlson, and Steve Crump to get clarification of the Universities effort to raise the classification of equipment on grant spending from 500 to 5000 dollars. A proposal is now under consideration at Clemson with possible adoption by July 1, 1997. Under the increased limit, grant money could be spent on equipment purchases up to $5,000 rather than the present $500. This would increase grant money eligible for indirect costs, although the rate may be lowered causing the final move to be revenue neutral. Indirect costs on existing grants would not be increased as the new policy takes effect. Paperwork on inventory would be reduced as 48,000 equipment items currently on inventory would be reduced to 4500. Insurance of equipment items would not be affected as the deductible would remain at $1,000. A written proposal is being prepared and will be shared with the Faculty Senate Research Committee.

The next meeting of the Faculty Senate Research Committee will be held on Wednesday, March 5 at 3 pm in 104 McAdams Hall.

Submitted by,

Tom Jenkins
18 December 1996

To: Professor Patricia T. Smart, Chair
Faculty Senate Policy Committee

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

Re: Deletion of Council of Academic Deans from Manual

Among the recommendations of the ad hoc committee considering the implementation of the Academic Council is the observation that "The current Council of Academic Deans should be disbanded since its charge is embraced by the Academic Council."

The composition of the Council of Academic Deans is outlined on page 52 of the August 1996 Faculty Manual. A check of that roster against the composition of the new Academic Council (page 39) confirms that many are represented on the new body as advisory to the President through the Provost EXCEPT for the senior vice provosts, the Vice President for Public Service and Agriculture, and the Director of Computing and Information Technology. With the exception of the Vice President, it could be argued that all the others have adequate access to the provost through weekly staff meetings. Presumably the vice presidents have formal chance to interact through membership on the President’s Cabinet (pages 45-46).

In order to reduce the span of control in terms of the number of governance bodies reporting to the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, it is requested that you and your committee colleagues give endorsement to the deletion of that paragraph in the current Faculty Manual dealing with the charge and composition of the Council of Academic Deans. If there is any clarification which I may provide, please call upon my services.

cc: Academic Vice President and Provost Steffen H. Rogers
Faculty Senate President Ronald J. Thurston
ad hoc Committee Chair Dean James F. Barker
Policy Committee Members
Mesdames Betty M. Moore and Cathy T. Sturkie
To: Professor Patricia T. Smart, Chair  
Faculty Senate Policy Committee

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

Re: Reestablishment of Graduation Ceremony Committee

In the faculty governance changes effected last year,  
the former provision for a "Graduation Ceremony Committee"  
(page 42 of the 1991 Faculty Manual) was omitted from the  
1996 version. That omission needs to be corrected for an  
oversight body composed of representative administrators,  
faculty members, and undergraduate/graduate students is  
needed for the supervision of academic ceremonies.

It is proposed that a new committee be added to those  
reporting to the Academic Council. An abbreviated charge  
and slightly redefined membership should appear on page 41  
as follows:

8. Academic Ceremony Committee.

This committee formulates and recommends policy  
relating to academic ceremonies and coordinates Faculty  
participation in such ceremonies.

Members are the University Marshall (chair), the  
collegiate marshalls, the Registrar, the Senior Vice  
Provost for Undergraduate Studies, the Graduate School  
Dean, a College Dean, the President of the Faculty  
Senate or designee, the President of the Student Senate  
or designee, the President of the Student Body or des-  
ignee, and the President of the Graduate Student Asso-  
ciation or designee.

In this fashion a representative committee would be available to address policy concerns affecting campus ceremonial functions.

cc: Academic Vice President and Provost Stephen H. Rogers  
Faculty Senate President Ronald J. Thurston  
Senior Vice Provost Jerome V. Reel, Jr.  
Interim Graduate Dean Farrell B. Brown  
University Marshall Harold Garth Spencer  
Student Body President Theodore J. Swann  
Student Senate President D. Scott Mazyck  
Graduate Student Gov't President Melissa Lynn Major  
Task-Force Chair Ronald H. Nowaczyk  
Policy Committee Members  
Mesdames Betty M. Moorhead
To: Professor Patricia T. Smart, Chair  
Senate Policy Committee  

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

Re: Abolition of the Fine Arts Committee  

Among the issues to be resolved before the expiration of your committee's service is the request from the Fine Arts Committee (page 47 of the 1996 Manual) that this committee be abolished.

The legislative history of the matter may be summarized as follows. Under the date of March 14, 1995 then Chair of the Fine Arts Committee, Mike Ellison, recommended that the committee be "dissolved" since the changing face of the fine arts on campus with the construction of the Brooks Center and the appointment of a Director provided an environment in which there is "no commanding reason d'etre." Provost Jennett accepted the recommendation on March 17th, but the suggestion never made the rounds of the three-tiered review process for changes in the Faculty Manual.

I referred the matter to the attention of your committee on May 7, 1996. At the following Faculty Senate meeting in June you reported that the committee expressed the desire to inquire further into the matter to be sure that no campus interest was being overlooked in accepting the Fine Arts Committee's recommendation. There the matter has rested in the intervening months except for passing mention at the October meeting of the Policy Committee that the issue was pending still.

We need to get this resolved one way or the other because a committee on the fine arts has been moribund for two years! I ask that this subject be placed on the agenda for the Policy Committee meeting slated for February 18th. If there is any additional background which I may provide on this question, please call upon my services because I had previously contacted all the interested parties.

cc: Vice President and Provost Stephen H. Rogers  
Dean James F. Barker  
Faculty Senate President Ronald J. Thurston  
Former Fine Arts Committee Chair Michael S. Ellison  
Performing Arts Chair Clifton S. M. Egan  
Brooks Center Director Lillian U. Harder  
Senate Policy Committee Members  
Mesdames Betty M. Mooj
To: Professor Patricia T. Smart, Chair  
Faculty Senate Policy Committee  

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

Re: Adding Libraries Patent Coordinator to Intellectual  
Property Committee  

The August 1996 Faculty Manual makes provision on page  
49 for an Intellectual Property Committee composed of those  
campus individuals most conversant with matters involving  
patents and intellectual property proposals.  

Experience now suggests that the Patent Coordinator for  
Cooper Library should be included in the membership of that  
body as an ex officio, non-voting member. A check with the  
affected constituencies suggests that this is an idea with  
merit.  

Language to effect such a change could be accomplished  
in the following manner in line 6 (new language under-  
scored):  

... a faculty representative from each college, and the  
person from Cooper Library identified as Patent Coordi-  
nator serving in an ex officio, non-voting capacity.  

In this fashion the membership of the committee would con-  
form to best practice in reviewing faculty proposals.  

I apologize for the last-minute nature of the re-  
quest, but it has just been drawn to my attention and it  
seemed best to get such a minor consideration reviewed be-  
fore the conclusion of the current Senate year.  

cc: Vice President and Provost Steffen H. Rogers  
Faculty Senate President Ronald J. Thurston  
Special Assistant to the President Bob E. Gilliand  
Dean of Libraries Joseph F. Boykin, Jr.  
Policy Committee Members  
Mesdames Betty M. Moore and Cathy T. Sturkie
To: Professor Patricia T. Smart, Chair  
Faculty Senate Policy Committee  
From: Robert A. Waller, Editorial Consultant for the  
Faculty Manual  
Re: Addition of Librarian to Calhoun College Committee

As a result of the Nowaczyk committee efforts the governance structure of this university was streamlined with the introduction of an Academic Council reporting to the President through the Provost. Among the committees reporting to this body is the Calhoun College Committee which assists in formulating and recommending policy with respect to the Honors Program.

Implementation of the Nowaczyk committee recommendations has just begun, but it is realized that it was perhaps an oversight to omit representation from Cooper Library in the composition of this committee. Library resources are too central to the effectiveness of any honors program for that unit not to be represented on the Calhoun College Committee.

Thus, it has been suggested that the composition of this committee (page 41 of the August 1996 Faculty Manual) be amended to allow the addition of one (1) voting member from the Libraries on campus. Such a change could be effected by modifying the opening statement on membership as follows (with added language underscored):

Membership consists of the following: (Voting)

One faculty representative from each college and the library elected by the collegiate and library faculty for a staggered three-year term;.... [The remainder of the paragraph would remain the same.]

In this fashion an important constituency in the delivery of an effective honors activity would be continuously represented at the advisory table.

If I may provide any additional assistance to you in reviewing this request, please call upon my services.

c.c.: Vice President and Provost Steffen H. Rogers  
Librarian Joseph F. Boykin, Jr.  
Honors Director Stephen H. Wainscott  
Faculty Senate President Ronald J. Thurston  
Professor Ronald H. Nowaczyk  
Policy-Committee Members  
Mesdames Betty M. Moore and Cathy T. Sturkie
To: Professor Patricia T. Smart, Chair
Faculty Senate Policy Committee
From: Robert A. Waller, Editorial Consultant for the Faculty Manual
Re: Formation and Dissolution of Departments, Faculties, Schools, and Centers

As we work with the August 1996 version of the Faculty Manual, it has been discovered that the present and previous manuals are silent on the issue of procedures to be followed in the formation and/or dissolution of academic departments, faculties, schools, centers, and comparable units. That omission should be corrected.

During the most recent administrative reorganization of the campus concerning the colleges and the vice presidents, the President and the Board of Trustees were directly involved following faculty study. In previous years the formation of new departments, faculties, schools, centers, and comparable units was handled on an ad hoc basis with a presumption that the Provost's Office would ultimately be involved in the decision. Now seems a propitious time to codify that involvement and also to include attention to the dissolution of units as well as their formation.

I direct your committee's attention to the description of the responsibilities of the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost found on pages 6-7 of the 1996 Faculty Manual. To the roster of duties found in the paragraphs on page 7, the following should be inserted at the conclusion of the second paragraph (new language underscored):

...and recommends such increases to the president; receives recommendations from the collegiate deans concerning the formation and/or dissolution of departments, faculties, schools, and centers and transmits his/her recommendation to the President, the Board of Trustees, and/or the Commission on Higher Education as appropriate.

In this manner the role of the chief academic officer in these important decisions would be legislatively established.

c.c.: President Constantine W. Curris
Academic Vice President and Provost Steffen H. Rogers
Collegiate Deans
Faculty Senate President Ronald J. Thurston
Policy Committee Members
Mesdames Betty M. Moore and
To: Professor Patricia T. Smart, Chair
Faculty Senate Policy Committee
From: Robert A. Waller, Editorial Consultant for the Faculty Manual
Re: Policy Statement on Political Activity for the Manual

Unexplainedly, the August 1996 version of the Faculty Manual omitted a policy statement with respect to political activity on the part of faculty. To correct that omission, the following language is proposed for insertion on page 76:

As a public institution Clemson University does not take a position in favor of or in opposition to any candidate or to any non-University-related political position. However, the University recognizes that, as citizens, Clemson employees may desire to undertake civic duties and participate in political life at its local, state, and national levels. The University recognizes, also, that full-time and some part-time employment with Clemson University is a time-consuming responsibility and the University cannot permit the neglect of that responsibility. Therefore, it is the policy of Clemson University that its employees may seek election to and hold public office provided such actions are in compliance with all state and federal rules and regulations and in accordance with the following guidelines:

A. RUNNING FOR PUBLIC OFFICE

Any employee who desires to run for public office at the state or federal level will be required to take leave without pay if it is determined by the immediate supervisor that such activity impinges upon the fulfillment of the employee's University responsibilities. Appeals of such determinations may be made within one week to the appropriate...
ate Vice President. Further appeal may be made within one week by either party to the President.

B. HOLDING PUBLIC OFFICE

Recognizing that the responsibilities of holding public office at the state or federal level affect adversely the fulfillment of University responsibilities, the employee elected to such a public office will need either to be granted a leave without pay for the period of active service or to resign his or her position prior to assuming office. The holding of county, municipal, and other local offices is permitted. However, if the duties of such an office adversely affect the fulfillment of University responsibilities, the employee must either request a leave without pay for the period of active service or resign his or her position. Requests for leave without pay are to be made in accordance with University policy and procedures. Such requests will be considered on an individual basis and will be granted if it is determined that approval of the request will not negatively affect the University. Appeals of the need for leave without pay or resignation may be made by the elected official through appropriate University channels and are grievable under University grievance procedures.

cc: President Constantine W. Curris
Vice President and Provost Steffen H. Rogers
General Council Benjamin W. Anderson
Senate President Ronald J. Thurston
Policy Committee Members
Mesdames Betty M. Moore and Cathy T. Sturkie
19 February 1997

To: Professor Patricia T. Smart, Chair
Faculty Senate Policy Committee

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

Re: Refinement of Tenure and Rank Descriptions

Among the issues facing Clemson University are the adjustments necessary to accommodate the CHE/legislative initiatives known as "Quality Indicators" which in the future will govern state support for higher education. Areas needing immediate attention are the Faculty Manual definitions associated with tenure and faculty ranks.

The matter of tenure policies is addressed on pages 25-26 of the present Manual. Consideration should be given to inserting a sentence in the fourth paragraph on page 26 to read (new language underscored):

Normally, the decision to grant tenure shall be made during the penultimate year of the probationary period and becomes effective at the beginning of the next year. A recommendation to confer tenure for an assistant professor must be accompanied by a favorable recommendation to award promotion to associate professor. In exceptional cases, tenure may be granted earlier. [The remainder of the paragraph would remain the same.]

The description of regular faculty academic ranks appears on page 16 of the current Manual. Those descriptions would be modified to read as follows (new language underscored; old language bracketed):

Associate Professor. Normally, the terminal degree and [four years of] relevant experience are required. Also expected is evidence of scholarly or creative publication; fulfillment of service responsibilities to the department, the school, the college, and the University; and marked success in teaching, research, and/or public service.
Similarly, the definition for "professor" would be modified as follows:

Professor. The terminal degree, [and not less than nine years of] relevant experience, and continued significant scholarly/creative accomplishment are [normally] required. The rank of professor is granted on the basis of distinguished scholarly or creative publication, outstanding contributions to the University, and conspicuous success in all areas of assigned responsibility - teaching, research, and/or public service.

In this fashion the Manual would be adjusted to fit the new conditions under which the state's higher education institutions must operate now and in the future.

c.c.: President Constantine W. Curris
Academic Vice President and Provost Steffen H. Rogers
Faculty Senate President Ronald J. Thurston
Director David B. Fleming
Policy Committee Members
Mesdames Betty M. Moore and Cathy T. Sturkie
RESOLUTION CONCERNING UNDERGRADUATE PRESENTATIONS
BY FACULTY CANDIDATES

Whereas, The Provost has unilaterally mandated that candidates for faculty positions shall make a presentation to undergraduates; and

Whereas, The Provost’s Office has issued no procedures for conducting these presentations, nor any means for evaluating them; and

Whereas, Conducting these presentations has little or no pedagogical value and disrupts the continuity of the class in which they are presented; and

Whereas, The manner in which this policy was established and announced is contrary to the Faculty Manual and normal standards of collegiality;

Resolved, That the Faculty Senate urges the Provost to rescind this policy immediately.
RESOLUTION CONCERNING QUARTER ON THE DOLLAR RESEARCH INCENTIVE FUNDS
FS97-3-1 P

Whereas, The Commission on Higher Education acted in good faith in building into the funding formula an incentive for research activities by including a twenty-five cent match for each dollar of external grant money awarded to faculty; and

Whereas, Clemson University's Administration has made good effort in continuing this incentive through reallocation even after formula funding from the State was discontinued; and

Whereas, Declining State support has forced Deans to use the majority of the twenty-five cent on the dollar research incentive funds to meet essential operating expenses for the Colleges; and

Whereas, This twenty-five cent on the dollar match is rarely returned to the faculty and provides little or no incentive for stimulating research activities;

Resolved, That the

(1) Administration cease referring to any portion of funds distributed to any College as research incentive funds until that College has developed a policy to ensure that at least fifty (50%) percent of these matching funds are returned to the Principal Investigator who generated the research money, and

(2) Administration of Clemson University should actively seek new funds from the State to continue a research incentive program rather than reallocating existing funds.

This resolution was unanimously passed at the March 11, 1997 Faculty Senate Meeting.
1. **Call to Order.** President Francis A. McGuire called the meeting to order at 2:33 p.m.

2. **Approval of Minutes.** The Faculty Senate Minutes of April 8, 1997 were approved as corrected.

3. **Special Order of the Day.** Jeff Martin, Director of Continuing Education/Conference Center, provided an historical overview of the Madren Center, in general, and the Martin Inn, in particular. Donations and endowment opportunities were explained which will enable the plans for the much-needed lodging facilities to move forward as planned. Construction will begin in June to open in 1998. Questions and answers were then exchanged.

4. **Election of Senate/Faculty Representatives to University Committees.** Motion made by Kathy Neal Headley to suspend normal voting rules and elect by plurality was seconded and passed. Senators then marked their ballots.

5. **Introduction of Faculty Senate.** Each member of the Faculty Senate present introduced herself/himself.

6. **Committee Reports**

   a. **Committee Reports**

      Policy Committee. No report.

      Research Committee. No report.

      **Scholastic Policies Committee.** Nancy Ferguson, Chair, noted this Committee met last week, and in response to the list of priorities resulting from the 1996 Faculty Survey, determined to focus on the University-wide assessment and evaluation of teaching in the promotion and tenure process; faculty and student evaluations; how departments currently evaluate teaching; and how our benchmark institutions evaluate teaching.

      Welfare Committee. No report.

      Finance Committee. Chair Robert Campbell noted the date for the first meeting, May 20, 1997.

   b. **University Commissions and Committees**

      1) **Faculty Development Center Committee** - Senator Kathy Neal Headley, Chair, thanked faculty for feedback to her request of what such a center might be in terms of supporting faculty.
7. **President's Report**  
President McGuire stated his belief that the President, Provost, and Board of Trustees have the welfare of Clemson University at heart and that he will proceed with this attitude for more faith and trust between faculty and administration. Noting that it is time to enter adulthood in this relationship, President McGuire stated that the faculty need to ask questions, get answers, listen and think them through. Other items to report include: (1) beginning in August a “Free Speech” period will be held at the beginning of each Faculty Senate meeting so that general faculty may speak on individual issues of importance to them; (2) the expectation of regular reports to the Senate from University committee representatives; (3) identification of a mechanism to work with the Board of Trustees so they may hear our voice directly; (4) establishment of the Annual Review Committee to study the Provost’s draft proposal (membership includes Raj Singh, Chair, Peggy Cover, Tom Dickens, Sid Gauthreaux, Les Grady, Bob Green, Alan Grubb, Don Henricks, Ellen Krupar, Judy Melton, Ed Pivorun, Cheryl Rainey, and John Warner).

8. **Old Business**  
(None)

9. **New Business**

a. Senator Raj Singh requested that the issue of higher education in South Carolina be a top priority of the Faculty Senate noting that the President, Provost, and Deans need faculty assistance in order to communicate with legislators.

b. Senator Jack Peck requested that resolutions and rationales be forwarded to all faculty for comments and suggestions prior to Senate meetings so they may have the opportunity to provide input to senators.

c. Senator Subhash Anand asked for guidelines to share Senate information within colleges. Discussion was held.

d. President McGuire entertained a resolution authored by Senator John Huffman (Attachment A). Senator Alan Grubb moved for adoption which was seconded. Discussion was held during which known history was shared. Because not all questions regarding resolution could be answered satisfactorily, Senator Horace Skipper moved to postpone resolution indefinitely which was seconded. Vote to postpone was taken and passed.

10. **Adjournment**  
President McGuire adjourned the meeting at 3:44 p.m.

Kathy Neal Headley, Secretary

Cathy Toth Sturkie, Administrative Assistant

RESOLUTION REGARDING DISSOLUTION
OF THE FACULTY SENATE AND FACULTY CONSTITUTION
AT
FRANCIS MARION UNIVERSITY

Whereas, The Board of Trustees of Francis Marion University, upon recommendation of the President, has unilaterally rescinded the Faculty Constitution and dissolved the Faculty Senate; and

Whereas, These actions were carried out with total disregard and in violation of accepted standards of the application of faculty participation in collegiate governance as outlined by the Southern Association of Universities and Schools; and

Whereas, These actions violate the rights of the Faculty of Francis Marion University to have elected representatives participate in University governance formalized by means of a Faculty Constitution;

RESOLVED, That the Clemson University Faculty Senate condemns these actions of the Board of Trustees and President of Francis Marion University, and urges that these actions and associated policies be rescinded immediately.

Postponed Indefinitely at the
May 13, 1997 Faculty Senate Meeting
Page 1

missing.
Recognizing progress this year, President Thurston noted that there are some areas where grave concerns remain. Of immediate concern is that higher education is under question in South Carolina and the State of South Carolina must determine the future of higher education. The Faculty Senate must take a more active role in this determination on a state level and at the campus level by helping to identify where money should go in academics. President Thurston told the Senate not to be disheartened; that the potential of the University is felt by the faculty, staff, and students. President Thurston ended by saying Clemson University needs leadership and that we must pay attention to things related to our number one mission - academics (Written Report Attachment F).

5. Old Business

a. Reports from Faculty Senate Select Committees

1) Faculty Senate Select Committee on Sabbatical Policy - Senator Sidney Gauthreaux submitted the Revised Sabbatical Policy (Attachment G) from this Committee. Motion was made by Senator Alan Grubb to accept Report, which was seconded. Vote to accept was taken and passed unanimously. Senator Dale Linvill moved that this Report be forwarded to the Provost as a Faculty Manual change, which was seconded. Vote was taken and motion passed by a two-thirds majority.

2) Faculty Senate Select Committee on Evaluation of University Administration - Professor and Chair Ashby B. Bodine, II noted amendments and submitted the amended Report from this Committee for acceptance by the Senate, which was seconded (Attachment H). Vote was taken and passed unanimously. Senator Gauthreaux moved that it be forwarded to the Faculty Senate Policy Committee for further evaluation and to make recommendations for implementation to evaluate administrators. Motion was seconded. Vote was taken and passed unanimously.

3) Faculty Senate Select Committee on Administrator Award - Professor and Chair Webb Smathers submitted this Report; Senator Murr moved acceptance; and Senator John Huffman seconded motion (Attachment I). Discussion was held. Vote to accept Report was taken and passed. Senator Murr then moved to forward Report to the Faculty Senate Policy Committee for review, which was seconded. Discussion was held. Vote to forward for review was taken and passed.

b. Resolution on Election to the Faculty was submitted for approval by Senator Ted Taylor and was seconded. Senator Murr moved that this Resolution be approved by acclamation. Vote was taken and passed (FS97-4-1 P) (Attachment J).

c. Noting the two-thirds requirement for Faculty Manual changes, Senator Smart submitted two proposals for approval: Refinement of Tenure Description and Refinement of Academic Rank Descriptions (Attachments K and L, respectively). Action on each item was taken individually during which discussion was held. Vote was taken on each proposed change and passed.

d. Senator Ferguson submitted a Faculty Manual change concerning the Grade Retention Policy from the Scholastic Policies Committee for approval. Discussion was held. Vote was taken and passed unanimously (Attachment M).
e. The 1996-97 Salary Report was presented by Senator Robert Campbell, who provided an overview of the “Average Percent Increase in Base Salary, by Group and Category, between December 1995 and December 1996” (Attachment N). Of particular interest was Senator Campbell’s explanation of the 2.5 administrators to 1 faculty (2.5/1) ratio.

During discussion, Provost Steffen H. Rogers thanked the Faculty Senate for urging the administration to look at the salary issue, noting that the systems simply did not work. Provost Rogers further noted that the Faculty Senate was right in its assessment, and that there does appear to be a two-tiered system. It was promised by Provost Rogers that this salary situation will not happen again next year adding that he hopes this marks the beginning of a working relationship between the Faculty Senate and administration.

Other items the Provost wanted to discuss: (1) Resolutions - he would have liked to have approved those forwarded to him, but believed he could not because of the format in which they were submitted (if the Provost could not substantiate, he wanted to wait until he had real numbers); (2) Savings - Clemson has had savings from restructuring, but some savings have been spent and some savings will not appear until the future; (3) Relationship between Faculty Senate and Administration - sometimes he was asked to do things and was then told how to do them; in the future he will either accept or reject resolutions with explanatory reason. Commending the Accountability Committee, Provost Rogers ended by saying he hopes this is the first step to end the mistrust, rift between faculty and administration.

On behalf of the retiring senators, Senator Murr requested receipt of the full salary report upon completion next year.

President Thurston asked for a Sense of the Senate to support recommendations contained within the Salary Report: (1) the development of an accountability policy so that salary analyses will be inclusive (to keep everything straight so there will not be any questions about titles; to explain how raises are given and for what purpose) and (2) a clear and careful analysis of salary supplements together with regular salary data providing reasons for supplements. A Sense was taken on each issue and passed unanimously.

6. Introduction of Faculty Senate President
President Thurston introduced the new Faculty Senate President, Francis A. McGuire. New officers were installed at 4:30 p.m.

7. New Business
   a. President McGuire introduced the new senators as a group to the continuing senators and guests.
   b. President McGuire reminded senators to return Committee Preference Questionnaires to the Faculty Senate Office as soon as possible.
   c. A Sense of the Senate was taken to hold Faculty Senate meetings at 2:30 or 3:30 p.m. The Sense of the Senate was 2:30 p.m.
d. President McGuire requested approval to continue with three established committees from the 1996-97 Faculty Senate: Budget Accountability Committee, Committee on Diversity, and the Committee to Position Clemson University for Performance Indicators. Approval was granted.

8. **Adjournment**  
President McGuire adjourned the meeting at 5:05 p.m.

\[ \text{Kathy Neal Headley, Secretary} \]

\[ \text{Cathy Toth Sturkie, Administrative Assistant} \]

Absent: H. Wheeler, G. Bautista, (R. Campbell for), S. Amirkhanian, S. Cross
FACULTY SENATE POLICY COMMITTEE
ANNUAL REPORT TO THE SENATE
APRIL 8, 1997

Members: John Huffman
          Ken Murr
          Martin Jacobi
          Michael Morris
          Matt Saltzman
          Ed Pivorun
          Rich Poling
          Pat Smart, Chair

Meetings of the Faculty Senate Policy Committee were held the third Tuesday of each month. Several additional meetings were held as needed. Since most of the work of the Committee was brought before the full Senate, and subsequently approved (there were few exceptions), and, therefore, reflected in the Faculty Manual, a recapitulation of this work will not be included in this report.

The Committee recommended numerous editorial refinements and several substantive changes to the Faculty Manual. Most notably, the addition of a Parking Advisory Committee, placing responsibility for final approval of all Faculty Manual changes with the Faculty Senate Policy Committee, and placing all University Policies not included in the Faculty Manual but impacting upon faculty within the department office for easy access.

The Committee revised the manual policy regarding political activity, and examined the role of the coordinator in affirmative action and the role of the Dean in Departmental Search Committees. Library representation was added to several significant committees, and several committees representing graduate education were added to the Faculty Manual.

Other work of the Policy Committee included determinations of Faculty Manual violations and interpretations of policies.

The Policy Committee would like to thank the Scholastic Policy Committee and the Research Committee for assisting us in several matters this year.

Respectfully submitted;

Pat Smart, Chair
Faculty Senate Research Committee
Final Report
April 8, 1997

Members:
Dr. Sid Gauthreaux
Dr. Horace Skipper
Dr. Tom Jenkins, Chair
Dr. Beth Kunkle
Dr. Dale Linvill
Dr. Elham Makram
Dr. Hap Wheeler

Meetings of the Faculty Senate Committee were held the first Wednesday of each month in 104 McAdams Hall.

The Committee considered revisions to the Faculty Manual regarding Clemson University's Policies on Research Ethics, and on Use of Biohazards and Radioactive Agents. Recommendations by the Committee on wording were subsequently approved by the Faculty Senate Policy Committee and the Provost's office.

A major effort of the Committee this year was to review the policies and procedures at Clemson regarding disbursement of the CHE 25 cent on the dollar research incentive funds. The Committee met with Mr. Scott Ludlow, Chief Financial Officer at the October 2 meeting to discuss policies by the central budget office on the incentive funds, and in following meetings, contacted Deans of each College and Program Directors to request their policies on distribution of incentive funds within their units. The Committee wrote a RESOLUTION CONCERNING QUARTER ON THE DOLLAR RESEARCH INCENTIVE FUNDS which was approved at the March 11, 1997 Faculty Senate meeting.

The Committee followed reorganization of the administrative structure of Environmental Health and Safety. A recommendation was made to the Provost that separate research and service arms of EHS should be established with equal authority that report to VP Ransdall, and also have lines of communication to the Provost. A final administrative structure adopting most of these concerns were announced in December.

The Committee met and discussed on several occasions the impact on the research community of a comprehensive Chemical Hygiene Plan prepared by EHS. A meeting was held with Naomi Kelley, Chemical Hygiene Officer, to discuss the plan. The Committee agreed to sign the document indicating only that it was seen by the Committee and that changes will be considered as additional problems are identified by researchers.
The Committee reviewed a policy under development by the University that governs access and retention of research records. Bill Geer from Sponsored Programs attended the January 23, 1997 meeting to explain his first draft of this policy. The Committee provided written and oral critique and suggestions. Mr. Geer indicated he would return to the Committee with a revised copy of the policy after taking all input into consideration. A revised policy has not been received by the Committee as of the date of this report.

The Committee was informed of an effort by the University to raise the classification of equipment from 500 to 5000 dollars. The Committee met with Charles Tegan, W. C. Hallums, Clint Carlson, and Steve Crump at the February 5, 1997 meeting to get clarification on this effort. Discussion was held on the impacts that this change would have on the researcher. A formal proposal was to be sent from Charles Tegan to the Committee for review, but has not been received by the date of this report. The general feeling of the Committee after discussion of the topic at various meetings was to endorse increasing the limit from 500 to 5000 dollars.

The Committee remained involved in the selection process of the Senior Vice Provost for Research/Chief Research Officer by the Committee Chair serving on the selection committee, and by members attending seminars and informal sessions during interviews.

Respectfully submitted,

Tom Jenkins, Chair
Scholastics Policies Committee Report for 1996-97
Syd Cross, Chair

*Bonnie Martin, Student Services Program Coordinator, met with the Committee to discuss developing a policy that would lower the minimum credit requirements for certain disabled students to be considered full time. The Committee agreed that this was a reasonable request and we encouraged her to pursue this.

*Scholastic Policies Committee was asked to develop a grade retention policy for auditing and records. A recommendation was sent to the Policy Committee which brought a resolution to the floor of the Senate which was defeated. This business will come before the Senate again in the near future.

*Since the University restructuring eliminated the Commission on Graduate Studies, the Scholastic Policies was asked to take up an issue of guidelines for PHD candidacy. The Scholastics Policies Committee suggested new wording for the Graduate Announcements regarding PHD candidates that policies regarding visiting scholar status, comprehensive examination before admission to candidacy, and off-campus research be strengthened in such a way to prevent unethical application of exceptions.

*The Committee assessed the Fall 1996 Academic Calendar and found organizing events around the elections was an unnecessary disadvantage to the students and will forward a recommendation to the University Calendar Committee to avoid this in the future.

*A report compiled as a research project in Math Sciences under the direction of Professor M. Coffin was submitted to the Faculty Senate. This report, which originated under the immediate past Scholastics Policies Committee Chair, Webb Smathers, attempts to explain the perceived change in grade distribution at Clemson University over the last eighteen years. The report was accepted and seemed to satisfy all questions and criticisms.

*The Committee also addressed the issue of back withdrawals and whether the Undergraduate Studies Office was over-stepping their authority on this matter. Examination of this practice seems to indicate that proper documentation and procedures have been followed and, that if anything can be improved, it might be the follow-up communication between the Undergraduate Office and any involved faculty of individual cases.
Finally, the Committee reviewed the new requirements from the Provost's Office for the Tenure and Promotion document and sited that requiring actual student evaluations to be included in the document was a violation of the Faculty Manual. The Committee further recommended that the Faculty Senate establish a committee to do an in-depth study on how student evaluations of teaching should be developed and implemented.
Faculty Senate Welfare Committee

Committee Meeting - March 12, 1997

Attending 3/12/97: Robert Campbell; Kathy Neal Headley, Chair; Clint Isbell; Frank Tainter

(1) Faculty Survey: Executive summary has been mailed to all faculty. The complete document should soon be located on the Faculty Senate Web Page and copies forwarded to the Reserves Section of the Cooper Library, offices of each college dean, Provost Rogers, and President Curris.

(2) Salary Data: Robert Campbell continues to work with revisions to the past year's salary comparisons. Update will be provided at the April 8th Faculty Senate meeting. When the revised analysis is completed, the report will be published electronically in the Open Forum.

(3) Program by Program Salary Comparisons as included in last month's Faculty Senate agenda packet: Robert Campbell will address these comparisons at the April 8th meeting of the Faculty Senate.

A written response was forwarded to Kathy Headley urging the Faculty Senate to recognize some major flaws in the "Program by Program (Salary) Comparisons with our 'Benchmark Institutions.'" Program classifications are still a major problem. In this particular case, the department was misidentified and therefore comparison information was misleading. Additionally, only one department was used for comparative analysis. The department submitting the letter of record to Kathy Headley had passed a motion stating "that the Faculty Senate, or anyone, should be very careful in the use of such data without serious consideration of exactly what comparisons are actually being made for any given department."

(4) Randall Davis, Director of Telecommunications, has contacted Personnel and the telephone directory publisher. They do not believe that creating a separate listing or section of the directory is desirable and would complicate the process of locating people. A footnote indicator character can be added to the title line (the second line in the listing) for the listing of persons holding adjunct or courtesy titles but who are not University employees. The use of italics or a different font for adjunct/courtesy listings is also being investigated. Randall Davis will update the Welfare Committee when additional information is available.
1996-97 Welfare Committee Summary

1. The Welfare Committee recommended to the Executive/Advisory Committee that the Faculty Senate consider the establishment of an award for an outstanding administrator at Clemson University.

2. Investigated accumulation of faculty sick leave issue.

3. Initial salary report from the Office of Institutional Research was distributed during the fall semester. Data is presently undergoing further analysis. The Welfare Committee collaborated with the Finance and Accountability Committees in establishing a job classification system with set job categories for permanent full time employees. Upon completion, the salary data for 1990-91 forward will be analyzed according to the revised classification system. This will provide total salary compensation information for faculty, staff, and administration. Once completed, these additional salary analyses will be reported.

4. Faculty Survey administered and analyzed. Executive summary has been mailed to all faculty. The full report is available for review in the Reserves Section of the R.M. Cooper Library and on the Faculty Senate Web Page.

Resolutions approved:
(1) Resolution on the Office of Institutional Research
(2) Resolution on Development of Program for Faculty Compensation

Recommendations to the 1997-98 Welfare Committee:
(1) Investigate faculty incentives at other universities (particularly our benchmark institutions).
(2) Review section VII of the Faculty Manual and propose revisions that address compensation for Faculty service on University committees.
(3) Follow-up with Randall Davis on creating a separate listing or section of the telephone directory for individuals with adjunct faculty or courtesy titles who are not employees of the University.
(4) Revise the Faculty Survey and administer electronically.

My many thanks to members of the 1996-97 Welfare Committee: Robert Campbell; Gloria Bautista; Clint Isbell; Pat Smith; Frank Tainter; and Gerry Walker. Your efforts and support have greatly benefitted our campus community. Special thanks go to Rich Poling for his time and expertise.
Faculty Senate Finance Committee
Annual Report to the Senate
April 8, 1997

Members: Warren Adams, Serji Amirkhanian, Kerry Brooks, Mary LaForge, Russ Sutton, Ted Taylor
Thanks also to:
Accountability Committee members: Gordon Halfacre & Jim Davis
Open Forum Committee: Robert Campbell; Special assistance of Michael Morris; and to our close associates Kathy Headley and the Welfare Committee
Tasks accomplished:
Cost studies, review of current accounting and reporting system, review of restructuring cost saving claims, joint review of critical items with Welfare Committee, coordination of tasks with Accountability Committee, and Senate’s approval of formation of the Accountability Committee
Resulting in Resolutions:
FS96 - P: The need for an operational audit for the university
Status: ??? PRACTICALLY REJECTED.
FS96-10-1 P: Concerning the alleged savings from college restructuring
Status: ??? REJECTED.
FS96-10-1 P: On annual financial reporting to faculty (real cost of teaching and research and service versus all other costs)
Status: ??? REJECTED.
FS96-10-3 P: Regarding disparity between administrators and faculty pay
Status: ??? REJECTED.
FS97-2-1 P: Development of a program for faculty compensation
Status: ??? REJECTED.
FS97-2-2 P: On revising the 2.5% fund pullback policy
Status: ??? PRACTICALLY REJECTED.
FS97-2-3 P: Regarding better utilization of university resources
Status: ??? REJECTED.

On a positive note, the committee is encouraged by the recent move toward a bottom up approach in the budgetary process and requests the Senate’s input on how the Finance Committee can get engaged in the budgetary phase rather than continuously reacting to what has already taken place.
Serious drawbacks: recently enforced bottlenecks and other tactics used to discourage or discredit Finance, Welfare, Accountability, R. Doost
1. I like to thank the 40+ senators and faculty who came to our party last Friday. I tried to be as nice as I could and also invited some ten administrators from Sikes hall; not even one of them acknowledged my invitation. As I have often said, they are all like our brothers (there is no sisters in that level). There is never a rift between faculty and administration. We are just trying to find the truth.

2. Another historical perspective on accountability:
About two decades ago, I started a doctoral dissertation on governmental budgeting and reviewed hundreds of financial statements from all across the country. Later, I submitted several papers dealing with the question of governmental budgeting. In the past few years, I published several additional papers on the question of university overhead, cost allocation, and accounting methodology. Through Assessment and Finance Committee of the Senate, I had taken a personal interest on the issue of accountability.

3. In a meeting of Management Accounting professors in San Antonio on November 2, 1996, I raised the question: “Why isn’t anyone of us studying the issue of university accounting and accountability?” There was a dead silence. Later, during the evening reception, several faculty who do not want to be identified approached me and said that this is a No! No! area because the Administration would resent it and would retaliate....

4. “If you can’t understand something, you just need to ask” Sike Hall to Roger Doost, November 19, 1996.
--What were the key questions that we were exploring:
* How much did we save in college restructuring and where?
* Who authorized shifting of 4 to 5 million dollars from department head account to faculty salary account in the name of saving/redirecting of funds and is this misleading entry reversed?
* What is the real cost of teaching, research, and service? What is our realistic overhead?
* Why have administrators consistently received considerably more raises than faculty in the past six years?
* Is our cost allocation system of shifting 15-20 million dollars from one account to another reasonable or at least, misleading for internal reporting purposes?

* Is it time for a zero-based review of administrative positions?

* Are our number of faculty 800+ or 1200+?

4. There was an apparent, recent comment in Sikes Hall that "we were right". How did this revelation come about? Was there a recent independent study done? Can we see that study? Did the general faculty dissatisfaction of the state of affairs had something to do with it? Does this mean that the resolutions will be revisited? In what respects were we right? The previous president and the previous provost had also come to this realization, and they pleaded with Faculty for understanding, but what are we going to do about it? "Acceptance = honesty", "Integrity = honesty + doing something about it." This does not mean equal raise for the next year. It means commensurate adjustments until the inequitable treatment of the last six years is repaired. In either case, I praise the Provost for his change of heart. As I have said to my fellow senators, it is a tough job to be a university administrator, because intelligent and educated faculty can not be bullied. They have to be convinced. It is much different than managing a factory with materials, machines, and a bunch of uneducated workers.

5. What were the justifications for rejecting the resolution on savings from academic restructuring? Where is the paperwork? Does anyone see these savings in their colleges? Is it not true that they have added another layer of "directors" to the bureaucracy in PSA? Is it not true that while we speak, they are also working on adding another dean and another vice president? Did you know that our Finance, Budgets, Fiscal Affairs, Controller, CFO had nothing to do with these calculations and presentations? Do you know who was in charge? - Our Public Relations Office!

6. Did we have a final accounting of the number of faculty and administrators? Is it true that faculty numbers have dwindled in the past decade while administrators have more than doubled? Why was this
resolution denied?
7. The comment, “Accountability Committee is working on this” is at best misleading. Our mandate was to a) review the work of Finance & Welfare Committees, b) follow up on their requests and resolutions. We were instead cut off from direct contacts with the sources of data. Administration was supposed to work on our resolutions and provide a response. Is there a way to override what the Senate may consider as unreasonable rejection of our resolutions? Otherwise, what are we here for?
8. Add’l adjectives used in the past six months to describe my/our work: provocative, inflammatory, (hidden agenda, cheap shots)*, insidious, unprofessional, unscientific....
* Sikes Hall verified that these adjectives were directed to me and not the committees or the senate.
Slow down folks! I am not too versed in the English language, I have to look up the meaning of some of these words in the dictionary!
Provoke: 1) to excite to some action or feeling, 2) to anger, irritate, or annoy....
Inflammatory: to rouse excitement, anger, violence, rioting...
Insidious: 1) characterized by treachery or slyness, 2) operating in a slow or not easily apparent manner, 3) more dangerous than seems evident.
9. The poem, “Lost Creativity”
10. Scenes from the play the price that kept me going...
Gregory Solomon is an 89-year-old, Russian immigrant/antique dealer who is conversing with the seller, a policeman:
Act 1. An old man has no hidden agenda - he decided not to buy!
Act 2. An old man is truly honest and is not after material things
Act 3. An old man can get angry too! THIS IS JUST AN ACT!
Respectfully submitted, Roger K. Doost, Chair, Finance & Accountability Committees
April 8, 1997
Lost Creativity

I lost my creativity,
My imagination too.

They told me to think - but only in their terms.
They told me to read - but only what they wanted me to read.
They told me to write - but only what pleased their fancy.
They told me to learn - but only the vocabulary of submission.
They told me to rise - but only to cut down the guy next to me.

No! I did not lose it in the elementary school;
   I needed some initial prodding.
No! I did not lose it in secondary school;
   I still needed to learn some basic rules.
No! I did not lose it in high school;
   I still had some raw power to fight back.

I lost some of it in college, the way the professor lectured.
I lost more of it in the graduate program, the way the professor behaved.
I lost all of it in the doctoral program,
As the professor got his ultimate revenge;
By making me research, the way he had done it;
By making me subservient to his will.

Those days have long passed, and
Alas! I have done the same to my students, and
   Albeit, unknowingly.

Finally, the burden is easing
And I am starting to break this tradition,
   This heavy load,
   This burdensome chain.
I may even regain my imagination -
   My creativity too.
Our daily struggle!

Only when we are tender children, or when we are ready to depart this earthly frame, we are, for the most part, totally honest, totally integrated.

But then, in the years in between, because of compassion or greed, or position or power, or need or desire, or simple expediency, or for the drive to satisfy or to impress, or for a bigger raise or recognition, or for fear of reprisal, or just due to our own insecurity, we may fall into the trap of half truths, of lies and cheating, of intimidating or being intimidated.

There is a beauty, there is a spiritual satisfaction in becoming old, in appearing to be naive or crazy. We become like a tender child again, we become totally honest again, we may even regain our God-given integrity.
---What were the key questions that we were exploring:
* How much did we save in college restructuring and where?
* who authorized shifting of 4 to 5 million dollars from department head account to faculty salary account in the name of saving/redirecting of funds and is this misleading entry reversed?
* What is the real cost of teaching, research, and service? What is our realistic overhead?
* Why have administrators consistently received considerably more raises than faculty in the past six years?
* Is our cost allocation system of shifting 15-20 million dollars from one account to another reasonable or at least, misleading for internal reporting purposes?
* Is it time for a zero-based review of administrative positions?
* Are our number of full-time faculty who are primarily engaged in teaching and research 800+ or 1200+?

Some highlights on college restructuring and financial accountability:
1. Fall 1994: President Prince provides conflicting answers to the question of savings on restructuring: a) savings is in millions and we are working on it, b) we are not doing it to save money; we are doing it to do things better.
2. Spring 1995: several glowing reports appear in the media about the substantial cost savings from restructuring.
3. 1995: several faculty members complain to the Faculty Senate and want an accounting of the savings from restructuring. The question is posed to Provost Jeanette. Provost responds that he believes the numbers on savings can be found in an issue of Inside Clemson.
4. August 1996: the president reports to CHE that we have saved over 8 million dollars in restructuring.
5. September 1996: the Finance Committee reports that such savings do not seem to be substantiated by financial reports.
6. October 1996: the Finance Committee discovers that there is a shift of 4 to 5 million dollars from department-heads’ account to faculty salary account.
7. This shift of accounts publicized as “redirecting” of funds to education is reported to the Senate on November 12, 1996.
8. Sikes Hall summons Roger Doost for questioning about this item and other issues and considers the language used provocative and says, “If you don’t
understand something, you just need to ask.” and suggests formation of a committee to verify the work of Roger Doost and Finance Committee.

9. December 1996: some deans call special meetings before the December Senate meeting. Dean of College of Business and Public Affairs considers college restructuring as a “charade”.

10. Surprise! Accountability Committee is formed and reports its findings coupled with resolutions on above and other matters to the Senate on 12/10/96.

10. A series of meetings are held with this committee in Sikes hall between December 96 and March 97, and the Office of Institutional Research takes some steps in correcting their employee database. Results are yet unknown as of the date of this report.

11. The president reports a saving of over 8 million dollars from restructuring to the Board of Trustees (apparently, based on a public relations report dated June 1995 that was never shared with the Senate).

12. January 1997: the president sends an e-mail to all faculty considering the Senate’s request for such accounting as “insidious”.

13. 1/17/1997: Accountability Committee responds and refutes the president’s report to the Board of Trustees.

14. January 1997: the Accountability Committee responds to the president’s e-mail to all faculty through an electronic e-mail which is released by the administration after some negotiations.

15. Four individuals (three from Sikes Hall) send e-mails to Roger Doost and one to him and several senators calling his (their) work and communications as “provocative”, “inflammatory”, “cheap shots”, “insidious”, “unprofessional and unscientific” (Dec. 96 to Feb. 1997).

16. Senate meeting (2/11/97): Sikes Hall indicates that the president never said anything about 8 million dollars of savings to the Board of Trustees.

17. Senate meeting (3/11/97): report to CHE, report to the Board, and response to the president is put in the Senate packet together with a summary oral report about the same.

18. 3/24/1997? - Senate president is called to the president’s office about the concern that Finance Committee or I may have shared some of our findings with the CHE. I assure him that we have not - although what we have discussed is public information.

19. 4/8/1997: Sikes Hall rejects all of Senate’s Welfare & Finance resolutions
Swan Song

by

Ronald J. Thurston

Faculty Senate President, 1996-1997

Well, it all started three years ago when I entered the Faculty Senate as a naive freshman Senator. The naivété did not last very long. Then Faculty Senate President Walt Owens appointed me Chairman of the Policy Committee, right after the departure of University President Max Lennon, and during the tenure of interim University President Phil* Prince. Interesting times indeed. The reorganization sent the Faculty Manual into obsolescence overnight, not to mention that the Senate itself was berated by the administration for beginning to question some of the management practices of those in control. The Policy Committee found itself in a moratorium, trying to sort out who should be where and for what reasons.

The second year brought with it the duties of Vice President-President Elect of the Senate under the leadership of former Senate President Budd Bodine. Rather a quiet year, everyone sorting out the effects of reorganization, and the experience of having our third University President in three years. A time of adjustment and hope that the purported savings brought about by reorganization would be wisely spent on curing our academic ailments. During this year I was able to begin serving on the South Carolina Conference of Faculty Senate Chairs, an association which later led to appointments on committees for the Commission of Higher Education for the purpose of developing performance indicators for evaluating institutions of higher education. The Conference of Faculty Senate Chairs carried the voice of the faculty to the Commission and legislators who were, and still are, involved in developing policies which will significantly impact upon higher education.

As you know, my third and final year in the Senate was as Faculty Senate President. By this time, much of my naivété had been cured, but I fully expected to have time to warm up my engine before entering the race. No such luck. Early in the year I was appointed to serve on the Provost Search and Screen Committee, the NCAA Self Study Committee for Athletics and then was selected by the Commission of Higher Education to serve on the Benchmark and Sector Committees for establishing performance indicators. This meant several trips to Columbia. Add to this the regular duties of the Senate, plus a record year for Grievances, plus having to do research and teach 5 credit hours. I had to call on the backup team. Incoming President Francis McGuire was very helpful, taking over the duties of evaluating the Provost Candidates, chairing Grievance committees, attending meetings, working with the Provost and President. I can tell you one thing for certain, you will be extremely well-represented by Senate President McGuire. But he can't claim naivété.
It is the extras that really take your energy level: Honorary Degree Committee, Academic Council, President's Cabinet, meeting with the various Senate Committees, Governmental Affairs Committee, Parking Advisory Committee, Academic Calendar Committee, Faculty Manual Committee, Graduate Affairs Committee, various Committees of the Board of Trustees...ad infinitum. And then, there are those little things Senate Presidents tend to do to themselves, like appoint a myriad of Senate Select Committees.

I would do it again. When faculty serve on the Senate, they are exposed to a multitude of political and administrative issues that provide an extensive knowledge concerning how the University functions. Both the good and the bad. I am a firm believer in democracy and what is more democratic than representational government? What is more efficient than a system that has checks and balances? And why shouldn't the faculty, the individuals responsible for carrying out the mission of the university, have representation and participate in university government?

Previous to the mid-1980's, universities were accepted as the organizations almost solely responsible for the generation and dissemination of advanced knowledge and technology which was not of proprietary interest. Accordingly, faculty held positions of high regard in the eye of the general public. Then, almost overnight, the microcomputer industry revolutionized the way we do business. Knowledge became available in a multitude of software forms, and in remote places. Add to this the Internet, and the result was that Universities were in the midst of something completely unfamiliar; competition for knowledge and technology from outside of the academic institutions. Better availability and distribution of knowledge fueled technology and gave birth to biotechnology, computer driven engineering and architecture and new analytical methodology to the social sciences. Universities responded by trying to incorporate much of this newness, an approach that gave the appearance of attempting to become everything to everybody. An unprecedented number of administrators were hired and preparations were undertaken to enjoy the luxuriance of being the number one technological university. But, as is always the case, change develops slowly and is expensive, has to be productive and only works if it is beneficial to the shareholders. At Clemson University, reality finally had to be faced: burdened with a cumbersome bureaucracy, high tuition, far too many expenditures in the non-academic sector and all to many cases of poor management, something had to be done. The administrative solution was to reorganize.

Reorganization brought claims of savings, reduced administration and supposedly, more efficiency at the faculty level. But, the Faculty Senate's careful assessment of the situation far more often than not, indicated that the savings from reorganization were minimal at best, that bureaucracy was not reduced, but often increased, and that a huge portion of the budget still remained in the non-academic sector. Meanwhile, previous problems at USC, and recent problems at the Citadel, Winthrop, Francis Marion and yes, even Clemson, have eroded the confidence of
the public and State leaders that Universities can effectively manage themselves. As a result, performance evaluation for the purpose of determining the level of State funding will become a reality. Most likely, we will continue to endure close scrutiny. Faculty must be prepared to accept student evaluations and post-tenure review as part of their performance assessment. Likewise, the administration should be prepared to accept evaluations administered by the faculty.

At Clemson, progress has been made toward resolving problems that have irritated the faculty. These problems include how faculty are classified, and hence how salary data is analyzed, and how salary supplements are distributed. But faculty concerns about a two class system where administrators are treated and rewarded much better than faculty, about how we account for our money, about our priorities, and about the continued diminution of faculty input into important University decision-making, remain, for the most part, unresolved.

What does the future portend? Given the multitude of problems currently faced by many institutions of higher education in the State, and the growing concern for accountability by State government and the general public, it appears that conflict will be inevitable unless the responsible parties of Universities, the administration, faculty and staff, work with a greater understanding and respect toward resolving major problems. In other words, if we are going to talk the talk, then we need to walk the walk.

At the President's Cabinet Meeting on March 31, President Curris distributed copies of the Kellogg Commission's Statement of Principles to Guide Academic Reform. These Principles were: 1. A Learning Community 2. Access and Opportunity 3. An Education of Value 4. Containing Costs 5. Accountability 6. Meeting New Needs 7. Flexibility and Responsiveness. President Curris indicated that the leadership of Clemson University is in general agreement with the principles of this report. He also stated that guiding principles are no better that the effort universities put forth in following the principles. I agree. However, to what degree Clemson University follows such principles is currently the subject of disagreement between the faculty and administration, especially as relates to containing costs and accountability. There is much work to do and the Faculty Senate must take the role of leader, not follower.

Finally, I would like to say that during my term as Senate President, I was privileged to have the help and guidance of outstanding Faculty Senators. You made my job so much easier. I am proud of all of you and wish to extend my sincere thanks from the bottom of my heart. Your continued work will make this University the type of institution we all want, and know it can be. Do not be disheartened, for the roots of a fine academic institution are present at Clemson and are ready for growth. But it is us who must properly cultivate and fertilize before responsible and productive growth will occur. Real problems require real solutions, not facades or charades which create the illusion of academic excellence. The work of this year's Senate has prepared the way and I am very grateful to all of you for
your unfailing efforts. On behalf of all of the faculty at Clemson University, I extend my sincere appreciation.

Ronald J. Thurston
Professor
Faculty Senate President
Revised Sabbatical Policy
Approved by the Policy Committee, April 1, 1997

Last fall Provost Rogers asked the President of Faculty Senate to appoint a Senate ad hoc committee to examine the current sabbatical policy at Clemson University with the understanding that the committee would examine existing procedures followed by the different colleges and recommend changes that would produce a set of guidelines that could be followed by all tenured faculty with Clemson University. The committee concluded its work, and a recommended new policy was submitted to Provost Rogers, and the Faculty Senate. The following policy incorporates changes recommended by the Provost, and the Faculty Senate Policy Committee at their meeting on April 1, 1997. This policy would replace section L, pages 69-70 of the current Faculty Manual.

Sabbatical leave may be granted by the President of the University to any tenured faculty member who has completed at least six years of full-time service with the University. The purposes of sabbatical leave are to relieve faculty of normal duties so that they might pursue significant projects facilitating their professional growth and development, thus enhancing their future contributions to the mission of the University. Such leaves, therefore, are not granted automatically upon completion of the necessary period of service. Sabbaticals cannot occur more frequently than every seventh year.

Applications for sabbatical leave by faculty on nine-month appointments may entail a request for one semester of leave at full pay or for two successive semesters at half pay. Applications for sabbatical leave by faculty on twelve-month appointments and administrators with faculty rank may be made for periods up to six months at full pay or for periods of over six months to one calendar year at half pay. There shall be no discrimination between one-semester or two-semester sabbaticals for nine-month faculty and between six-month or twelve-month sabbaticals for faculty with twelve-month appointments. Certain fringe benefits may be continued during sabbatical if arrangements are made in advance with the Division of Human Resources. Faculty on sabbatical leave will maintain all the rights and privileges of regular faculty. The following steps should be followed in the application and review processes for sabbatical leaves:

- Applicants requesting sabbatical leaves should prepare a proposal containing information on the goals of the sabbatical including supporting materials and information on how the teaching responsibilities of the applicant will be handled while he or she is away from campus. An applicant must consult with the Department Chair concerning teaching responsibilities.

- 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 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 July 31, as appropriate.

- By March 15 or 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.

- The President shall render his or her decision within two weeks of receiving the Provost's recommendation.

- The Office of the Provost shall maintain and publish a list of the individuals granted sabbaticals, the date the sabbatical was approved, the title of the project, and the dates when the sabbatical was taken.

Sabbatical leaves are granted in good faith. When such a leave is ended, a faculty member is expected to return to regular service with the University for at least one contract year or, at the University's request, refund the remuneration received from the University during that time. Upon return from sabbatical leave the faculty member shall file a written report on his/her professional activities during the leave period with the department chair or school director.
Senate Select Committee on Evaluation of University Administration
Preliminary Report

Charge: To devise a process, with associated documentation, which could be employed as a fair and useful tool in evaluation of all administrators at Clemson University.

Rationale: For an evaluation process to be instructive and meaningful it is essential that it contain diverse assessment data and individual narratives from peers, and subordinates as well as persons to whom the evaluatee reports. Faculty evaluations are composed of Promotion and Tenure committee reports and student evaluations in addition to the assessments of Department Chair, Dean, and Provost (where necessary). To insure continuity and equitable evaluation procedures, all university personnel should be evaluated by procedures which are similar in structure and intent.

The Select Committee examined several evaluation forms and procedures from diverse sources and suggest the following general criteria for the evaluation process for administrators: (a) the forms used for evaluation should be reasonably short and contain both quantitative (response) data and narrative portions; (b) forms should be distributed to a randomly selected group of individuals (students, staff, faculty, peers) working in or associated with the administrator’s area of responsibility; (c) a central office should be responsible for collecting, collating, and analyzing the data and disseminating the summarized data to the appropriate review committee and the person being reviewed. All handwritten narratives would be typed at the central office to retain anonymity of responses; (d) a review committee composed of faculty, administration and other appropriate individuals, would be responsible for reviewing the evaluation data and making recommendations to the designated University officials.

The following attachment is a modification of a form used by Penn State for periodic evaluation of the Dean of a College. Your input on the procedures for evaluation of Administrators is solicited using the modified PS form as a working document. Please make any suggestions which will increase the versatility of the form and suggest any modifications which might increase the effectiveness of the form. You may E-mail your suggestions to me or to any other member of the committee.

A.B. Bodine, Chair
Jerry Waldvogel
Susan Underwood
Gordon Halfacre
Dale Hutton
Roger Doost
Kenneth Murr
Joann Deeken
Bill Hare
Faculty and Staff of the College of

As mandated by Penn State policy, a periodic administrative review of the office of the Dean of the College of is underway. As part of this process, the review committee would like to elicit the opinions of as many faculty, staff, and students as possible. Therefore, we would appreciate your taking the time to fill out this questionnaire. Please feel free to use additional sheets if necessary. Your responses will remain anonymous.

Members of the Academic Administration Evaluation Committee:

Please check your position in the College:

- Full Professor
- Associate Professor
- Assistant Professor
- Instructor
- Staff Non-Exempt
- Staff Exempt
- Administrator
- Other:

Location:

- UP
- CES

College of Vision and Mission

"The College of will be second to none in teaching, advancing knowledge through research and scholarship, engaging in outreach programs and activities, and in preparing professionals who provide exemplary educational and related service to improve the lives of individuals in a changing and complex global society.

Strategic Plan Update: 1996-97

An Equal Opportunity University
1. Please rate the functions of the Office of the Dean (not the Dean himself):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration of academic programs</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing and distance education</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeking externally funded research projects</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeking externally funded training programs</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni and constituent relations</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human resources</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General administrative support</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. How would you evaluate the overall performance of the Office of the Dean?

5 4 3 2 1 U

3. What specific recommendations do you have to improve the performance and operations of the Office of the Dean?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Now, consider the performance of as Dean.

4. Please rate Dean on each of the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Leadership Areas</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic standards</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy for the College</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouragement of effective teaching</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouragement of research</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for the mission of the College</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handling of promotion and tenure matters</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Personal Leadership Areas**             |           |      |         |
| Communication and listening skills        | 5 4 3 2 1 | U    |         |
| Dedication/Commitment                     | 5 4 3 2 1 | U    |         |
| Administrative style                      | 5 4 3 2 1 | U    |         |
| Delegation and follow through             | 5 4 3 2 1 | U    |         |
| Conflict resolution                       | 5 4 3 2 1 | U    |         |
| Fairness/Equity                          | 5 4 3 2 1 | U    |         |
| Advocacy for support staff                | 5 4 3 2 1 | U    |         |

5. How would you rate Dean in terms of overall effectiveness?

5 4 3 2 1 U
6. If a colleague from another college asked you to evaluate performance as Dean of this College, what would you say?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

7. What do you consider to be Dean's greatest strengths?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

8. What do you consider to be her particular weaknesses?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

9. What specific recommendations do you have to help improve her performance as Dean or with the operation of the College?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

10. Level of enthusiasm of appointment of Dean.
April 1, 1997

TO: Ron Thurston, President  
Faculty Senate

FROM: Webb Smathers, Chair  
Faculty Senate Select Committee to Study the Possibility of an Administrator’s Award (Committee Members: Shelley Fones, Peggy Cover, Debbie Dubose, Rich Poling, Stan Smith, and Holly Ulbrich)

SUBJECT: Report and Recommendations of the Committee

The charge of this committee was “...to study the feasibility of an award from the Faculty Senate on behalf of the faculty to be given to an outstanding administrator.” Specific items to consider included “...how often the award is to be given; what rewards it should consist of; suggestions for financing; criteria for nominees and recipient; and ceremony possibilities.”

The committee unanimously recommends to you and the faculty Senate that there be established an Outstanding Administrator Award to be given by the Faculty Senate on behalf of the entire faculty of Clemson University. We recommend that the award be given at most annually; however, if the selection committee feels no suitable applicants are nominated, then no award would be given in that year.

We recommend that the award carry a suitable plaque and a $1500.00 cash award to the recipient. We recommend that on an interim basis the $1500.00 stipend be financed by either the Provost or the Vice President for Agriculture, depending upon the appointment of the recipient. As a long-term funding option, we recommend that the award be listed on the menu of giving options in the capital campaign and proceeds be set up as an endowment. A second possibility either in part or in whole would be to utilize the Faculty Senate revenue from the Carolina Panther income.

We recommend that the criteria for nomination and selection of a recipient include but not be limited to:
- Support of faculty
  - Encourages faculty participation in professional development and activities
  - Encourages innovation and creativity in teaching, research, or public service
  - Encourages faculty cooperation and partnerships within and between academic units
- Leadership and Management
  - Promotes the goals and mission of their respective administrative unit and Clemson University
  - Promotes an environmentally open communication within the administrative unit
  - Promotes and helps identify opportunities for resources and scholastic development
  - Promotes and practices sound fiscal management within their administration unit
Ron Thurston
Page two
April 1, 1997:

Personal Characteristics
- Demonstrates personal integrity and leads by example
- Demonstrates high ethical standards and objectivity in decision-making
- Demonstrates a willingness to admit mistakes and correct errors
- Demonstrates a fairness in dealing with faculty and issues in their unit

We recommend a selection committee composed of the following:

(a) one faculty member from each college and the library,
(b) a Faculty Senator,
(c) an Extension Senator,
(d) a University-named professor,
(e) an administrator appointed by the VP for Ag and Natural Resources,
(f) an administrator appointed by the Provost.

We recommend the Advisory Committee of the Faculty Senate would elicit and approve committee nomination and recommend a list to the VP for Ag and Natural Resources and the Provost for their selection. Further, we recommend that committee members serve for two years with six and five replaced in alternate years such that approximately one half of the committee has previous service in any given year. We recommend that the chair be appointed by the Faculty Senate President.
RESOLUTION ON ELECTION TO THE FACULTY

FS97-4-1 P

Whereas, Dr. Gene H. Haertling has served with distinction in the Gilbert C. Robinson Department Ceramic Engineering for eight (8) years as the Bishop Professor of Ceramic Engineering;

Whereas, Dr. Haertling has brought honor and prestige to Clemson University and the Gilbert C. Robinson Department of Ceramic Engineering through his many inventions and honors, such as the R & D 100 Award in 1994;

Whereas, Dr. Haertling is the only Clemson University Faculty Member who is a member of the National Academy of Engineering;

Whereas, Dr. Haertling has been widely honored for his contributions to the field of Ceramic Engineering and Ceramic Engineering Education by organizations such as the American Ceramic Society;

Whereas, Dr. Haertling has served as Mentor Committee Chairman to six (6) Ceramic Engineering Doctoral students in addition to a Master's student and with them has coauthored approximately thirty (30) papers;

Whereas, Dr. Haertling is retiring after eight (8) years of service and the faculty of the Gilbert C. Robinson Department of Ceramic Engineering wish to retain him as a valuable resource and as a member of the Faculty even though he does not meet the time qualifications for normal granting of emeritus faculty status;

Resolved, That the Faculty of the Gilbert C. Robinson Department of Ceramic Engineering respectfully request that the President of the Faculty Senate submit the name of Dr. Gene H. Haertling before the Faculty as a whole at the next General Faculty Meeting and recommend to the Faculty that he be elected to the Faculty as an Emeriti Professor of Ceramic Engineering.

This resolution was passed by the Faculty Senate on April 8, 1997
To: Professor Patricia T. Smart, Chair
Faculty Senate Policy Committee

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

Re: Refinement of Tenure Description

Among the issues facing Clemson University are the adjustments necessary to accommodate the CHE/legislative initiatives known as "Quality Indicators" which in the future will govern state support for higher education. A July 15, 1996 CHE report listed "Quality of Faculty" as among the nine performance indicators to be utilized in implementing such an approach. Subpoint A. listed "Academic and other credentials of professors and instructors" as among the specific factors. The General Assembly then incorporated that recommendation into Bill 1145 which amended Section 3 of the 1976 Code to establish these measures of "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 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.

In Special Report No. 3 for October 4, 1996 the CHE established the following as the quantifiable measures of Subpoint (a) above:

a. the percent of all headcount faculty who meet the criteria for faculty credentials of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS); and
b. the percent of all headcount faculty who exceed the criteria for faculty credentials with SACS.

These stipulations become part of a phased funding formula for all of higher education in South Carolina.

An area needing our immediate attention is the Faculty Manual definition associated with tenure. The tenure policy is addressed on pages 25-26 of the present Manual. Consideration should be given to inserting a sentence in the fourth paragraph on page 26 to read (new language underscored):

VICE PRESIDENT FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS & PROVOST
206 Sikes Hall Box 345101 Clemson, SC 29634-5101
864-656.0851
Normally, the decision to grant tenure shall be made during the penultimate year of the probationary period and becomes effective at the beginning of the next year. In exceptional cases, tenure may be granted earlier. A recommendation to confer tenure for an assistant professor must be accompanied by a favorable recommendation to award promotion to associate professor. [The remainder of the paragraph would remain the same.]

In this fashion this institution would take one small step toward modernizing a policy which has remained unchanged for more than two decades going back to The Manual for Faculty Members (1976).

c.c.: President Constantine W. Curris
Academic Vice President and Provost Steffen H. Rogers
Faculty Senate President Ronald J. Thurston
Director David B. Fleming
Policy Committee Members
Mesdames Betty M. Moore and Cathy T. Sturkie
To: Professor Patricia T. Smart, Chair  
Faculty Senate Policy Committee  

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

Re: Refinement of Academic Rank Descriptions  

Given the legislative and Commission on Higher Education mandates outlined in the background to the recommendation on tenure, it is equally important to give consideration to a review of the descriptions for the academic ranks of associate professor and professor. Those basic definitions appeared in The Manual for Faculty Members (1976, page 47) and have been repeated in the Manual editions of 1982, 1983, 1985, 1986, 1988, 1991, and now 1996.  

Part of the present difficulty lies in the incongruity between the time definition for associate professor ("four years") and the consideration for tenure during the penultimate (sixth) year of service. Similarly, the time-in-rank provision for a professorship with "nine years of relevant experience" emphasizes a quantitative rather than a qualitative approach to faculty evaluation.  

The description of regular faculty academic ranks appears on page 16 of the current Manual. Those descriptions would be modified to read as follows (new language underscored; old language bracketed):  

**Associate Professor.** Normally, the terminal degree and [four years of] relevant experience are required. Also expected is evidence of scholarly or creative publication; fulfillment of service responsibilities to the department, the school, the college, and the University; and marked success in teaching, research, and/or public service.
Similarly, the definition for "professor" would be modified as follows:

**Professor.** The terminal degree, [and not less than nine years of] relevant experience, and continued significant scholarly/creative accomplishment are [normally] required. The rank of professor is granted on the basis of distinguished scholarly or creative publication, outstanding contributions to the University, and conspicuous success in all areas of assigned responsibility - teaching, research, and/or public service.

In this fashion the Manual would be adjusted to fit the new conditions under which the state's higher education institutions must operate now and in the future.

c.c.: President Constantine W. Curris
Vice President and Provost Steffen H. Rogers
Faculty Senate President Ronald J. Thurston
Director David B. Fleming
Collegiate and Library Deans
Policy Committee Members
Mesdames Betty M. Moore and Cathy T. Sturkie
GRADE RETENTION POLICY

Current employed faculty will retain all grade records 120 days, exclusive of summer vacation. Faculty who resign or are on sabbatical or leave of absence shall submit a copy of their grade records to the department to be retained for 120 days, exclusive of summer vacation.

(This proposal is submitted in lieu of developing a special retention schedule)
Average Percent Increase in Base Salary,  
by Group and Category,  
between December 1995 and December 1996  
[from Cooperative Salary Study, Phase II, Original Version, 4/97]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic</th>
<th>Central Admin</th>
<th>Extension</th>
<th>Auxiliary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pres/VP</td>
<td>4.19%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td></td>
<td>[12]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean Level</td>
<td>5.33%</td>
<td>4.96%</td>
<td>4.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[16]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[5]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair Level</td>
<td>5.46%</td>
<td>4.07%</td>
<td>7.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[85]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[36]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>7.88%</td>
<td>6.73%</td>
<td>5.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[59]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[189]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level Staff</td>
<td>8.04%</td>
<td>3.40%</td>
<td>8.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[29]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>8.04%</td>
<td>3.40%</td>
<td>8.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level Info</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tech</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>6.91%</td>
<td>6.12%</td>
<td>7.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>[611]</td>
<td>[556]</td>
<td>[358]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>6.63%</td>
<td>4.43%</td>
<td>6.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info Tech</td>
<td>[134]</td>
<td>[18]</td>
<td>[7]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.53%</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[730]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[57]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>4.30%</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[520]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[45]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non</td>
<td>5.10%</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>[129]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[8]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non</td>
<td>5.11%</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>[81]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[4]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All conversions from 9 to 12 months or 12 to 9 months are excluded for readability. Athletics has also been excluded. Only full-time employees (.75 FTE or greater) who were on the Clemson payroll during the entire period are included.

In brackets, the total number of employees in each category.
### Average Percent Increase

#### December 1995 to December 1996

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category Description</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>% Increase (1995-1996)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic PSA</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSA</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Administration Tier 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Administration Tier 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Administration Tier 2 - 9 to 12</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Administration Tier 1 - 9 to 12</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Administrative - 9 to 12</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Administrative</td>
<td></td>
<td>22.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured Faculty - 12 to 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Tenured Faculty - 12 to 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Tenured Faculty - 9 to 12</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Tenured Faculty - 9 to 12</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Tenured Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Administration Tier 2 - 12 Conversions</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Administration Tier 1 - 9 to 12</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Support - 12 to 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Support - 9 to 12</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology - Level 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology - Level 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaches</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversions</td>
<td></td>
<td>34.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Tenured Track Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td>34.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Administration - Tier 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Faculty includes in Faculty total.*

**Attachment N (2 of 2)**
MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE
JUNE 10, 1997

1. Call to Order. President Francis A. McGuire called the meeting to order at 2:35 p.m.

2. Approval of Minutes. The General Faculty and Staff Minutes dated May 6, 1997 were approved as corrected and the Faculty Senate Minutes of May 13, 1997 were approved as written.

3. Committee Reports
   a. Committee Reports
      Research Committee. No report.
      Welfare Committee. No report.
      Policy Committee. John Huffman submitted the Policy Committee Report (Attachment C) and brought forward for discussion a matter of concern regarding Faculty Manual changes recently approved by the Board of Trustees (Attachment D). Senator Huffman provided a brief history of the issue (approved policy does not resemble the policy approved by the Faculty Senate on March 11, 1997) which was further explained by President McGuire. Following discussion, Senator Huffman asked President McGuire to explore a separate policy for faculty and announced that he was prepared to present a resolution under New Business.
   b. University Commissions and Committees
      1) Senator Beth Kunkel stated that the search for a Graduate Dean was concluded; four candidates' names were forwarded to the Provost; and an offer was made by the Provost which was turned down (an offer will not be made to the other three candidates). The Provost will appoint an acting dean for next year and will reconstitute a new search committee.
      2) Senator Raj Singh submitted and explained the Interim Report by the Annual Review Committee (Attachment E).

4. President's Report President McGuire requested feedback on two issues that were introduced at the June Academic Council meeting: (1) the Intra University Transfer Policy (Attachment F) and the Tiger Brotherhood Mentoring Project (Attachment G). The announcement was made that there will be no Faculty Senate meeting in July and congratulations...
were offered to Senator Michael Morris who was awarded the Gordon K. Lewis Memorial Award for Caribbean Scholarship by the Caribbean Studies Association. President McGuire asked the Senate to seek concrete recommendations from faculty to improve morale.

5. Old Business
   a. Senator Huffman moved to remove from the table the Resolution regarding Dissolution of the Faculty Senate and Faculty Constitution at Francis Marion University. Vote was taken and passed unanimously. In addition to information provided in an article which appeared in Academe, President McGuire explained both sides of this issue based on conversations with the Immediate Past President of the Faculty Senate of Francis Marion and the President of Francis Marion. Senator Campbell offered a friendly amendment which was accepted by Senator Huffman. Vote to accept amended resolution was taken and passed (FS97-6-1 P) (Attachment H).

6. New Business
   a. Senator Campbell, for the Finance Committee, submitted for acceptance the Resolution on Compensation for Department Chairs. Much discussion was held during which it was suggested that this issue be discussed with the Organization of Academic Department Chairs. Senator Smart moved to postpone resolution indefinitely which was seconded. Vote was taken and passed.

   b. Senator Huffman stated that the Policy on Political Activity (Attachment D) adopted by the Board of Trustees on May 1, 1997 was not approved by the Faculty Senate and requested a ruling that it not be included in the Faculty Manual. Vote requiring two-thirds acceptance in order to bring issue to floor was taken and failed.

7. Adjournment President McGuire adjourned the meeting at 4:00 p.m.

Absant: E. Pivorun, R. Sutton (Christenbury for), H. Wheeler, F. Eubanks, M. Jacobi, M. LaForge, E. Hare, J. Peck (Lickfield for) T. Taylor
attachment-A-scholastic-policies-committee-report-

June 10, 1997

The committee met on May 26, 1997 to continue developing our goals for the coming year. Our work will focus on the evaluation and assessment of teaching as related to reappointment, tenure, promotion, and annual review. The proposed components of this project are:

1. New instruments for student evaluations, possibly one for university assessment and a separate form for personal assessment.

2. Guidelines for peer evaluation by other faculty

3. A plan for evaluation of course materials, learning objectives, and exams.

Faculty with appropriate expertise in various departments will be consulted to assist and guide the development of these proposed projects. We also plan to determine the methods used for faculty evaluation at our benchmark institutions.

To counter misconceptions about student evaluation of faculty, the committee has proposed to write an article on "Facts about Student Evaluation".

The next meeting of the Scholastic Policies Committee will be on Tuesday, July 8 at 2:30.
Policy Committee met on May 20 and discussed priorities for the committee during the 1997-1998 Senate term. Mentioned that the Chair did not want to have the Committee's agenda clogged up with Faculty Manual changes referred by Bob Waller. Suggest that these be run through the Executive-Advisory Committee, then referred to the appropriate Senate Committee.

1. Matters referred by the 1996-1997 Senate
   a) Award for administrator: Committee decided to think about this until our June meeting. The feeling is that there should be no monetary award. Some problems on academic versus non-academic administrators were mentioned.
   b) Form to evaluate administrators: Martin Jacobi has taken the Penn State form, and will have it scanned, and put into Clemson format.

2. New business
   a) Resolutions rejected by Provost: The Committee questioned whether these were really a Policy Committee matter. They appeared to fall more logically into the realm of the Finance Committee. Decided to bring this up at the Executive/Advisory committee meeting. There seemed to be a consensus that this should be discussed with the Provost so that the next round might not be rejected.
   b) Nine month appointments for department chairs: There was considerable discussion of this subject. Apparently there are inconsistencies across (and sometimes within) colleges regarding supplemental salaries for chairs. This is a particular problem with agriculture faculty who go from a 12 month appointment to a 9 month appointment as chair. The Committee decided to make this a top priority issue, however, we need to know if having chairs revert to 11 month appointments is expressly forbidden under restructuring. The role of chairs and directors is ill-defined and needs to be clarified. Consultation with the Provost is probably necessary.
   c) Post-tenure review: We did not have enough information to proceed. I now have a copy of the report of the Senate Select Committee on Tenure, and we will proceed from there.
   d) Revision of Grievance Procedures: We did not have a copy of the recommended revisions. Questioned whether this is a Policy or Welfare Committee issue.
   e) Student web sites: There was a brief discussion, but the consensus was that these are protected as freedom of speech/expression. Decided that no action would be appropriate.

The next meeting of the Policy Committee will be at 3:30 P.M. on Thursday, June 12.
Report of the Faculty Senate Finance Committee
June 10, 1997

The Faculty Senate Finance Committee met for the first time on
Tuesday, May 20, in Brackett 419, at 3:30 pm. Present were: Robert
Campbell (Chair), John Leininger (BPA), John Warner (BPA), and Jack
Peck (E&S). Absent: Kerry Brooks (AAH), Russ Sutton (AFLS).

I. Public Service Activity Budget

A major item on our agenda for 1997-1998 is an analysis of the Public
Service Activity Budget. We would like to know how much of the PSA
Budget is used for:

1) the Extension system (including off-campus Extension
faculty)
2) regulatory operations
3) research funding and other support for on-campus faculty

And, of the PSA money that is spent on campus, we would like to
know how much goes to:

1) support research by faculty members
2) hire staff
3) pay for travel
4) enhance faculty salaries

At $60 million a year, this is a significant part of the total University
budget, and it has not been closely examined by the Faculty Senate in
the past.

II. Funds for Travel and Outside Speakers

We are concerned about the current level of support for faculty travel
to conferences and for colloquium speakers. We now have detailed
information about 95-96 travel expenditures that was provided to the
Accountability Committee. We will seek information about money for
outside speakers (we know that in some departments, the funds
available for this purpose remain at $0).

We would like to find out what our benchmark institutions do in these
areas. We will ask Dave Fleming to provide such information about
benchmark institutions, if he has it, and encourage him to collect it, if
the Office of Institutional Research currently does not do so.

III. 9-month Department Chairs

The chronic difficulties posed by defining Department Chair as a 9-
month position were discussed. We drafted a resolution on this issue
which was passed by the Executive/Advisory Committee and is on today's agenda.

IV. The previous Finance Committee’s handout on “The Question of Pay Equity”

The 1997-98 Senate Finance Committee has discovered serious errors in the document that was titled “The Question of Pay Equity” and included in two reports of the 1996-97 Senate Finance Committee (March and April 1997). The current Finance Committee does not endorse this document, and apologizes to anyone who may have been misled by its content.

The flaws in the document include:

(A) It compares the salary an average faculty member to the salary of the President of the University, not than the salary of an average administrator (which would be more appropriate when pay equity is at issue).

(B) The salary figures for the President and the average faculty member for 90-91 to 95-96 are not the actual numbers, but are extrapolated backwards from 96-97. The President’s salary is already accurately known for each of those years. The Faculty Senate’s approximate numbers on faculty salaries over that period will soon be replaced by authoritative numbers from the Accountability Committee and the Office of Institutional Research.

(C) The assumed raise percentages (6% for the President, 3% for faculty) are not correct for raises between 95-96 and 96-97. Consequently the forward extrapolations for the President and the average faculty member are inaccurate.

(D) There are calculation errors at several points in the document.

We will continue our work on issues of pay equity, using the most accurate information available to us.
which was passed by the Executive/Advisory Committee and is on today's agenda.

**IV. The previous Finance Committee's handout on "The Question of Pay Equity"**

The 1997-98 Senate Finance Committee has discovered serious errors in the document that was titled "The Question of Pay Equity" and included in two reports of the 1996-97 Senate Finance Committee (March and April 1997). The current Finance Committee does not endorse this document, and apologizes to anyone who may have been misled by its content.

The flaws in the document include:

(A) It compares the salary an average faculty member to the salary of the President of the University, not than the salary of an average administrator (which would be more appropriate when pay equity is at issue).

(B) The salary figures for the President and the average faculty member for 90-91 to 95-96 are not the actual numbers, but are extrapolated backwards from 96-97. The President's salary is already accurately known for each of those years. The Faculty Senate's approximate numbers on faculty salaries over that period will soon be replaced by authoritative numbers from the Accountability Committee and the Office of Institutional Research.

(C) The assumed raise percentages (6% for the President, 3% for faculty) are not correct for raises between 95-96 and 96-97. Consequently the forward extrapolations for the President and the average faculty member are inaccurate.

(D) There are calculation errors at several points in the document.

We will continue our work on issues of pay equity, using the most accurate information available to us.
Policy Committee met on May 20 and discussed priorities for the committee during the 1997-1998 Senate term. Mentioned that the Chair did not want to have the Committee's agenda clogged up with Faculty Manual changes referred by Bob Waller. Suggest that these be run through the Executive-Advisory Committee, then referred to the appropriate Senate Committee.

1. Matters referred by the 1996-1997 Senate
   a) Award for administrator: Committee decided to think about this until our June meeting. The feeling is that there should be no monetary award. Some problems on academic versus non-academic administrators were mentioned.
   b) Form to evaluate administrators: Martin Jacobi has taken the Penn State form, and will have it scanned, and put into Clemson format.

2. New business
   a) Resolutions rejected by Provost: The Committee questioned whether these were really a Policy Committee matter. They appeared to fall more logically into the realm of the Finance Committee. Decided to bring this up at the Executive/Advisory committee meeting. There seemed to be a consensus that this should be discussed with the Provost so that the next round might not be rejected.
   b) Nine month appointments for department chairs: There was considerable discussion of this subject. Apparently there are inconsistencies across (and sometimes within) colleges regarding supplemental salaries for chairs. This is a particular problem with agriculture faculty who go from a 12 month appointment to a 9 month appointment as chair. The Committee decided to make this a top priority issue, however, we need to know if having chairs revert to 11 month appointments is expressly forbidden under restructuring. The role of chairs and directors is ill-defined and needs to be clarified. Consultation with the Provost is probably necessary.
   c) Post-tenure review: We did not have enough information to proceed. I now have a copy of the report of the Senate Select Committee on Tenure, and we will proceed from there.
   d) Revision of Grievance Procedures: We did not have a copy of the recommended revisions. Questioned whether this is a Policy or Welfare Committee issue.
   e) Student web sites: There was a brief discussion, but the consensus was that these are protected as freedom of speech/expression. Decided that no action would be appropriate.

The next meeting of the Policy Committee will be at 3:30 P.M. on Thursday, June 12.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Dick Simmons

DATE: May 5, 1997

IN RE: Policy on Political Activity

The attached Policy on Political Activity was approved by the Board of Trustees at the Board meeting last Friday. This policy replaces the current policy.

Please make proper distribution of this new policy.

Ben W. Anderson
General Counsel

BWA/la

Attachment

cc: President Curris, w/attachment
    Administrative Council, w/attachment

4 June 1997

Copy received by J. Walker

To: P. Moore

From: M. Armour

Date: 4 June 1997

Ben W. Anderson
General Counsel

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL
107 Sikes Hall  Clemson, SC 29634-5003
364.656.3414  FAX 364.656.1674
Policy on Political Activity

As a public institution Clemson University does not take a position in favor of or in opposition to any candidate or to any non-University-related political position. However, the University recognizes that, as citizens, Clemson employees may desire to undertake civic duties and participate in political life at its local, state, and national levels. The University recognizes, also, that full-time and some part-time employment with Clemson University is a time-consuming responsibility and the University cannot permit the neglect of that responsibility. Therefore, it is the policy of Clemson University that its employees may seek election to and hold public office provided such actions are in compliance with all state and federal laws and regulations and in accordance with the following guidelines:

A. Running for Public Office

Any employee who desires to run for public office will be required to take leave without pay if it is determined by the Vice President or equivalent chief administrative official responsible for that area that such activity impinges upon the fulfillment of the employee's University responsibilities. Appeals of such determinations may be made within one week to the President.

B. Holding Public Office

Should the responsibilities of holding public office affect adversely the fulfillment of University responsibilities, the employee elected to such a public office will need either to be granted a leave without pay for the period of active service or to resign his or her position prior to assuming office. Requests for leave without pay are to be made in accordance with University policy and procedures. Such requests will be considered on an individual basis by the Vice President or equivalent chief administrative official responsible for that area and will be granted if it is determined that approval of the request will not negatively affect the University. Appeals of such determination may be made within one week to the President.
COMMITTEE MEMBERS

- Peggy Cover and Tom Dickens
- Sid Gauthreaux and Don Henricks
- Les Gradey and Bob Green
- Alan Grubb and Ellen Krupar
- Judy Melton and Ed Pivrun
- Cheryl Rainey and John Warner
MEETING DATES

First meeting: 5-14-97  (General Discussion)
Second meeting: 5-28-97  (A list of written questions given to Provost)
Third meeting: 6-4-97  (Provost present)
Next Meeting: 6-16-97
KEY ISSUES TO BE ADDRESSED

- Streamline the process (basic uniformity in the evaluation process)
- According to State Law, post tenure review and student evaluation have to be included in the evaluation process
SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION

- The document as such is just something to start. He will accept the document that covers basic issues.
- The process of post tenure review has to be worked out. Reward (in small grant) to the faculty doing excellent job
- Address mechanisms to deal others (unsatisfactory performance)
A process that permits promotion of faculty members even against the chair of the department. This should not be a common practice.

All administrators (chairs, Assoc., Deans, etc.) should be evaluated each year like any other faculty. Faculty Senate should start this process.
Faculty Senate should start the administrators evaluation process immediately. The two committees can work in concert. After June 16th we will meet around middle of August (seeking others input). Get post tenure review information from other institution.
May 14, 1997

MEMORANDUM

TO: Academic Council
FROM: Provost Advisory Committee
RE: Intra University Transfer Policy

Intra University Transfer Policy

Any undergraduate student who meets the Continuing Enrollment Policy of the University may transfer from one major to another at will. Any exceptions to this policy require approval by the Collegiate Dean and the Provost.

Approved by Provost Advisory Committee
5/14/1997
MEMORANDUM

TO: Stef Rogers
Academic Affairs

FROM: Ted Swann
Student Government

RE: Mentoring Project

DATE: May 2, 1997

Would you please present the Tiger Brotherhood Mentoring Project to the Academic Council in my absence? As you will recall in one of our previous discussions, the Mentoring Project is aimed to give every freshman faculty member a mentor for their first year at Clemson. The mentors will be made up of Tiger Brotherhood members including students, faculty, staff, administrators and citizens from the community. The Mentoring Project is the result of a brainstorming session held last fall. Tripp Bradley, the VP of Tiger Brotherhood, was discussing ways in which Clemson could attract and retain the most excellent faculty members. Tiger Brotherhood has expressed their enthusiasm and willingness to invest their time in this endeavor. The program would convene at the beginning of school, coordinated with new faculty orientation. A dinner would be held where the mentors and faculty members would meet and hear a speech concerning Clemson, thus initiating their Clemson experience and growth in the Clemson family. Please relay any other details that I may have left out and know that I am looking forward to working very hard with this project this summer. I appreciate your help with this matter and apologize that I cannot be there myself. Please note, however, that I am at the beach and having way too much fun!

Sincerely,
Ted Swann
RESOLUTION REGARDING DISSOLUTION
OF THE FACULTY SENATE AND FACULTY CONSTITUTION
AT
FRANCIS MARION UNIVERSITY

FS97-6-1 P

Whereas, The Board of Trustees of Francis Marion University, upon recommendation of the President, has unilaterally rescinded the Faculty Constitution and dissolved the Faculty Senate; and

Whereas, These actions were carried out with total disregard and in violation of accepted standards of the application of faculty participation in collegiate governance as outlined by the Southern Association of Universities and Schools; and

Whereas, These actions violate the rights of the Faculty of Francis Marion University to have elected representatives participate in University governance formalized by means of a Faculty Constitution; and

Whereas, The threat by President Vickers to deny tenure to all tenure candidates at Francis Marion University, unless the Faculty Senate passed his desired policies, is an abuse of power; and

Whereas, the statement by Trustee Kiriakides that the purpose of post-tenure review is to ensure political loyalty, is likewise an abuse of power;

RESOLVED, That the Clemson University Faculty Senate condemns these actions of the Board of Trustees and President of Francis Marion University, and urges that these actions and associated policies be rescinded immediately.

This resolution was passed by the Faculty Senate on June 10, 1997.
RESOLUTION ON COMPENSATION FOR DEPARTMENT CHAIRS

Whereas, “Department Chair” was defined as a 9-month position during the reorganization of 1994-95; and

Whereas, Important department-level decisions must still be made during the summer - in such areas as budgets, faculty and staff raises, and graduate student admission - and orientation must be supervised; and

Whereas, Students, parents, and others who have inquiries need a knowledgeable and authoritative source of information about academic departments and their programs year-round;

RESOLVED, That either “Department Chair” should be once again defined as a 12-month position, and compensated accordingly; or

Nine-month department chairs should be required to work during the entire summer, and provided adequate supplemental pay for all 64 working days during that period, as a matter of University policy.

This resolution was postponed indefinitely by the Faculty Senate on June 10, 1997.
MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE
AUGUST 19, 1997

1. **Call to Order.** President Francis A. McGuire called the meeting to order at 2:38 p.m.

2. **Approval of Minutes.** The Faculty Senate Minutes of June 10, 1997 were approved as written.

3. **"Free Speech"**
   Professor John Huffman expressed his concern regarding funding costs for the Clemson University Libraries and urged that the President and Provost address this issue and support additional funding. Professor Huffman then noted that under a peak load agreement with Duke Power, the chillers are being cut off during the afternoon in order to save money. In some buildings, such as the Chemistry Building, this results in major humidity difficulties. It needs to be understood that educational work and research continues twelve months of the year including intercession weeks. It was decided that the Faculty Senate Research Committee will undertake the issue of Library funding and that President McGuire will discuss the humidity problem with the President.

4. **Committee Reports**
   a. **Committee Reports**
   
   **Research Committee.** Ed Pivorun stated that there was no report.
   
   **Scholastic Policies Committee.** Nancy Ferguson stated that there was no report.
   
   **Welfare Committee.** Gerry Walker stated that there was no report.
   
   **Finance Committee.** Robert Campbell stated that there was no report.
   
   **Policy Committee.** John Huffman, Chair of the Policy Committee, noted that this Committee had met several times during the summer to discuss several issues. In addition to those which will be brought under New Business, the Policy Committee considered the following issues:
   
   * award for administrators which was not supported by the Committee;
   * the draft evaluation of administrators was reviewed by the Provost and Deans and will be revised;
   * rejected resolutions by the Provost will be reconsidered in September;
   * nine-month appointment of Chairs transferred to Finance Committee;
   * preliminary study of post tenure review is complete and Committee will await the final report of the *ad hoc* Annual Review Committee;
   * non-faculty members on search committees was rejected;
departmental bylaws are not approved by the Provost in the Faculty Manual but after consideration the Provost will review departmental bylaws and approve departmental tenure and promotion policies;

Faculty Senate's statement on political activity will be revised and resubmitted for inclusion in the Faculty Manual.

Policy Committee meets on the third Tuesday of each month (next meeting September 16th).

b. University Commissions and Committees

1) Faculty Development Center Committee - Kathy Neal Headley, Chair of this Committee, stated that a draft report will be shared with the Provost. The Provost will be invited to meet with the Committee at the next meeting on September 2.

2) Annual Review Committee - Chair Raj Singh noted that the report from this Committee should be ready for the October Faculty Senate meeting.

3) Greek Housing Task Force - Senator Kerry Brooks informed the Senate that this Task Force is addressing future Greek housing on campus.

4) Committee to Position Clemson University for Performance Funding - President McGuire stated that this Committee met during the summer to work on this very confusing effort.

President's Report President McGuire discussed several items with members of the Senate:

a) In an effort to attain the goal of open communication, the Senate is extending invitations to other faculty groups and to the Board of Trustees to attend Faculty Senate meetings. President McGuire urged senators to report any rumors to him so that it may be determined if they can be addressed and what may be causing low morale.

b) The Provost informed President McGuire that any faculty member may request from his/her dean to see the college budget and that if the dean resists, to notify the Provost.

c) Lead senators are obtaining electronic-mail faculty lists from deans so that they may forward Senate information to faculty within their college. Deans have been told to share this information. If they resist, the Provost will help obtain it.

d) President McGuire encouraged senators to share their copies of the Clemson Experience Committee Report contained in the Agenda Packet with faculty within their college. Any comments are to be forwarded to Cathy Sams or Dean Barker, Chair of the Committee.

e) Plans are underway for the Faculty Senate to celebrate the members of the Class of '39 for their positive efforts on behalf of the faculty of Clemson University.
f) President McGuire reminded senators to accept the responsibility and the opportunities to meet with the administration in order to improve communications.

6. **Old Business** (None)

7. **New Business**
   a. Senator Campbell submitted and explained the Resolution on Reporting Undergraduate Class Sizes (Attachment A) and a Sample Report of Undergraduate Class Section Sizes (Attachment B). During discussion a motion to amend was received and accepted. Motion to postpone indefinitely was made, vote was taken and passed. Resolution will return to Committee for further consideration.
   b. Resolution Establishing the Office of Faculty Ombudsman was submitted for approval by Senator Huffman. Following a brief history, vote to accept resolution was taken and passed unanimously (FS97-8-1 P) (Attachment C).
   c. Senator Huffman submitted for approval and explained Revisions in Grievance Procedures I & II (Attachment D). Following the receipt of many suggestions for consideration during discussion, Senator Brooks moved to return to Committee to incorporate changes for resubmission. Motion was seconded. Vote was taken to return to Committee and passed unanimously.
   d. Faculty Manual Changes Related to Grievances (Attachment E) was submitted for acceptance and explained by Senator Huffman. Discussion was held. Motion was made by Senator Brooks to amend the proposed Faculty Manual Change which was seconded. Vote was taken to amend and passed. Vote was then taken to accept proposed Faculty Manual Change which required two-thirds vote and passed.
   e. Senator Brooks inquired if senators had received salary/reappointment letters (they had not).
   f. Senator Matthew Saltzman asked for an update on our request for a Faculty Senate Website person. President McGuire responded that a person has been suggested by a senator to update the Faculty Senate Websites and work with databases. This person will be paid through Panther monies.

8. **Adjournment** President McGuire adjourned the meeting at 4:10 p.m.

Kathy Neal Headley, Secretary

Cathy Toth Sturkie, Administrative Assistant

RESOLUTION ON REPORTING UNDERGRADUATE CLASS SIZES

Whereas, Average class section sizes for undergraduate courses convey some information about the services provided by Clemson University, in a form that is easily understood by students, parents, and the general public; and

Whereas, Such information is readily obtainable from the University's computerized course rolls;

Resolved, That Clemson University should henceforth report information about average undergraduate class size to the public each academic year;

Further Resolved, That reported information about average undergraduate class sizes should be classified by:

* College
* Academic Department or Program
* The Faculty Rank or Other Job Classification of the Primary Instructor
* The Level of Course being offered (100 or 200-level; 300-level; or 400-level)

Postponed Indefinitely by the Faculty Senate on August 19, 1997
SAMPLE REPORT of
UNDERGRADUATE CLASS SECTION SIZES

hastily drafted by Robert Campbell

Average Undergraduate Class Section Size by
Level of Course and Rank of Instructor, for the College of Business and
Public Affairs.

Academic Year 1997-1998*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>100 and 200-level</th>
<th>300-level</th>
<th>400-level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accountancy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Profs</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc Profs</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst Profs</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructors/</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturers /</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Political</strong></td>
<td>125</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Science</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Psychology</strong></td>
<td>125</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Profs</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc Profs</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst Profs</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructors etc.</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad Students</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sociology</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of BPA</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clemson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Needless to say, the numbers are 100% fictional!

The number of class sections in each category should also be included in the report.
Resolution Establishing the Office of Faculty Ombudsman

FS97-8-1 P

(Note: Following establishment of the Office of Faculty Ombudsman, enabling passages will be added to the Faculty Manual.)

Whereas, The Faculty Senate Select Committee to Study Grievance Procedures has recommended the appointment of a faculty ombudsman; and

Whereas, An increase in the number of Grievance Petitions has affected the available resources of the University to respond to Grievance Petitions in a timely manner; and

Whereas, Mediation by an ombudsman may avoid the filing of some Grievances;

Resolved, That the position of ombudsman be established in order to provide a mediator in all disputes except those concerning retention, promotion, or tenure, and

Further resolved, That the Executive/Advisory Committee of the Faculty Senate shall appoint the ombudsman for a renewable term of two years, and

Further resolved, That the ombudsman shall be selected from those full professors who have experience with the Grievance process, and

Further resolved, That the ombudsman shall receive release time during the academic year and appropriate compensation from the Provost's Office during the summer.

Passed by the Faculty Senate on August 19, 1997
The names of the counselors are available from the President of the Faculty Senate and Provost of the University. Guidelines related to all aspects of the Grievance Procedures should be obtained from the Provost's Office prior to filing any grievance. These guidelines are also available from the Faculty Senate office, and may be found at the Faculty Senate web site. The full texts of both grievance procedures follow.

B. Faculty Grievance Procedure I

b. If the petition is filed during one of the long semesters of the regular academic year, the Chairman of the Faculty Senate Advisory Committee shall call a special meeting of the committee within fifteen days of receipt of a properly submitted petition. If the petition is filed at any other time, the special meeting of the Faculty Senate Advisory Committee will be held within fifteen days after the beginning of the next long semester. If the Provost deems the matter of sufficient urgency, he/she may request that the Faculty Senate Advisory Committee meeting shall take place at a time outside the normal academic year. In this case those members of the Faculty Senate Advisory Committee who have nine month appointments will be compensated at a rate equal to that of their normal salary for any day or fraction thereof. A quorum for this meeting shall consist of five members of the Advisory Committee. If the Advisory Committee determines the petition is not grievable under this procedure, the Chair shall notify the faculty member within seven days of that decision and the matter is closed.

c. The Advisory Committee of the Faculty Senate will be the Hearing Panel. They will, within thirty days after reaching the decision to hear the petition, set a date for the hearing. The chairperson shall give each party to the grievance thirty days written notice of the hearing. Notification of the hearing date will include: a) the time, place and nature of the hearing; b) the procedure to be followed during the hearing; c) a statement of the legal authority under which the hearing is to be held; d) references to pertinent University statutes and portions of the Faculty Manual; and e) a short and plain statement of the matters asserted. The hearing shall be held during one of the long semesters of the regular academic year, unless the Provost deems the matter of sufficient urgency, and requests that the hearing take place at a time outside the normal academic year. In this case those members of the Faculty Senate Advisory Committee who have nine month appointments will be compensated at a rate equal to that of their normal salary for any day or fraction thereof.

FACULTY MANUAL PAGE 35

c. In the case of non-reappointment, denial of tenure or denial of promotion, the requirements to meet with the Department Chair and the Dean are waived.

d. If the matter cannot be resolved at the collegiate level, the faculty member has two options: a) he/she may petition the Provost to review the matter and render a decision regarding it; and b) if the faculty member so requests (or if the Provost, with the faculty member's consent, chooses to do so) the Provost shall refer the matter to the Grievance Board (composition given in the
Constitution, page 58) for its recommendation prior to making the decision. If the Provost is named as a respondent in the petition, the Provost shall submit the petition directly to the Grievance Board. If the Grievance Board determines that the Provost is correctly named as a respondent, the Provost shall be recused from a decision making capacity in the Grievance process. This petition must be in writing and must be received by the Provost within fifteen days of the faculty member's meeting with the dean regarding the matter. The petition shall not exceed ten pages in length, excluding supporting documents, which may be submitted as an appendix to the petition.

In order for the Provost or the Grievance Board to determine if the matter is grievable under Grievance Procedure II, the grievance petition must state:

**FACULTY MANUAL PAGE 35**

The Grievance Board or the Provost shall determine to which of the person(s) named in the petition copies of the petitions or relevant portions thereof shall be sent. Respondents to the petition must file a response with the Provost or the Grievance Board within fifteen-days of receiving the petition. This response is not to exceed ten pages excluding supporting documents, which may be submitted as an appendix to the response.

**FACULTY MANUAL PAGE 36**

f. If the matter is to be referred to the Grievance Board, the Board shall meet within fifteen days after receiving the petition if the petition is filed during one of the long semesters of the regular academic year, to determine whether the petition meets criteria set forth below delineating grievable and non-grievable complaints. If the petition is filed at any other time, the Grievance Board will meet within fifteen days after the beginning of the next long semester. If the Provost deems the matter of sufficient urgency, he/she may request that the Grievance Board meeting shall take place at a time outside the normal academic year. In this case those members of the Faculty Senate Advisory Committee who have nine month appointments will be compensated at a rate equal to that of their normal salary for any day or fraction thereof. If the Board finds the matter grievable, it shall set a date for review no later than thirty days after their receipt of the matter if this date is within one of the long semesters of the regular academic year. If this date is not within one of the long semesters, the hearing will be held within thirty days of the start of the next long semester. If the Provost deems the matter of sufficient urgency, he/she may request that the review shall take place at a time outside the normal academic year. In this case those members of the Faculty Senate Advisory Committee who have nine month appointments will be compensated at a rate equal to that of their normal salary for any day or fraction thereof. If the matter is determined non-grievable, the Board will promptly notify the petitioner, respondent(s), and Provost of its decision, and the matter shall be closed.

ii. In the review process, the Hearing Board is not asked to substitute its judgment for that of the faculty or administrator who made the decision at issue. The merits of the decision, per se, are not 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 no such improper or unfair influence existed and/or whether 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
REVISIONS IN GRIEVANCE PROCEDURES I and II

FACULTY MANUAL PAGE 30

The names of the counselors are available from the President of the Faculty Senate and Provost of the University. Guidelines related to all aspects of the Grievance Procedures should be obtained from the Provost's Office prior to filing any grievance. These guidelines are also available from the Faculty Senate office, and may be found at the Faculty senate web site. The full texts of both grievance procedures follow.

B. Faculty Grievance Procedure I

FACULTY MANUAL PAGE 32

b. If the petition is filed during one of the long semesters of the regular academic year, the Chairman of the Faculty Senate Advisory Committee shall call a special meeting of the committee within fifteen days of receipt of a properly submitted petition. If the petition is filed at any other time, the special meeting of the Faculty Senate Advisory Committee will be held within fifteen days after the beginning of the next long semester. If the Provost deems the matter of sufficient urgency, he/she may request that the Faculty Senate Advisory Committee meeting shall take place at a time outside the normal academic year. In this case those members of the Faculty Senate Advisory Committee who have nine month appointments will be compensated at a rate equal to that of their normal salary for any day or fraction thereof. A quorum for this meeting shall consist of five members of the Advisory Committee. If the Advisory Committee determines the petition is not grievable under this procedure, the Chair shall notify the faculty member within seven days of that decision and the matter is closed.

c. The Advisory Committee of the Faculty Senate will be the Hearing Panel. They will, within thirty days after reaching the decision to hear the petition, set a date for the hearing. The chairperson shall give each party to the grievance thirty days written notice of the hearing. Notification of the hearing date will include: a) the time, place and nature of the hearing; b) the procedure to be followed during the hearing; c) a statement of the legal authority under which the hearing is to be held; d) references to pertinent University statutes and portions of the Faculty Manual; and e) a short and plain statement of the matters asserted. The hearing shall be held during one of the long semesters of the regular academic year, unless the Provost deems the matter of sufficient urgency, and requests that the hearing take place at a time outside the normal academic year. In this case those members of the Faculty Senate Advisory Committee who have nine month appointments will be compensated at a rate equal to that of their normal salary for any day or fraction thereof.

FACULTY MANUAL PAGE 35

c. In the case of non-reappointment, denial of tenure or denial of promotion, the requirements to meet with the Department Chair and the Dean are waived.

d. If the matter cannot be resolved at the collegiate level, the faculty member has two options: a) he/she may petition the Provost to review the matter and render a decision regarding it; and b) if the faculty member so requests (or if the Provost, with the faculty member's consent, chooses to do so) the Provost shall refer the matter to the Grievance Board (composition given in the
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. Simultaneously, a copy of the Panel's findings and recommendations shall be forwarded to the grievant, and the respondent. In the event the Provost has been recused from a decision making capacity, the findings and recommendations shall be submitted to the President.

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, together with the report of the Hearing Panel, shall be transmitted in writing to the faculty member, the Hearing Panel, and all named parties. In those cases in which the Provost disagrees with the findings and/or recommendations of the Hearing Panel, the Provost shall submit a report to the President which includes a rationale for the decision. A copy of this report shall be provided to the Petitioner, the Respondent, the Hearing Panel, and the President.
Faculty Manual Changes Related to Grievances

(Added language is underscored)

Approved by the Faculty Senate on August 19, 1997

FACULTY MANUAL, page 24

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. The chair or director shall render a separate and independent recommendation as to the disposition of the case. 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 ensure that the affected faculty member is promptly informed in writing as to the results of and rationale for both recommendations. In the cases of promotion or early tenure consideration, the candidate may withdraw from further consideration at this point.

The chair or director shall forward to the dean both recommendations, 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. The Dean will meet with the Chair/Director and with the Peer Committee to discuss reasons for the discrepancy. A request for personnel action form shall be attached to provide a record of the review at all administrative levels.

FACULTY MANUAL, page 25

Early in the calendar year the faculty member's assigned duties and objectives for that year are established by the chair or director in consultation with the faculty member, using Form 1. Near the end of the calendar year, the faculty member completes Form 2 and submits it to the chair or director. On the basis of these two forms, personal observations, and a second interview, the chair or director completes Form 3 and forwards it to the dean. Procedures are provided in the guidelines for disclaimers by the faculty member at any stage of the evaluation process. If any disclaimer is filed, the Dean will investigate the matter and mediate if possible. If the matter cannot be resolved the material shall be forwarded to the Provost for further review.
September 1, 1997

Dear Clemson Faculty Senate Members

This letter is to invite you and your college to participate in the Faculty Outside the Classroom with Undergraduate Students (FOCUS) program here at Clemson. This program is designed to help students in the residence halls develop a relationship outside the classroom setting with faculty. This can assist students in knowing faculty on a different level, one that may be more informal.

One way to help foster this relationship is to have faculty present programs in the residence halls. These programs give you the chance to talk with students about your favorite topics, hobbies or specialty areas. We are not asking you to present a class lecture, but to discuss your interests and what you think would be of interest to the students.

This is the fourth year we have offered this program at Clemson. Each year, we have added more faculty and programs to our directory. Last year, forty programs were presented in the halls. Topics included: time management, healthy eating, interviewing skills, Black History Month, couples relationships, stress and getting to know your academic advisor.

I would like to ask that you share this information with the faculty in your department. If a faculty member is interested, please complete the attached survey and return to the address listed on the survey. We take information from the survey and compile it into a directory which staff uses to contact faculty. The staff will contact you to discuss presenting a program in their hall. Each staff member is required to have one FOCUS program during the year.

If you have any questions, please contact me at 656-1060 or you can email me at: wevelyn@clemson.edu. I would be happy to answer your questions. I hope you will want to be involved and return the attached survey by SEPTEMBER 29, 1997

Sincerely,

Evelyn A. Wallington
Residence Education Specialist
Faculty Outside the Classroom with Undergraduate Students (FOCUS) Survey

Name ____________________________________________

Department _______________________________________

Campus Address ___________________________________

Phone Number ______________________________________

____ YES, I am interested in the FOCUS program

____ NO, I am not interested in the FOCUS program, but I know of another faculty member who may be interested.

_________________________________________________ (Name)

____ NO, I am not interested in the FOCUS program

My hobbies and interests are:

_________________________________________________

_________________________________________________

_________________________________________________

Topics/programs that I would be willing to do in the halls:


PLEASE COMPLETE AND RETURN BY SEPTEMBER 29, 1997 TO:
Evelyn A. Wallington
Residence Education Specialist
200 Mell Hall
656-1060
wevelyn@clemson.edu
1. **Call to Order.** President Francis A. McGuire called the meeting to order at 2:36 p.m.

2. **Approval of Minutes.** The Faculty Senate Minutes of August 19, 1997 were approved as written.

3. **“Free Speech”**

   a. Senator Jack Peck shared his thoughts about the Clemson University Library issue. Senator Peck believes that the search for solutions to the Library's problems should not be restricted to increased funding but should be broadened to include other possibilities such as increased access to online information databases and fax-back services. He stated that timely access to information was the real problem. Funding may have been the cause of the problem and funding may be one of the solutions to the problem, but it may not be the only possible solution.

   b. Joe Boykin, Dean of Clemson University Libraries, planned to explain the cancellation process for journals, but instead responded to Senator Peck's comments. Dean Boykin explained that more information will be available to the Library, but there is the reality of the lack of a mechanism to stop the increase of the price of materials which is governed by the publishers. The Library has not been allocated resources over the years to keep up with the price increase. Therefore, subscriptions must be cancelled. The only way to live within the budget allocated to the Library is to cancel subscriptions. Dean Boykin requested faculty input into this onerous process.

4. **Committee Reports**

   a. **Committee Reports**

      **Research Committee.** Ed Pivorun submitted and briefly discussed the Research Committee Report (Attachment A).

      **Scholastic Policies Committee.** Nancy Ferguson stated that this Committee has collected data related to teaching, tenure, and promotion from other colleges and benchmark institutions. This Committee will meet soon with the Provost to receive his input in order to develop a comprehensive plan for teaching evaluations.

      **Welfare Committee.** According to Gerry Walker, Chair of the Welfare Committee, this Committee is looking at two issues: whether or not 9-month faculty can get paid over a 12-month period and whether or not there is some way non-University employees (vendors, contractors) could wear identification while they are on campus.

      **Finance Committee.** Robert Campbell noted that a graduate student has been hired to work with the Finance Committee, the Faculty Senate Office, and the Provost's Office. This Committee will study the impact of academic programs on the University as a whole. Its next meeting will be September 16th.
Policy Committee. John Huffman stated that the Policy Committee will meet on September 16th. Items under consideration by the Policy Committee include the method for writing the position of ombudsman into the Faculty Manual and a political activity policy for faculty.

b. University Commissions and Committees

1) Annual Review Committee - Raj Singh, Chair, announced that a draft report is almost complete; will be shared with the Provost; and will be brought to the Senate.

2) President McGuire noted that Scott Ludlow, Chief Financial Officer, has requested faculty input into the Budget Administrative Council. Senator Campbell has been directed to appoint a subcommittee to implement this process.

5. President's Report

President McGuire noted that the Faculty Senate, in particular, and the faculty, in general, are being asked for a lot of input. Therefore, it is assumed that there will be followup on that input and that we must take advantage of this opportunity. Discussion followed.

6. Old Business

a. Senator Huffman submitted the Revisions in Grievance Procedures I and II (Attachment B) for reconsideration by the Senate for incorporation into the Faculty Manual. Provost Rogers asked that this issue be tabled until he meets with the Policy Committee which was granted.

b. President McGuire informed the Senate that the definition of the word “composed” in the instance of the composition of search committees will be pursued by Robert A. Waller, Faculty Manual Editorial Consultant.

7. New Business

a. The Resolution on Library Budget was submitted for acceptance by Senator Nancy Ferguson. Following discussion, during which a friendly amendment was accepted, vote to accept was taken and passed (FS97-9-1 P) (Attachment C).

b. President McGuire reminded everyone (1) to respond to and share the Faculty Outside the Classroom with Undergraduate Students (FOCUS) information in the packet and (2) of the Board of Trustees Breakfast on October 11, 1997.

8. Adjournment

President McGuire adjourned the meeting at 3:43 p.m.

Kathy Neal Headley, Secretary

Cathy Toth Stufkie, Administrative Assistant

Absent: M. Horton, P. Skewes, R. Sutton, H. Wheeler, K. Brooks, M. Jacobi, J. Leininger, J. Warner (Smith for), M. Cooper, T. Taylor (Lickfield for)
The Faculty Senate Research Committee opened discussions on what many Clemson faculty consider to be the major problems with research infrastructure and incentives that hamper or complicate research endeavors at the University. These discussions included problems associated with both faculty and graduate student research. The following major concerns had been distilled from faculty input to the University Research Council Subcommittee on Infrastructure and Compliance that I chair (not ranked by importance):

1) Tremendous gap between tenure track faculty and the graduate student - lack of official post doc designation.

2) Research proposal process-simplify and streamline.

3) Perceived pressure for increased teaching loads-administrative recognition of the undergrad and grad research courses is needed.

4) Pressure to build excellence in specific areas at Clemson to attain national stature.

5) University service contracts vs dept expenditures for equipment maintenance.

6) Interim funding for faculty between grants.

7) Faculty release time for those who oversee common equipment or facilities.

8) PSA vs E&G funding -unique problem in CAFLS?

9) Greater assistance from Office of Sponsored Programs - locating funding sources for specific research ideas.

10) Better timing for information transfer regarding deadlines for submission of research projects. Many cases where information reaches the faculty just a few weeks before deadlines for submission.

11) Develop coop system between faculty and administration before major initiatives or programs are initiated at the University. Avoid problems associated with TTWET and ITEL.

12) Is there a movement to emphasize "applied" research and to eliminate "basic" research.

13) Elimination of charges for use of University facilities - EM facility; Godley-Snell Animal Facility.

14) Lack of in-house equipment repair and development facilities.

15) Needs for funding of grad student research and travel.
16) Rectify problems associated with the University accounting system
17) Simplify the hiring practices for temporary research personnel
18) Library holdings
19) Increase the level of grad student stipends
20) Develop a source of funding for major research equipment replacement
21) Develop a source of start up funds for new faculty
22) Develop a protocol to address critical research space needs
23) Develop a uniform policy on indirect cost recovery to the grant holding faculty member-reward and incentive system.

Deliberations concluded that the Research Committee would emphasize 4 major concerns with the University research infrastructure and incentive practices:

a) Intellectual property: review patent policy and inventor rights.

b) Major research initiatives (programs; centers): initiate a dialog with the administration that will culminate in the development of a University wide policy that emphasizes faculty involvement in the initiation, development and monitoring of any major initiatives that have a major impact on the financial resources and academic infrastructure of the University or individual Colleges.

c) Teaching loads: initiate a fact finding mission to determine the policies within the individual Colleges regarding teaching loads for faculty with active research programs. Do faculty have to buy out time during the academic year with funds obtained from research grants or contracts in order to meet their time obligations for research? Information will be obtained on average load distributions in the areas of scholarly activities, extension and outreach. The fact finding mission will also make inquiries on average teaching loads in comparable Colleges or Departments at Clemson’s peer institutions.

d) Research Infrastructure (equipment upkeep and replacement; library holdings; graduate student stipends): initiate a dialog with the administration that would culminate in the establishment of a pool of money that would be available to Colleges and Departments for upgrading or replacing major research/teaching equipment; the establishment of graduate student fellowships; and increased funds for the library. A possible source of monies would be the establishment of a surcharge on athletic tickets that would be used for the purpose of financing this equipment replacement, graduate fellowship and library upgrade strategy.

The presence of both a University Research Council and the Senate Research Committee would be seen by some as potential duplication of effort. Since I chair the Research Council Subcommittee on Infrastructure/Compliance, I will make every effort to make sure that both committees obtain each others minutes. Any overlap in the committees efforts may actually be beneficial and whatever comes out of both groups in the end might well be complementary in their overlap.
REVISIONS IN GRIEVANCE PROCEDURES I and II

FACULTY MANUAL PAGE 30

The names of the counselors are available from the President of the Faculty Senate and Provost of the University. Guidelines related to all aspects of the Grievance Procedures should be obtained from the Provost's Office prior to filing any grievance. These guidelines are also available from the Faculty Senate office, and may be found at the Faculty senate web site. The full texts of both grievance procedures follow.

B. Faculty Grievance Procedure I

FACULTY MANUAL PAGE 32

b. If the petition is filed during one of the long semesters of the regular academic year, the Chairman of the Faculty Senate Advisory Committee shall call a special meeting of the committee within fifteen days of receipt of a properly submitted petition. If the petition is filed at any other time, the special meeting of the Faculty Senate Advisory Committee will be held within fifteen days after the beginning of the next long semester. If the Provost deems the matter of sufficient urgency, he/she may request that the Faculty Senate Advisory Committee meeting shall take place at a time outside the normal academic year. In this case those members of the Faculty Senate Advisory Committee who have nine month appointments will be compensated at a rate equal to that of their normal salary for any day or fraction thereof. A quorum for this meeting shall consist of five members of the Advisory Committee. If the Advisory Committee determines the petition is not grievable under this procedure, the Chair shall notify the faculty member within seven days of that decision and the matter is closed.

c. The Advisory Committee of the Faculty Senate will be the Hearing Panel. They will, within thirty days after reaching the decision to hear the petition, set a date for the hearing. The chairperson shall give each party to the grievance thirty days written notice of the hearing. Notification of the hearing date will include: a) the time, place and nature of the hearing; b) the procedure to be followed during the hearing; c) a statement of the legal authority under which the hearing is to be held; d) reference to pertinent University statutes and portions of the Faculty Manual; and e) a short and plain statement of the matters asserted. The hearing shall be held during one of the long semesters of the regular academic year, unless the Provost deems the matter of sufficient urgency, and requests that the hearing take place at a time outside the normal academic year. In this case those members of the Faculty Senate Advisory Committee who have nine month appointments will be compensated at a rate equal to that of their normal salary for any day or fraction thereof.

FACULTY MANUAL PAGE 35

c. In the case of non-reappointment, denial of tenure or denial of promotion, the requirements to meet with the Department Chair and the Dean are waived.

d. If the matter cannot be resolved at the collegiate level, the faculty member has two options: a) he/she may petition the Provost to review the matter and render a decision regarding it; and b) if the faculty member so requests (or if the Provost, with the faculty member's consent, chooses to do so) the Provost shall refer the matter to the Grievance Board (composition given in the
Constitution, page 58) for its recommendation prior to making the decision. **If the Provost is named as a respondent in the petition, the Provost shall submit the petition directly to the Grievance Board.** If the Grievance Board determines that the Provost is correctly named as a respondent, the Provost shall be recused from a decision making capacity in the Grievance process. This petition must be in writing and must be received by the Provost within fifteen days of the faculty member’s meeting with the dean regarding the matter, or within fifteen days of receipt of notification of non-reappointment, denial of tenure or denial of promotion. The petition shall not exceed ten pages in length, excluding supporting documents, which may be submitted as an appendix to the petition.

In order for the Provost or the Grievance Board to determine if the matter is grievable under Grievance Procedure II, the grievance petition must state:

**FACULTY MANUAL PAGE 35**

The Grievance Board or the Provost shall determine to which of the person(s) named in the petition copies of the petitions or relevant portions thereof shall be sent. **Respondents to the petition must file a response with the Provost or the Grievance Board within fifteen days of receiving the petition.** This response is not to exceed ten pages excluding supporting documents, which may be submitted as an appendix to the response.

**FACULTY MANUAL PAGE 36**

f. If the matter is to be referred to the Grievance Board, the Board shall meet within fifteen days after receiving the petition **if the petition is filed during one of the long semesters of the regular academic year, to determine whether the petition meets criteria set forth below delineating grievable and non-grievable complaints.** **If the petition is filed at any other time, the Grievance Board will meet within fifteen days after the beginning of the next long semester.** If the Provost, or President if the Provost is recused, deems the matter of sufficient urgency, he/she may request that the Grievance Board meeting shall take place at a time outside the normal academic year. In this case those members of the Grievance Board who have nine month appointments will be compensated at a rate equal to that of their normal salary for any day or fraction thereof. If the Board finds the matter grievable, it shall set a date for review no later than thirty days after their receipt of the matter **if this date is within one of the long semesters of the regular academic year.** If this date is not within one of the long semesters, the hearing will be held within thirty days of the start of the next long semester. If the Provost, or President if the Provost is recused, deems the matter of sufficient urgency, he/she may request that the review shall take place at a time outside the normal academic year. In this case those members of the Hearing Panel who have nine month appointments will be compensated at a rate equal to that of their normal salary for any day or fraction thereof. If the matter is determined non-grievable, the Board will promptly notify the petitioner, respondent(s), and Provost of its decision, and the matter shall be closed.

ii. In the review process, the Hearing Board is not asked to substitute its judgment for that of the faculty or administrator who made the decision at issue. The merits of the decision, per se, are not 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 no such improper or unfair influence existed **and/or whether 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, together with the report of the Hearing Panel, shall be transmitted in writing to the faculty member, the Hearing Panel, and all named parties. **In those cases in which the Provost disagrees with the findings and/or recommendations of the Hearing Panel, the Provost shall submit a report to the President which includes a rationale for the decision. A copy of this report shall be provided to the Petitioner, and the Hearing Panel.**
RESOLUTION ON LIBRARY BUDGET

FS97-9-1 P

Whereas, A comparison of the Clemson Library Budget for 1996 with the library budgets for other ACC schools and our peer institutions, demonstrates that our library’s budget for purchase of materials (especially monographs and serials) is well below average for both groups; and

Whereas, A strong, competitive library is a necessary component of any nationally recognized university; and

Whereas, A strong, and competitive library is a vital element in maintaining and attracting top notch faculty and students; and

Whereas, A strong, and competitive library is a necessary part of making and maintaining the quality of Clemson’s classes;

Resolved, That the condition of the Clemson library budget for purchase of materials is a crisis that threatens the quality of our institution, and the education we offer now, and will offer in the future;

Further resolved, That the Administration is urged to obtain the necessary funding to maintain our present journal collection and add necessary monographs.

Further resolved, That the Faculty Senate constitute a special Committee on the State of the Library, and direct that Committee to meet with the University Administration and the Library Administration in order to work out a plan of action for resolving the funding and resource crises at that library, and making our Library comparable to those found in other ACC schools, or at our peer institutions.

This resolution was passed by the Faculty Senate on September 9, 1997.
September 1, 1997

Dear Clemson Faculty Senate Members

This letter is to invite you and your college to participate in the Faculty Outside the Classroom with Undergraduate Students (FOCUS) program here at Clemson. This program is designed to help students in the residence halls develop a relationship outside the classroom setting with faculty. This can assist students in knowing faculty on a different level, one that may be more informal.

One way to help foster this relationship is to have faculty present programs in the residence halls. These programs give you the chance to talk with students about your favorite topics, hobbies or specialty areas. We are not asking you to present a class lecture, but to discuss your interests and what you think would be of interest to the students.

This is the fourth year we have offered this program at Clemson. Each year, we have added more faculty and programs to our directory. Last year, forty programs were presented in the halls. Topics included: time management, healthy eating, interviewing skills, Black History Month, couples relationships, stress and getting to know your academic advisor.

I would like to ask that you share this information with the faculty in your department. If a faculty member is interested, please complete the attached survey and return to the address listed on the survey. We take information from the survey and compile it into a directory which staff uses to contact faculty. The staff will contact you to discuss presenting a program in their hall. Each staff member is required to have one FOCUS program during the year.

If you have any questions, please contact me at 656-1060 or you can email me at: wevelyn@clemson.edu. I would be happy to answer your questions. I hope you will want to be involved and return the attached survey by SEPTEMBER 29, 1997.

Sincerely,

Evelyn A. Wallington
Residence Education Specialist
Faculty Outside the Classroom with Undergraduate Students (FOCUS) Survey

Name ________________________________

Department ________________________________

Campus Address ________________________________

Phone Number ________________________________

YES, I am interested in the FOCUS program

NO, I am not interested in the FOCUS program, but I know of another faculty member who may be interested.

______________________________ (Name)

NO, I am not interested in the FOCUS program

My hobbies and interests are:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Topics/programs that I would be willing to do in the halls:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

PLEASE COMPLETE AND RETURN BY SEPTEMBER 29, 1997 TO:
Evelyn A. Wallington
Residence Education Specialist
200 Mell Hall
656-1060
wevelyn@clemson.edu
Troubling Myths About On-Line Information

RECENTLY MET A WOMAN RESPONSIBLE FOR PRODUCING JOURNALS FOR SEVERAL EASTERN EUROPEAN UNIVERSITIES. FACULTY MEMBERS AT THOSE UNIVERSITIES WHO HAD GONE ABROAD IN THE PAST FEW YEARS HAD BEGUN TELLING THEIR GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS THAT ALL INFORMATION IN THE WEST IS NOW AVAILABLE ELECTRONICALLY, AND THAT THEIR TRADITIONAL WAY OF Acquiring INFORMATION—IN PRINT—IS PASSED.

Wishing to be "with it," the government officials had ordered the woman to spend 10 percent of her budget on electronic journals. She is in despair, because too few of the journals she wants are available on line, and because the remaining budget is not enough to acquire the print journals that students and professors really need to support their research.

This incident illustrates one of the many myths about electronic information that now are widely accepted, both in academe and in society at large: All information is now available electronically. A related myth is just as dangerous: All information is available free somewhere on the World-Wide Web, if only one is clever enough to be able to find it.

It's easy to see how the average person could come to believe these myths after logging onto the Web and being overwhelmed by the vast amount of information available on tens of thousands of Web pages. But what is the nature of this material? Much of what purports to be serious information is junk—neither current, objective, nor trustworthy. It may be impressive to the uninformed, but it is clearly not of great use to scholars.

The dangerous part of the myth of availability is illustrated by the state legislator who informed me last year that the library at my university no longer needed any budget for library materials, because Harvard University had digitized its entire library collection and was making it available to the world at no charge. If only that were true! I would love to see Harvard spend billions of dollars to digitize its collection (figuring out, in the process, who the thousands of copyright holders are and compensating them accordingly), and then magnanimously make its collection available free in the Web. But common sense tells me that this will not happen.

The Web certainly contains free material of considerable value. The Electronic Text Center of the University of Virginia Library, for instance, has made many classic texts that are no longer covered by copyright available on its Web site. But the University of Virginia Library is not a commercial publisher, and few commercial publishers are likely to place their most valuable copyrighted materials on the Web at no cost, or even at low cost.

Some publishers do make selected excerpts from their current titles available on line, in the hope that the excerpts will persuade readers to buy the whole work on paper. On the whole, however, current books are simply not now available electronically. Nor will we see all of the titles already in print on line someday.

Digitizing is labor-intensive, expensive work, and both scholarly and commercial publishers are being extremely selective about which of their titles they will digitize.

Although many books published in the future will eventually be available on line, they will probably cost readers much more in that format than they ever did in print. When the book is called up on the Web, publishers will be able to charge users by the paragraph or by the page, over and over again, rather than charging them once for the whole work. And in many cases, the material will be available only on line, so users will not be able to get it more cheaply in some other format.

Journals are more likely than books to become available electronically in the near future, because articles in general are shorter, more focused, and less expensive than books, and thus are more saleable. Users also are willing to pay a premium for the timeliness of articles, which can be edited and published much more quickly than books. And publishers are eager to publish articles individually in electronic form as they become available, rather than waiting until a group of articles is ready to be published in a complete paper volume. But so far, out of perhaps 150,000 journals available to scholars worldwide, fewer than 4,000 are available in electronic format. Many of these journals do not provide all of the text available in their paper editions and offer only issues from the past few years.

On-line availability does solve some problems of access, storage, theft, and perhaps preservation. And publishers such as the Johns Hopkins University Press, Elsevier Science Inc., and HighWire Press are making increasing numbers of journals available electronically. However, it is clear that electronic journals will not cost any less than what we have been paying for printed ones. Although libraries now can have dual subscriptions to some publications and receive the paper and electronic versions for just a few dollars more than the paper version alone, subscribing to just the electronic version is about as expensive as a subscription to the paper version.

Quite simply, publishers are determined to protect their current profit margins. In fairness to publishers, it must be noted that electronic publication is not as effortless as it seems. Publishers still need a staff to edit, produce, and market their material, and for every dollar saved in paper, postage, and ink, an offsetting dollar must be spent in research and development, hardware and software, and other start-up costs.

Publishers will be swift to exploit the possibilities of the Web for almost-constant updates of material, each of which can produce additional income. But timely products will be expensive to maintain. While the Internet can make a publisher out of virtually anyone, it cannot make all publications equal in quality. In general, the cost of material will be proportional to its value, on line as well as in print.

Occasionally, that cost will be borne by colleges and universities that pay their faculty members to produce useful, free Web pages. And some electronic information is available at no charge from the U.S. government—although taxpayers subsidize the production of that information. But in general, the cost of publication is inelastic, to be borne by individual purchasers of libraries, and the price must cover the efforts that both commercial and scholarly publishers undertake to ensure the quality of the information that they produce.

It would be wonderful if electronic information meant lower costs for libraries. But the cost of acquiring scholarly information, regardless of format, is still rising faster than our budgets for purchasing materials, and we face hard and unpopular choices about what we can afford to purchase.

Predictions of the future usually overestimate the extent of change in the short run and underestimate it in the long run. While much, if not most, of the information useful for scholarly research will probably be on line some day, we are still not even close to having the critical mass of information available on line that is necessary to support faculty or even student research.

EVEN WHEN WE DO REACH THE POINT at which on-line information meets most of our research needs, libraries and librarians will still be necessary—contrary to a third myth about electronic information. Librarians will still need to evaluate material and, with advice from faculty members, decide what to add to collections; then they must order, pay for, and process the material, to say nothing of helping people to use it effectively. Faculty members and students generally do not care to perform any of these functions, and commercial firms are not noted for their devotion to the long-term maintenance of low-use materials, or for facilitating access to such information.

As one expert put it, students and scholars are trying to drink from the firehose of information spewing out of the World-Wide Web: It is not uncommon for a user to have 10,000 hits in response to a query on the Internet. A librarian can help make sense of the torrent of data.

In the meantime, it is dangerous to assert—or assume—that the brave new world is here, and that all information is now on line, free, and easy to use. When anyone says such things, legislators, university presidents, and others hear them, believe them, and want to act on them. The result could be disastrous for higher education, robbing researchers of resources they need and impoverishing all of those who depend on future breakthroughs in scholarship.

It is far better to adopt a realistic perspective: All information is not yet electronic and probably never will be; electronic information will not be less expensive than current printed information; and libraries—both physical and virtual—will continue to be needed, along with the professionals who run them.

Whatever the future holds, we must not hamstring librarians by dictating the format in which they should acquire material or how much of their budgets should be devoted to on-line publications. In this time of transition, we must let them decide the best way to keep students and scholars up to date.

William Miller is president of the Association of College and Research Libraries, a division of the American Library Association, and director of libraries at Florida Atlantic University.
MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE
OCTOBER 14, 1997

1. Call to Order. President Francis A. McGuire called the meeting to order at 2:32 p.m.

2. Approval of Minutes. The Academic Convocation Minutes dated August 19, 1997 and the Faculty Senate Minutes of September 9, 1997 were approved as corrected.

3. "Free Speech"
   a. Senator Peter Skewes presented a concern regarding the banning of cyclists noting that cycling is an important mode of transportation. Speaking on behalf of a colleague, Senator Skewes stated that bicycles should not be included in the ban and suggested bike paths. Beth Jarrard, *Inside Clemson*, informed the Senate of plans to build bike paths on campus.

   b. Senator John Leininger explained concerns about summer schedules - in particular, that classes will not be offered because they do not have the required number of students with the result that many students are not able to take a given class in the summer in order to graduate or stay on track for graduation. This situation allows students to take classes out of order or forces delayed graduation.

4. Special Order of the Day Debra C. Jackson, Acting Dean of the Graduate School, submitted and explained a draft proposal for the establishment of a University Graduate Council (Attachment A).

5. Suspension of Agenda Order Senator John Huffman moved to suspend the order of business which was approved by the Senate. The following items were presented by Senator Huffman:


   b. Motion was made by Senator Huffman to remove from the table the issue of Revisions in Grievance Procedures I and II. Vote was taken and passed unanimously. Senator Huffman explained revisions and accepted a friendly amendment. Vote to approve amended revisions was taken and passed with required two-thirds vote. (Attachment C).

   c. Senator Huffman submitted for approval and explained the history of the Proposed Faculty Manual Statement on Political Activity by Faculty. Vote to approve statement was taken and passed with required two-thirds vote (Attachment D).

   d. Language for incorporation into the Faculty Manual for the Establishment of the Office of Faculty Ombudsman was moved for acceptance by Senator Huffman. Following the acceptance of a friendly amendment, vote to accept was taken and passed unanimously (Attachment E).
e. Provisions for Departmental/School Bylaws and Personnel Procedures in the Faculty Manual were brought forward by Senator Huffman for acceptance by the Senate. Vote was taken and passed unanimously (Attachment F).

f. At the request of fellow faculty within the Clemson University Libraries, Senator JoAnne Deeken addressed the Faculty Senate. Specifically mentioned in this address was appreciation to the Faculty Senate and others for their concern for the Library; the need to push for additional funding and to work together for best access; and that the Library will ask for major funding and space.

g. Senator Huffman submitted for acceptance the Resolution to Provide Funds for the Library which was seconded. Vote was taken and passed unanimously (FS97-10-1 P) (Attachment G). On behalf of the Library, Joseph F. Boykin, Jr., Dean of the Libraries, expressed appreciation for this action and expressed the hope that other matching funds will allow the Library not to cancel any of the titles that any faculty requested be saved.

6. Committee Reports

a. Committee Reports

Research Committee. Ed Pivorun submitted and explained the October, 1997 Research Committee Report (Attachment H). During discussion, Senator Elizabeth Dale, Chair of the Faculty Senate Select Committee on the Library, urged the inclusion of Library funding as a main or strategic issue affecting research/scholarship growth at Clemson University.

Scholastic Policies Committee. Senator Nancy Ferguson presented this Committee's Report (Attachment I) and noted that the University Academic Calendar Committee has proposed improvements which will soon be shared.

Welfare Committee. No report.

Finance Committee. Robert Campbell announced that the next meeting will be October 28, 1997 at 3:30 p.m. during which the Committee will identify fields within the University's databases. Senator Campbell made a statement that in some colleges deans have pointed out that raises for department chairs have not been large due to demands by Faculty Senate. Faculty Senate concerns include adequate summer compensation and a possible disparity between salaries; internal hiring; and others. It was noted that if the University keeps academic and administrative costs, constraints on the budget will continue. Discussion followed.

b. University Commissions and Committees

1) Senator Dale stated that the University Libraries Advisory Committee had met and decided to wait until the Provost approved the Faculty Senate committee contained within the September resolution. Once approved, the Faculty Senate Select Committee was established, met, and will report to the University Budget Council. Senator Dale further noted that Fran McGuire, President of the Faculty Senate, and James F. Barker, Dean of the College of Architecture, Arts, & Humanities, have brought the Library issue to the Budget Council. A preliminary report from this Committee will be submitted by December to the Faculty Senate, the Budget Council, and the Provost. Subcommittees will consider comparisons relating to peer institutions; Library's needs from the perspective of the Library; Library groups' expectations; and options. A survey regarding the Library has been disseminated and both the graduate and undergraduate students will have an opportunity to respond.
7. **President's Report**  President McGuire reported on the following:

a. The Board of Trustees approved a new Mission Statement and endorsed a Vision Statement and implementation concepts which may be controversial. This week the Faculty Senate will transmit via electronic mail the mission and vision statements and the concepts. A formal system to collect and summarize comments will be established through lead senators with Pat Smart as Chair. President McGuire is enthused that the Board requested faculty input and has urged the Senate to increase and formalize faculty representation on the Board's committees.

b. His decision to send an invitation to Faculty Senate meetings to all faculty through electronic mail the week before scheduled meetings noting Agenda items and items of interest.

c. The Class of '39 Award for Excellence nominations are due on October 27th.

d. President McGuire submitted for acceptance a recommendation regarding the University Marshal. Motion to amend the term of University Marshal to a one-year term was received by Senator Subhash Anand. Vote on amendment was taken and passed unanimously. Senator Matthew Saltzman suggested that the first person hold the title from December, 1997 through June, 1999 and then begin the one-year term with Convocation in August, 1999 (Attachment J).

8. **Statement by Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost**

Steffen H. Rogers informed the Senate of the good impression Ron Thurston, Fran McGuire, and Pat Smart have made on the Board of Trustees with their cooperative spirit and stated that due to the illness of President Curris, the Board and President Curris have told the Provost that he has the full power of the President’s Office, and that the University will continue to function as usual.

9. **Adjournment**  President McGuire adjourned the meeting at 4:27 p.m.

__________________________  
Kathy Neal Headley, Secretary

__________________________  
Cathy Toth Sturkie, Administrative Assistant

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: Establishment of a University Graduate Council

1 October 1997

In order to coordinate all of the policy considerations which affect graduate education, it is proposed that a University Graduate Council be formed to assist in the direction of graduate education on this campus.

To effect such a request, it is proposed that the Faculty Manual be amended on page 41 of the August 1997 version by adding the following to the committees reporting to the Academic Council:

10. University Graduate Council

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

The membership of the University Graduate Council consists of all the elected members of the following committees: Graduate Advisory, Graduate Curriculum, Graduate Admissions and Continuing Enrollment Appeals, Graduate Fellowships and Awards, and Graduate Student Academic Grievances. Ex-officio (non-voting) members include: Dean and Associate Deans of the Graduate School, Chief Research Officer and Senior Vice Provost for Research and Graduate Studies, and a representative of the Faculty Senate appointed by that body’s President.

The dean of the Graduate School shall convene the Council for the purpose of electing a Chair with a two-year term from among the voting membership. The Council will meet at least three times each academic year. A special meeting can be called by the Chair, by the Graduate Dean, or by request of a third of the Council members in order to manage the Council’s business.

If additional particulars are needed, please call upon my services or those of Acting Graduate Dean Debra Jackson. I ask that this topic be an agenda item for the October 23 meeting of the Policy Committee.

c.c.: Vice President and Provost Steffen H. Rogers  
Chief Research Officer Y. T. Shah  
Acting Graduate Dean Debra B. Jackson  
1997-98 Policy Committee Members  
Mesdames Betty M. Moore and Cathy T. Sturkie
Report from the Policy Committee

October 14, 1997

The Policy Committee met on September 16. Provost Rogers met with us, primarily to discuss revisions in the grievance procedures. A number of other issues were discussed, and four resolutions were approved by the Committee which will be presented at the October 14 Senate meeting. The following matters are under discussion and/or have been resolved.

1. Revisions in the grievance procedures. The Provost had some constructive suggestions, which have been included in the revised policies approved by the Committee. These Manual revisions will be presented again at the October meeting.

2. A revised policy for evaluation of administrators was discussed. A new form is being devised, and the policy is under consideration. Until we come up with a package, we will keep it in committee.

3. Resolutions from 1996-97 rejected by Provost: We discussed these briefly with the Provost and he mentioned that much of what was in those resolutions has now been adopted. We will probably look at them again in October.

4. Policy on Political activity. A resolution (addition to the faculty Manual) was passed by the Committee. To be presented at the October Senate meeting.

5. Manual changes from Bob Waller. The following were approved by the Committee and will be presented at the October 14 Senate meeting.

   1) Provost's approval of departmental by-laws, etc.

   2) Ombudsman.

6. Proposed graduate council. A new proposal submitted by Dean Jackson was discussed briefly by the Committee. Bob Waller has since prepared a draft proposal in Faculty manual format. This will be discussed at the October Policy Committee meeting.

The Policy Committee meets at 3:30 P.M. on (usually) the third Tuesday of each month. Since the third Tuesday in October is during fall break, our next meeting will be Thursday, October 23rd.
REVISIONS IN GRIEVANCE PROCEDURES I and II

Revised 9/17/97

Note: The passages in bold and underlined are to be added to the manual. Those which are in italics are to be deleted.

FACULTY MANUAL PAGE 30

The names of the counselors are available from the President of the Faculty Senate and Provost of the University. Guidelines related to all aspects of the Grievance Procedures should be obtained from the Faculty Senate office or the Faculty Senate website prior to filing any grievance. The full texts of both grievance procedures follow.

B. Faculty Grievance Procedure I

FACULTY MANUAL PAGE 32

b. If the petition is filed during one of the long semesters of the regular academic year, the Chairman of the Faculty Senate Advisory Committee shall call a special meeting of the committee within fifteen days of receipt of a properly submitted petition. If the petition is filed at any other time, the special meeting of the Faculty Senate Advisory Committee will be held within fifteen days after the beginning of the next long semester. If the Provost deems the matter of sufficient urgency, he/she may request that the Faculty Senate Advisory Committee meeting shall take place at a time outside the normal academic year. In this case those members of the Faculty Senate Advisory Committee who have nine month appointments will be compensated at a rate equal to that of their normal salary for any day or fraction thereof. A quorum for this meeting shall consist of five members of the Advisory Committee. If the Advisory Committee determines the petition is not grievable under this procedure, the Chair shall notify the faculty member within seven days of that decision and the matter is closed.

c. The Advisory Committee of the Faculty Senate will be the Hearing Panel. They will, within thirty days after reaching the decision to hear the petition, set a date for the hearing. The chairperson shall give each party to the grievance thirty days written notice of the hearing. Notification of the hearing date will include: a) the time, place and nature of the hearing; b) the procedure to be followed during the hearing; c) a statement of the legal authority under which the hearing is to be held; d) references to pertinent University statutes and portions of the Faculty Manual; and e) a short and plain statement of the matters asserted. The hearing shall be held during one of the long semesters of the regular academic year, unless the Provost deems the matter of sufficient urgency, and requests that the hearing take place at a time outside the normal academic year. In this case those members of the Faculty Senate Advisory Committee who have nine month appointments will be compensated at a rate equal to that of their normal salary for any day or fraction thereof.

FACULTY MANUAL PAGE 35

c. In the case of non-reappointment, denial of tenure or denial of promotion, the requirements to meet with the Department Chair and the Dean are waived.
d. If the matter cannot be resolved at the collegiate level, the faculty member has two options: a) he/she may petition the Provost to review the matter and render a decision regarding it; and b) if the faculty member so requests (or if the Provost, with the faculty member's consent, chooses to do so) the Provost shall refer the matter to the Grievance Board (composition given in the Constitution, page 58) for its recommendation prior to making the decision. If the Provost is named as a respondent in the petition, the Provost shall submit the petition directly to the Grievance Board. If the Grievance Board determines that the Provost is correctly named as a respondent, the Provost shall be recused from a decision making capacity in the Grievance process. This petition must be in writing and must be received by the Provost within fifteen days of the faculty member's meeting with the dean regarding the matter, or within fifteen days of receipt of notification of non-reappointment, denial of tenure or denial of promotion. The petition shall not exceed ten pages in length, excluding supporting documents, which may be submitted as an appendix to the petition.

In order for the Provost or the Grievance Board to determine if the matter is grievable under Grievance Procedure II, the grievance petition must state:

**FACULTY MANUAL PAGE 35**

The Grievance Board or the Provost shall determine to which of the person(s) named in the petition copies of the petitions or relevant portions thereof shall be sent. Respondents to the petition may file a response with the Provost or the Grievance Board. Any such responses must be filed within fifteen days of receiving the petition. This response is not to exceed ten pages excluding supporting documents, which may be submitted as an appendix to the response.

**FACULTY MANUAL PAGE 36**

f. If the matter is to be referred to the Grievance Board, the Board shall meet within fifteen days after receiving the petition if the petition is filed during one of the long semesters of the regular academic year, to determine whether the petition meets criteria set forth below delineating grievable and non-grievable complaints. If the petition is filed at any other time, the Grievance Board will meet within fifteen days after the beginning of the next long semester. If the Provost, or President if the Provost is recused, deems the matter of sufficient urgency, he/she may request that the Grievance Board meeting shall take place at a time outside the normal academic year. In this case those members of the Grievance Board who have nine month appointments will be compensated at a rate equal to that of their normal salary for any day or fraction thereof. If the Board finds the matter grievable, it shall set a date for review no later than thirty days after their receipt of the matter if this date is within one of the long semesters of the regular academic year. If this date is not within one of the long semesters, the hearing will be held within thirty days of the start of the next long semester. If the Provost, or President if the Provost is recused, deems the matter of sufficient urgency, he/she may request that the review shall take place at a time outside the normal academic year. In this case those members of the Hearing Panel who have nine month appointments will be compensated at a rate equal to that of their normal salary for any day or fraction thereof. If the matter is determined non-grievable, the Board will promptly notify the petitioner, respondent(s), and Provost of its decision, and the matter shall be closed.

ii. In the review process, the Hearing Board is not asked to substitute its judgment for that of the faculty or administrator who made the decision at issue. The merits of the decision, per se, are not...
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 no such improper or unfair influence existed and/or whether 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.
Proposed Faculty Manual statement on Political activity by Faculty
(This is essentially the policy which was passed by the Senate in March, 1997)

As a public institution Clemson University does not take a position in favor of or in opposition to any candidate or to any non-University-related political position. However, the University recognizes that, as citizens, Clemson faculty may desire to undertake civic duties and participate in political life at its local, state, and national levels. The University recognizes, also, that a position as a member of the Clemson University faculty is a faculty member’s primary professional responsibility and the University cannot permit the neglect of that responsibility by a faculty member desirous of engaging in the political process. Therefore, it is the policy of Clemson University that faculty members may seek election to and hold public office provided such actions are in compliance with all state and federal laws and in accordance with the following guidelines:

A. Running for Public Office
Any faculty member who seeks a full-time political office at the local level, or any office at the state or federal level will be required to take leave without pay if it is determined by the immediate supervisor that such activity impinges upon the fulfillment of the faculty member's University responsibilities. Appeals of such determinations may be made within one week to the Provost. Further appeal may be made within one week to the President.

B. Holding Public Office
Recognizing that the responsibilities of holding public office at the state or federal level may adversely affect the fulfillment of University responsibilities, the faculty member elected to such a public office will need either to be granted a leave without pay for the period of active service or to resign his or her position prior to assuming office. The holding of part-time county, municipal and other local offices is permitted. However, if the duties of such an office adversely affect the fulfillment of University responsibilities, the faculty member must either request a leave without pay for the period of active service or resign his or her position. In recognition of the legitimacy and social importance of political activity by faculty members, such requests for leave will be awarded unless it can be demonstrated that approval of the request will adversely affect the University. Requests for leave without pay are to be made in accordance with University procedures. Appeals of need for leave without pay or resignation may be made by the elected official to the Provost. If refused, further appeals may be made through faculty grievance procedures.
15 October 1997

To: Vice President and Provost Steffen H. Rogers

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

Re: Establishment of the Office of Faculty Ombudsman

At the Faculty Senate meeting on August 19th the full Senate approved in principle the establishment of the Office of Faculty Ombudsman. That recommendation was accepted by you on August 24th.

At the Faculty Senate meeting on October 14 language to implement this concept in the Faculty Manual was approved by the required two-thirds majority. On behalf of Faculty Senate President Fran McGuire, I transmit for your approval the insertion on page 30 of the following language just before the description of Faculty Grievance Procedure I:

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 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 first recommendation of the Select Committee to Study the Grievance Procedures (February 11, 1997) and the Senate Resolution of August 19, 1997 would be implemented. Because the implementation of this practice represents a new departure for Clemson in resolving disputes at an informal level, it is my recommendation that this change be referred to and approved by the Educational Policy Committee of the Board of Trustees.

c.c.: Faculty Senate President Francis A. McGuire
Policy Committee Chair John W. Huffman
1997-98 Policy Committee members
Administrative Intern Doris R. Helms
Mesdames Betty M. Moore and Cathy T. Sturkie
To: Professor John W. Huffman, Chair  
Faculty Senate Policy Committee  
Thru: Faculty Senate President Francis A. McGuire  
From: Robert A. Waller, Editorial Consultant for the Faculty Manual  

The Policy Committee's attention has been drawn to the fact that the current Faculty Manual makes inadequate provision for the use of departmental or school bylaws. Currently the August 1997 Faculty Manual makes mention of departmental bylaws in connection with faculty appointments declaring "Such [search and screening] committees are selected in accordance with departmental bylaws or, in the absence of relevant bylaws, by the departmental Faculty Advisory Committee" (page 21). In a general discussion of Faculty participation in University governance there is this statement: "To fulfill their academic governance responsibilities at the collegiate, school, and departmental levels, the faculties of the several colleges, schools, and departments are formally organized according to bylaws" (page 38). No other provision is made for departmental or school bylaws.

With regard to personnel procedures the Manual references faculty appointments being made "in connection with the department's regular tenure-and-promotion process" (p. 21). In a discussion of procedures for renewal, tenure, and promotion, provision is made for "Individual departments ... [to] establish written procedures and committee structures in order to facilitate peer evaluation" (page 23). On page 24 specific provision is made for the department's peer evaluation process to "receive formal approval by the faculty, the department chair or school director, the dean, and the Provost. To the maximum extent possible, the procedures followed and the criteria used shall be explicit." Interestingly, the Manual does not mention this responsibility when defining the duties of either the Provost (pp. 6-7) or the collegiate deans (pp. 7-8).
To correct these oversights, there is sentiment to make specific provision for departmental/school bylaws with attendant review routes through the collegiate deans and the Provost and to clarify approval by those officials for departmental personnel procedures and criteria. To accomplish these objectives, I propose the following for committee consideration:

1. At the conclusion of the last full paragraph on page 38 following the discussion of the primacy of departmental faculty with respect to "curriculum, appointment, tenure, and promotion" add the following:

Departmental/school bylaws shall be established by majority faculty vote in each academic unit with attention to internal governance procedures. Such bylaws will be reviewed by the collegiate dean and the Provost.

2. Assuming the acceptance of the specific provision for departmental bylaws, then the roster of the collegiate dean's duties needs to be amended as follows on page 8, line 6:

review departmental/school bylaws and approve departmental peer evaluation processes and personnel criteria forwarding them to the Provost;

3. Concurrently, the roster of duties for the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost would be expanded to include the following (page 7, paragraph 2, line 3):

reviews departmental/school bylaws and approves departmental peer evaluation processes and personnel criteria forwarded by the collegiate deans;

In this fashion a formulation requirement and review process would be built into an amended Faculty Manual giving this basic instrument of faculty governance the prominence which departmental/school bylaws properly deserves. It would also serve to clarify that deans and provosts "review" bylaws but "approve" personnel practices and criteria. If there is any additional assistance which I may provide with respect to this issue, please call upon my services.

c.c.: Vice President and Provost Steffen H. Rogers
1997-98 Policy Committee Members
Mesdames Betty M. Moore and Cathy T. Sturkie
RESOLUTION TO PROVIDE FUNDS FOR THE LIBRARY
FS97-10-1 P

Whereas, The Clemson University Libraries are in a crisis situation from a lack of funding which has occurred over a number of years; and

Whereas, There are less funds available in 1997-98 than in the previous years; and

Whereas, The Faculty Senate has been allocated fifty thousand ($50,000) dollars from Carolina Panthers revenue;

Resolved, That the Faculty Senate donates twenty-five thousand ($25,000) dollars of their Panther funds to the Clemson University Libraries for the acquisition of books and periodicals. The exact method of disbursement of these funds shall be negotiated by the Faculty Senate President or his representative, and the Dean of the Libraries.

This resolution was passed unanimously by the Faculty Senate on October 14, 1997.
The Faculty Senate Research Committee discussed:

1) information on Sponsored Programs Activity at Clemson University. FY 97. This information was provided to Senator Pivorun and other members of the Research Council by Dr. Shah. The highlights page and a pie chart of breakdown of federal grant sources is provided on the next page. Federal grants make up 77% of the grant monies acquired by Clemson faculty and staff. This information is available through Senator Pivorun or other members of the Research Council.

2) the main or strategic issues affecting research/scholarship growth at Clemson University. These issues were identified BY THE FACULTY. These strategic issues are currently being discussed by the Research Council. The final deliberations and document should be completed by the end of November. After the main issues are identified, faculty input for solutions or “fixes” will be sought through the Research Council. The following represents the broad categories being discussed:

a) Research Investment Funding
b) Recognition and Rewards for Faculty

3) Marketing Clemson’s Research Program (locally and nationally)

D) Facilitation of Interdisciplinary Efforts
v) Enhancement of the University Capabilities for Research Competitiveness

The Research Committee will be provided with 2 very important documents for discussion at our next meeting:

a) the revised Policy on Research Ethics that is required by NIH
b) the Clemson University Policy on Research Data Access and Retention

Both of these documents are in draft stage and were presented to me October 10, 1997 for overview by Dr. Steve Chapman, Office of University Research (Senior Contract Advisor). I stated both documents need to be reviewed by the Research Committee and it was so agreed.
Clemson University

Highlights of Sponsored Programs Activity

FY 97

- Clemson University submitted 1,108 competitive proposals in FY 97 — compared to 919 for the previous fiscal year.

- Clemson University was awarded $54.4M in FY 97 — compared to $43.1M in FY 96

- The number of Clemson University faculty involved in proposal submissions was 553 of a possible 1,066 or 51.88 percent

  - The College of Agriculture, Forestry, and Life Sciences faculty participation level was the highest with 87.28% of their faculty participating in proposal submission. The average award for the principal investigators receiving FY 97 awards in this college was $74,352.

  - The College of Engineering and Sciences followed closely with 75.44% of their faculty submitting proposals in a Principal Investigator or Co-Lead Investigator role. The average award for Engineering and Sciences principal investigators receiving FY 97 awards was $200,460.

  - The College of Engineering and Sciences received eight awards over $500,000 and a total of $31.5M awarded dollars in Fiscal Year 97. The College of Agriculture, Forestry & Life Sciences received three awards over $500,000 and a total of $13.7M awards in FY 97.

- Based on a faculty headcount of 1,066 — awarded dollars equaled $51,034 generated per Clemson University faculty member.

- There were 396 principal investigators receiving awards in FY 97 and their average award was $137,378

- Federal funding sources accounted for 77% of the total dollars awarded to Clemson in FY 97 with the Department of Energy (DOE) being the highest grantor by contributing 22% of the federal dollars awarded to Clemson.
FY 97

Breakdown of Federal (77%)

OTHER includes, for example: DLA, FAA, NSA, and Veteran's Administration
The Scholastic Policies Committee met with Provost Rogers on September 23 to discuss our proposal for teaching evaluation. He was supportive of our proposed categories and suggested that the committee contact student government officers who may be working on teaching evaluation. He requested that we include our proposal with the report from the committee chaired by Raj Singh.

Proposed categories for teaching evaluation: (1 through 4 would be required, additional criteria as appropriate to specific disciplines).

1. **Teaching philosophy.** Each faculty member should write a statement of their teaching philosophy to be included in tenure/promotion packet.

2. **Evaluation of course materials, learning objectives, and exams.** Criteria for determining the appropriateness of such materials need to be developed.

3. **In-class visitation.** We suggest a requirement for in-class visitation by faculty peers (may include chairs, school directors, deans, etc) as part of the peer-evaluation process. Written recommendations should be based on at least two (??)visits to the same class. Broad guidelines for peer evaluation by other faculty need to be developed.

4. **Student evaluation forms.** We suggest revision of current form and development of a two-part form. One part devoted to teaching improvement and absolutely for the use of the faculty member. The other part devoted to teaching effectiveness and to be forwarded as part of tenure/promotion/annual evaluation process. Faculty with expertise in formulating questions and survey analysis will be consulted to participate in development of these forms.

5. **Additional criteria.** Exit interviews where appropriate may be used to determine the effectiveness and value of individual faculty as part of the overall education process. Post-graduation interviews or questionnaires may be used in a similar way. Course development, writing textbooks, membership on national teaching committees and other criteria relevant to specific disciplines should be included in the overall evaluation package.
UNIVERSITY MARSHAL RECOMMENDATION

1) The rotation cycle will begin with the College of Agriculture, Forestry, & Life Sciences and travel alphabetically through the academic colleges to include the Clemson University Libraries.

2) The faculty member selected for the honor as University Marshal will serve in this capacity for one (1) year.

Passed by the Faculty Senate on October 14, 1997.
1. **Call to Order.** President Francis A. McGuire called the meeting to order at 2:39 p.m.

2. **Approval of Minutes.** The Faculty Senate Minutes of October 14, 1997 were approved as corrected.

3. **Special Order of the Day - Bill D'Andrea, Director of the Student Athlete Enrichment Program, shared information about programs for student athletes which assist with the development of skills in order for these students to be successful. The Life Skills Program was described as one that addresses academics, athletics, personal growth, careers and community service. Mr. D'Andrea noted progress in academics by citing an increase in the number of students accepted to the honor roll and a higher grade point average and encouraged faculty to offer their expertise to these students. Mr. D'Andrea informed the Senate that his position now reports to the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost upon the recommendation of the NCAA Certification Committee in order to bridge athletics and academics.**

4. **Class of '39 Award for Excellence - President McGuire appointed Kathy Neal Headley to count ballots for this Award with the Provost or his designee. The election of the 1997 Class of '39 Award for Excellence was held by secret ballot and ballots were collected.**

5. **“Free Speech”**
   a. Jens Holley thanked the Faculty Senate for its generous donation of $25,000 to the Library and offered pre-release information on how the Libraries plan to spend this money by purchasing the Carl UnCover system, a web-based current index and table of contents listing of approximately 17,000 journals in all disciplines. Mr. Holley explained the system noting that it will help provide the Clemson community with the information it needs when it is needed.
   b. David Bargatze, Director of Student Services for Student Government, expressed student sentiments regarding the vision and mission statements and implementing concepts recently approved and endorsed by the Board of Trustees.

6. **Committee Reports**
   a. **Committee Reports**

      **Research Committee.** The November, 1997 Research Committee Report was submitted by Ed Pivorun, Chair, and discussed (Attachment A). Senator Pivorun requested that input on the strategic issues be forwarded to him.

      **Scholastic Policies Committee.** Senator Nancy Ferguson submitted this Committee’s Report (Attachment B).
Welfare Committee. No report.

Finance Committee. Senator Robert Campbell announced that the next meeting of this Committee will be at 3:30 p.m., November 18, in 414 Brackett Hall and that items under consideration are the analysis of program level contributions and information regarding PSA funding. Senator Jack Peck noted that he serves on a committee to look at software in anticipation of the present dire software situation on campus which will fall apart in the year 2000. President McGuire appointed a Faculty Senate Select Committee, chaired by Senator Peck, to assist the University committee in this pursuit.

Policy Committee. This Committee’s Report dated October 30, 1997 (Attachment C) was presented by Senator John Huffman who also noted that draft policies regarding academic misconduct of former students and the revocation of degrees were also considered by the Policy Committee which will be presented to the Senate under New Business for approval.

b. University Commissions and Committees

1) Senator John Warner informed the Senate that the draft report from the Annual Review Committee has been forwarded to the Provost which will be revised and will then be forwarded to the Policy Committee for further consideration.

2) Parking Advisory Committee - Senator Ted Taylor noted that he will soon submit a petition calling for the elimination of parking fees and referred to his Committee Report (Attachment D).

3) University Assessment Committee - Senator Melanie Cooper submitted and explained her Report dated November 4, 1997 (Attachment E) noting, in particular, possibilities for the upcoming SACS visit in 2002.

4) Computer Advisory Committee - Senator Peck provided an update on the computer status on campus (Attachment F).

5) Recreation Advisory Committee - Senator Subhash Anand submitted the Committee Report and noted the expansion of the family definition to include grandchildren and the increase of the spouse fee to one hundred dollars (Attachment G).

6) Mission/Vision Statements and Implementing Concepts Committee - Faculty Senate Vice President/President-Elect Pat Smart stated that at the request of the Board of Trustees this Committee is preparing a resolution and revisions to the approved statements and endorsed concepts which will be presented to the Senate in December. Information has been gathered from the faculty at large. Concepts of focus include numbers 2, 5, and 12.

7. President’s Report

a. President McGuire noted that there had been public criticism of the Provost and stated that communication between the Provost and the Faculty Senate was very good further noting that everything the Senate has asked of the Provost, he has done. President McGuire stated that the Provost is always truthful and encouraged the Senators that if they agree,
to express these sentiments to the media. President McGuire stated that the Provost has been an advocate and supporter of much of what the Senate has done, and that if he does not agree, an explanation is always provided.

b. President McGuire explained the history of the Intra University Transfer Policy first brought to the Academic Council (on which each college is represented) where lively discussion was held. The proposed policy was then brought a second time to the Academic Council where discussion continued; then brought to the Admissions and Continuing Enrollment Committee; then back to the Academic Council two weeks ago, where it was passed. This was an open document for review and college representatives could have brought it to the attention of faculty within individual colleges. President McGuire stated that if Senators have concerns about considerations by the Academic Council, they should find out who their college representatives are and consult with those persons.

c. Faculty Senate websites are up and running.

d. January 12th has been scheduled for the reception hosted by the Faculty Senate to honor and celebrate the members of the Class of ’39 for all they do for faculty and the Faculty Senate.

8. Old Business (None)

9. New Business

a. On behalf of the Policy Committee, Senator Huffman submitted the Resolution to Celebrate and Honor the Clemson University Class of ’39. Vote was taken and resolution passed unanimously (Attachment H) (FS97-11-1 P).

b. Senator Huffman presented the University Graduate Council change to the Faculty Manual. Vote to accept was taken and passed (Attachment I).

c. Senator Huffman submitted and explained the subject of “composed” for adoption by the Senate which would require a Faculty Manual change. Following a friendly amendment which was accepted, vote was taken and passed unanimously (Attachment J).

d. Senator Huffman moved for consideration the Policy on Academic Misconduct for Former Students and the Policy and Procedure on Revocation of Academic Degrees which need two-thirds vote to bring to floor for consideration by the Senate. Senator Huffman noted that these changes were submitted by the Clemson University Legal Counsel for consideration by the Faculty Senate. Motion was seconded and vote to consider was taken and passed. Senator Huffman then explained each change which was discussed. Vote on each individual change was taken. Following full discussion by the Senate, vote to accept both policies in their entirety was taken and passed (Attachment K).

e. Senator Deeken heighened the awareness of the Senate that Boston University has filed suit against at least two companies regarding academic misconduct and that at least in Massachusetts, there may be a ruling that such things are detrimental to universities.
f. The Provost announced that attempts are being made to track down all of the Board of Trustees policies and put together a Board of Trustees policy manual on University-wide policies.

g. President McGuire asked Senators to have faculty contact him if they do not believe this Faculty Senate is being responsive to them.

8. **Adjournment**  President McGuire adjourned the meeting at 5:02 p.m.

[Signatures]

Absent: J. Christenbury, H. Skipper, R. Sutton, H. Wheeler, M. Jacobi, R. Singh
FACULTY SENATE RESEARCH COMMITTEE REPORT
November 1997

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

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:

1) The revised document: POLICY ON RESEARCH ETHICS

2) The new document: Clemson University RESEARCH DATA ACCESS & RETENTION POLICY (draft 9/22/97)

Both of these documents were approved by the Research Committee members present. No negative comments were forwarded to the chair by Committee members not present.

These two documents will be forwarded to Dr. Huffman, Chair of the Policy Committee.

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. The Research Council will seek input from the Faculty regarding these issues. The Research Council will make recommendations to the Provost and President regarding Faculty Incentives, The Enhancement of Clemson's Research Capabilities, and Implementation through Facilitation of New Ideas and Interdisciplinary Efforts.

The Research Committee also discussed:

1) 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.

2) The needs to educate the public about the research efforts at the University. This would further support the Research Culture of the University. There seems to be a paucity of stories highlighting the research efforts at the University in Inside Clemson. There needs to be a greater effort on the part of the University News Services in highlighting research efforts at the University and to get this information into the local and State papers.

3) The need to provide a mentoring policy to help new faculty and those that have had problems in promotion decisions.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Provost Steffen Rogers
Dean Jim Barker
Dean Harold Cheatham
Dean Tom Keinath
Dean Jerry Trapnell
Dean Bill Wehrenberg

FROM: Y.T. Shah
Chief Research Officer

DATE: November 6, 1997

SUBJECT: University Research Council Update

On November 5, 1997, the University Research Council met and decided to work on solutions for the attached six issues that will help growth of scholarship and research at Clemson University. These issues can be divided into three parts: Faculty Incentives, Enhancing Clemson's Research Capabilities, and Growth through Facilitation of New Ideas and Interdisciplinary Efforts. The subcommittee chairs for these three areas are:

Steve Davis (Faculty Incentives)
Chris Prziurembel (Enhancing Clemson's Research Capabilities)
Ed Pivorun (Growth through Facilitation of New Ideas and Interdisciplinary Efforts)

These issues will be put forth to the Faculty Senate.

In the coming months, the subcommittees will develop some suggestions towards these issues. If you have any comments, I will be happy to pass them on to the faculty committee.

:mc

Attachment

xc: Faculty Senate
    Steve Davis
    Ed Pivorun
    Chris Prziurembel
STRATEGIC ISSUES AFFECTING RESEARCH/SCHOLARSHIP GROWTH AT CLEMSON UNIVERSITY

Faculty Incentives

➢ Rewards for research/scholarship accomplishments
➢ Research/scholarship as an integral and equitable part of faculty workload

Enhancing Clemson's Research Capabilities

➢ Maintenance and growth of centralized research support facilities
  • Animal facility
  • Library
  • Computing
  • Health & Safety
  • Space
➢ Procurement and maintenance of major research equipment

Growth through Facilitation of New Ideas & Interdisciplinary Efforts

➢ Facilitation and reward mechanisms for interdisciplinary research efforts
➢ Seed money for new ideas
Scholastic Policies Committee Report

The committee is working on a resolution regarding faculty attendance at graduation and recommends that the Academic Ceremony Committee explore ways to improve the graduation ceremony.

Report from Admissions and Continuing Enrollment Committee
Attended by Nancy Ferguson

Slight adjustments were made in the admission requirements for some Colleges. These will be published elsewhere. A revised version of the Intra-University Transfer Policy will be sent back to the Academic Council for its consideration.

The revised version states:

Any undergraduate student who meets the Continuing Enrollment Policy, who is allowed to continue by virtue of a semester 2.2 GPR on 12 earned credits, or who is allowed to continue through appeals to the Continuing Enrollment Appeals Committee (or by other authorization of this committee) may transfer from one major to another at will. Any college or department which seeks an exception to this policy must have the approval of the Collegiate Dean and the Provost.

The Scholastic Policies Committee is concerned that this policy will allow large numbers of transfers into highly desirable departments that may lack resources for these students. We recommend that the situation be monitored to make sure such transfers do not cause problems for some departments.
Report from the Policy Committee

October 30, 1997

The Policy Committee met on October 23. In the absence of Chairman John Huffman, JoAnne Deeken presided. The following matters were discussed, and the indicated actions were taken.

1. The University of Rhode Island policy for evaluation of administrators was discussed, and the Committee decided to endorse this procedure. The policy has been given to Bob Waller to prepare a draft in Faculty Manual language. A revised evaluation form will be reviewed by individuals expert in conducting surveys.

2. Resolutions from 1996-97 rejected by Provost: These were discussed, and for the most part the Committee felt that we should simply keep a watchful eye on the administration. An exception was resolution FS97-2-1 which was to implement FS96-4-1, dealing with the development of a program for faculty compensation.

3. Graduate council: The draft proposal circulated at the October Senate meeting was approved, and will be presented at the November Senate meeting.

4. Meaning of the word "composed" for faculty search committees. A faculty manual revision was drafted indicating that individuals other than regular faculty may serve on these committees, provided that this is incorporated into the department's by-laws.

5. Faculty Manual Violations: Since these were a personnel matter, the committee went into executive session. A letter from the Committee Chair to the Senate President has been drafted.

6. Letter honoring the Class of '39 for the award: A draft of this letter was circulated to the Committee by e-mail, and approved. It will be submitted to the senate for approval at the November meeting.

The Policy Committee meets at 3:30 P.M. on (usually) the third Tuesday of each month. Our next meeting will be Tuesday, November 18th.
Parking Advisory Committee Report

Introductory Comments

This committee has no real power. It serves only an advisory capacity. This year the members of the committee are:

- Mr. Gary Campbell, Assoc Director, Student Housing
- Mr. Joe Granger, Parking Services
- Mr. Michael Hunnicutt, Parking Services
- Mr. Les Jones, Athletic Department
- Mr. Gerald VanderMey, Planning Office
- Ms. Kathleen Wueste, Planning Office
- Ms. Debi Culler, Municipal Court Judge
- Heather Graham, Student Government
- Elmer Gray, Classified Staff
- David Hamilton, Graduate Student Government
- Fran McGuire, Faculty
- T. D. Taylor, Faculty

It is worth noting that of the 12 members on this advisory committee, only the lower 5 of the 12 represent purchasers of parking facilities. This is analogous to having the majority of the Faculty Senate composed of Administrators.

The majority of the committee, in this representative’s opinion, is concerned with maintaining things as they are. When asked about the scarcity of parking spots on campus a typical response will include the fact that there is plenty of parking for faculty near the fire station on perimeter road. When asked about the cost of parking for faculty and staff, the response is to compare us to our peer institutions.

The September 4 Meeting

This was the first meeting of the Fall Semester. The main focus at this meeting was to introduce ourselves to other members and to be oriented to the permanent members of the committee: those from the planning office, police department, parking services and housing. The minutes of that meeting are included in this report. At this meeting, the subject of parking fees was brought up. In response to this, a survey of our institutions was initiated. The results were collected and are included in this report. Your representative mentioned that the parking fees are paid with monies after individual income tax had been paid. He also stated that many academic institutions and many manufacturers had no parking fees.

The committee also unanimously recommended that the fine for handicap parking violations on campus be raised from $100.00 to $200.00. This fine now conforms to the state fine for the same violation. Guest parking proposals were presented and are included here. No action was taken on these proposals so that members would have time to study the recommendations.
The October 2, Meeting

The Agenda for this meeting is included with this report. Originally, there were only 3 items on the agenda. Your representative asked that the item of parking fees be added. The agenda was then rearranged and Joe Granger was the only person to speak at the meeting. He made a presentation that included a biased presentation on what other Universities charge for parking. Significantly, Clemson was among the highest.

The following points were brought out:

- Expenditures:
  - Transit operations 10%
  - Administration 36%
  - Salaries 57%
  - Data Services 27%
  - Travel 0.5%
  - General & Administrative Charges 6%
  - Office Maintenance 2%
  - Permit Sales 6%
  - Maintenance 15%
  - Construction 5%
  - Enforcement 27%

- The sale of permits yields approximately $726,000 per year.
- Fines yield another $700,000.
- The percentage amount of revenue from the sale of permits is:
  - Employees 24%
  - Students 75%
  - Vendors 1%
  - The ratio for numbers of permits is approximately the same

- The parking department retains the money from permit sales. Mr. Granger stressed that this was extremely important. He fears that if the money for his operation were to come from the University, the amount of funds would decrease. This would, in turn, result in a lower level of service to the University Community.

- While it was admitted that there were no parking fees at the University of South Carolina, it was claimed that there were no lots maintained by USC and that all employees and faculty were required to park in metered zones.

- Parking is an auxiliary service and must be self-sustaining.
- Parking lots must conform to the Campus Master Plan: i.e. major buildings should be close together and that traffic should be minimized in the central campus area to increase the safety of that area.
Summary

It's going to be a challenge to convince this committee to change directions. Most members are committed to keeping major items and methods of operation as they are. Rules and guidelines are to be followed and not challenged. While this maintains stability, it also inhibits improvement. Your faculty representative is not convinced that we must have parking fees:

- Many if not most organizations furnish free parking to their employees, unless they are situated in a downtown area.
- Organizations simply absorb this expense as an operating expense, decreases the profit or the salaries that the organization can pay. *It should be stressed, however, that parking money obtained in this manner is money that is deducted before the employee pays income tax on it.*
- It has been argued that the present parking fee structure that is based on income is illegal and amounts to an income tax. ... only states, municipalities, etc. may levy such a tax.

Action Items:

⇒ The faculty at this point should examine the Guest Parking Proposal also included with this report. The changes contained in these proposals could affect where faculty will be allowed to park.

⇒ The faculty senate, together with the Classified Employees should consider circulating a petition requesting that the University abolish parking fees.

[Signature]

Theodore D. Taylor
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Faculty/Staff (Note 3)</th>
<th>Resident (Note 1)</th>
<th>Commuter (Note 1)</th>
<th>Vendor (Note 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auburn, CA</td>
<td>$15/$20</td>
<td>$421</td>
<td>$30</td>
<td>$30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi State</td>
<td>$200/$300</td>
<td>$88</td>
<td>$30</td>
<td>$30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Tech</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$30</td>
<td>$40</td>
<td>$40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$72</td>
<td>$40</td>
<td>$40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>$30</td>
<td>$30</td>
<td>$40</td>
<td>$40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>$30</td>
<td>$30</td>
<td>$40</td>
<td>$40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Veh Rates: $3/hr, Meters: $0.75/hr, $5/day)

(Note 1) Non-exempt emp & GTA's and GRA's
(Note 2) "Permanent Visitors" $15 Semester (wives/husbands, boyfriend/girlfriend etc.)
(Note 3) Faculty/Staff based on salary range
The University Assessment Committee is an advisory committee to the Provost. Two topics were discussed at this meeting:

1. Assessment of General Education Outcomes.

The Provost has asked for recommendations on how to assess the outcomes of General Education. In 1990 a Nationally normed standardized assessment instrument was administered to randomly picked freshman and junior students (900 total). In general Clemson students scored at or above the national average in most areas. Upper level students also showed increased skills as compared to Freshmen. This instrument gave a baseline reading for general education and we now need to decide how to assess general education skills. A sub committee will be formed which will consider the options available and their pros and cons, for example:

A national standardized instrument could be administered, but may not result in the kind of feedback that would result in improvements being made.

Questions could be embedded in general education courses, but this would require the consent of the instructors.

The committee will prepare a list of options for the Provost.

2. The Upcoming SACS Self Study and Visit in 2002.

There are two possibilities for the SACS visit:

A normal self study as was performed for the last accreditation visit.

An alternative self study, that would require an agreement with SACS at least three years prior to the visit so that plans could be made.

In either case the University must begin to prepare itself for the procedure. The committee will recommend that assessment procedures should be in place by the end of the Spring semester 1998.

In general assessment plans should include:

1. The goals of the program (which should focus on the outcomes expected)
2. The procedures used to evaluate the goals
3. An evaluation of whether the goals are being met.
4. The use of the results from evaluation to improve the program.
Computer Advisory Committee Report
10-2-97

1. Approximately $1,200,000 was collected through Student Technology fees. The money was disbursed as follows:

$550,000 for DCIT specific projects
- 172 machines replaced (apx 50% of PCs on campus)
- All machines upgraded to Windows 95
- All MS Office products upgraded to current release
- Language labs upgraded
- Music labs upgraded
- Intelligent classroom project started (31 planned)
  - McAdams will be first (10/15/97)
  - PC will be the primary machine
  - Some MACs will be available when needed
- No unit on campus has responsibility for classroom maint.
  - This will be a problem for Intelligent Classrooms

$100,000 used for 3 consulting positions for student help

$70,000 for campus-wide Novell network license

$150,000 Collaborative Learning Initiative
  $50,000 Faculty training
  $50,000 Training staff
  $50,000 Faculty incentive grants for lab projects (must include matching from department)

$50,000 Library databases

$280,000 Institutional administrative projects to benefit students
  - Imaging project to improve record keeping and admiss. for GS
  - Upgrade library’s online system to a client/server platform

2. High performance computing

- Expensive and has small number of users but is critical to these users.

- DCIT generated funds through royalties on software developed and marketed.
  - Royalties deposited in the CU Research Foundation
  - Some problems getting access to money due to TIWET problems
  - Future revenues reserved to bail-out TIWET if required
- Three HP supercomputers purchased
  - R&D machine
  - Teaching machine for faculty and students
  - Upgrade to the campus mail server

3. About 50% of DCIT's operations are now funded by outside income (approximately $2,000,000 per year).

4. One time funding ($500,000/year) is being used to maintain the campus network, although the expenses are recurring expenses.
The Recreation Advisory Committee held a meeting on Tuesday, Sept. 16, 1997 in Holmes Meeting Rooms A & B at 2:30 PM. Those present were Dr. Jim Pope, Dr. Kirk Brague, Mr. Bob Brookover, Ms. Jenny Kafsky, Mr. Jason Rice, Dr. Subhash Anand, Dr. Larry Gahan, Mr. George Smith, Ms. Adrienne Qerus, Ms. Sonya Goodman, Mr. Steve Perry, Mr. Josh Reed, Ms. Lauren Rounsville, and Ms. Suzanne Rook. The following items were discussed:

- Opening remarks and introductions were made by Dr. Kirk Brague. Dr. Jim Pope explained the purpose of the committee and a sheet listing the make-up of the committee was issued to each person present. This is an advisory committee that can put forth recommendations to the Vice President for Student Affairs. The Vice President does listen to these recommendations very carefully.

- Past history of committee was discussed. The committee was originally formed when Fike Recreation Center was opened over twenty years ago. The committee includes representation from all areas across campus and has addressed fees and charges, use of facilities, rules and regulations, etc. The Department of Campus Recreation is responsible for recreational programs and facility management. The department interfaces with many groups on campus including the Athletic Department and PRTM. Campus Recreation employs six full-time staff members and hundreds of student workers.

- Election of committee chair was held. Dr. Jim Pope had asked Dr. Brague if he was interested in continuing this post and he was agreeable to this. A motion was made by Ms. Sonya Goodman to re-elect Dr. Brague with Steve Perry seconding the motion. Dr. Kirk Brague was elected committee chair for another year.

- There was discussion of a proposal to offer a “grandparent/grandchild” membership in which the grandparent or grandchild of an active member could purchase their own membership that would provide the same privileges as those of a “family membership.” A family membership includes anyone presently living in the household of an active member. There are currently only two types of open memberships offered to the community: a) through the Wellness Program with availability limited to 200 memberships at a fee of $300/yr. per individual and b) through Alumni Services with availability limited to 200 memberships and a fee of $170/yr. per individual. The grandparent/grandchild membership would not impact the attendance numbers for high-usage time. The same rules, regulations and hours of use for family membership would apply along with the same rates of $12.50/semester. Dr. Anand made a motion to pass this new type of membership and Dr. Gahan seconded. The motion was passed and will be implemented for the spring semester.

- A review of the facilities and programs was presented by Dr. Pope. Campus Recreation is in dire need of capital improvements. The programs are big but
suffering a little this year. They have not been able to hire as many students to referee as they would like and have had to cut back on the frequency of several programs from twice a year to once a year. Budget needs have significantly increased for both facilities and programming areas. We are one of the few schools that do not charge a fee for programming and intramural activities. The Vice President for Student Affairs and Dean of Student Life are well aware of these needs and are active in pursuing avenues to address these problems. There has been discussion about a student recreational fee. Some time was spent over the summer looking at several peer institutions in the South to compare and research their recreational facilities. Clemson is the only university without a mandatory recreational fee.

• Several funding changes were discussed. Dr. Pope proposed that the building rental fee be increased by 29% with the $25.00/hr fee going up to $35.00/hr. The student-use group rates would not be changed. Only non-student group rentals would be affected. It was also suggested that the Conference and Guest Services charge (presently $.40 per person per day for usage of facility) be increased to $1.00 which would bring it in line with the guest fee for all other members. Motion was made by Dr. Anand to approve both of these fee increases and Joshua Reed seconded the motion. The motion passed and the fee increases will be implemented July 1, 1998.

• There was discussion regarding the spouse fee and the summer session fee for students. It was proposed that the spouse fee be increased to $100/yr. to bring it in line with staff membership fees. This would primarily impact the employee base. It was also suggested that the summer session fee for students (presently $10/per session) be increased to $15/session to bring it in line with the employee fee. A motion was made by George Smith to approve both of these fee increases. Dr. Gahan seconded and the motion passed.

• There was discussion of rates for graduate assistants and part-time students. It was suggested that these fees be brought in line with the employee fees. This issue will be brought up at a later date when GA representatives are present for the discussion.

• Dr. Brague inquired about plans for expansion of the fields. Dr. Pope stated that there were no plans for this in the near future but would hope to expand toward Lightsey Bridge area whenever possible.

• Dr. Anand inquired about the maintenance of the tennis facilities. In the past maintenance responsibilities have been shared by Campus Recreation and the Athletic Department. Daily maintenance will be provided by the Athletic Department for their areas only.

With no other items up for discussion, the meeting was adjourned at 4:00 PM.

Minutes recorded by Karen Addis
Approved
RESOLUTION TO HONOR THE

CLEMSON UNIVERSITY

CLASS OF '39

FS97-11-1 P

Whereas, The Class of '39 established the Class of 1939 Award for Excellence "to inspire the greatest possible level of achievement by members of the faculty of Clemson University;" and

Whereas, The Award for Excellence is presented annually to one distinguished member of the faculty whose outstanding contributions have been judged by peers to represent the highest achievement of service to the University, the Student Body, and the larger community; and

Whereas, Faculty who have received this distinction become members of the Class of '39; and

Whereas, The members of the Class of '39 have bestowed the privilege of the Award facilitation to the Faculty Senate; and

Whereas, The Class of '39 respects and believes in the importance of faculty and its impact on students and the future of Clemson University;

Resolved, That the Faculty Senate does hereby honor and celebrate the members of the Great Class of '39 for its trust and confidence in and recognition of the faculty of Clemson University.

Passed unanimously by the Faculty Senate on November 11, 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: Establishment of a University Graduate Council

In order to coordinate all of the policy considerations which affect graduate education, it is proposed that a University Graduate Council be formed to assist in the direction of graduate education on this campus.

To effect such a request, it is proposed that the Faculty Manual be amended on page 41 of the August 1997 version by adding the following to the committees reporting to the Academic Council:

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

   The membership of the University Graduate Council consists of all the elected members of the following committees: Graduate Advisory, Graduate Curriculum, Graduate Admissions and Continuing Enrollment Appeals, Graduate Fellowships and Awards, and Graduate Student Academic Grievances. Ex-officio (non-voting) members include: Dean and Associate Deans of the Graduate School, Chief Research Officer and Senior Vice Provost for Research and Graduate Studies, and a representative of the Faculty Senate appointed by that body's President.

   The dean of the Graduate School shall convene the Council for the purpose of electing a Chair with a two-year term from among the voting membership. The Council will meet at least three times each academic year. A special meeting can be called by the Chair, by the Graduate Dean, or by request of a third of the Council members in order to manage the Council's business.

If additional particulars are needed, please call upon my services or those of Acting Graduate Dean Debra Jackson.

c.c.: Vice President and Provost Steffen H. Rogers  
Chief Research Officer Y. T. Shah  
Acting Graduate Dean Debra B. Jackson  
1997-98 Policy Committee Members  
Mesdames Betty M. Moody and Cathy T. Sturkie
To: Policy Committee Chair John W. Huffman
From: Faculty Senate President Francijsf^r McGuire
From: Robert A. Waller, Editorial Consultant for the Faculty Manual

Re: Meaning of "Composed" in the Faculty Manual

In responding to a request for an interpretation of the meaning of the word "composed" as used in the Faculty Manual in connection with the composition of departmental search and screening committees (page 21), I have approached the topic from an historical perspective and from the contextual reference.

One question to ask ourselves is how did the present phrasing come to take this form? A research into the records reveals the following. The February 1960 Manual in a paragraph devoted to "Procedures for Appointments and Promotions" notes: "In cases of original appointments it is suggested that department heads consult with the senior members of their respective departments...." (page 21). In the next major revision to the Manual the latitude for the department head in "Procedures for Appointments and Promotions" became more restrictive in that the Head "will appoint a faculty advisory committee to include minority representation when appropriate to assist him in reviewing the qualifications of departmental personnel...." (August 1976, page 48). The present language is reflected in the next major revision of the Manual in 1982 (page II:11) and the five amendments during the 1980s. The same phrasing occurs in the 1991 and 1996 revisions. This appears to represent how we got to this point with a role for the faculty and others as provided in bylaws OR, in the absence of any other provision, for the role of a faculty Advisory Committee.

Another way to examine the question relates to the larger context in which this provision for faculty involvement occurs. We ask: what stipulation is made elsewhere in academic circles for the composition of a search committee. In the selection of the University President special provision is made for first a screening committee of eleven members (of which one is elected from among the professors) and then a selection committee which includes the President of the Faculty Senate (page 9). In the case of "any other academic administrative position" there is provision for a faculty committee augmented "with student and staff representation when appropriate" (pages 9-10). In the case of a
department chair the directions are even more explicit requiring "at least one student" and with the dean's role limited to appointing a minority of the committee (page 10). For a dean of a college or library, the conditions are explicit by referencing a membership consisting of "at least one student, at least one department chair (or equivalent) from within the college, and either an off-campus representative of an appropriate profession or a dean from another college within the University" (page 10). In the instance of the Provost the relevant paragraph requires the membership to include "at least one graduate student and one undergraduate student" (page 11). Later in the Manual in the discussion of recruiting endowed chairs there is the condition that there "must be representation on the search-and-screening committee from a college(s) other than the one(s) to which the chair or titled professorship is assigned" (page 18). The point of this analysis is to demonstrate that the Faculty Manual always makes provision for search committee membership if other than faculty members are to be included.

Thus, I conclude that the intent of the present Manual language is to restrict membership of departmental search and screening committees exclusively to departmental faculty members UNLESS there is specific provision otherwise in the department's bylaws. Thus, a department in its bylaw provisions could include among the committee membership a place for students (either undergraduate or graduate), for classified staff, and/or for a representative outside the department but from within the academic community or from the larger professional arena.

In order to correct any ambiguities, it is proposed that the August 1997 Faculty Manual be amended to read as follows on page 21 (new language underscored):

Candidates for appointment to the regular faculty shall be recruited and evaluated by a search-and-screening committee composed of the regular faculty and others as specified in departmental bylaws. Such committees are selected in accordance with departmental bylaws or, in the absence of relevant bylaws, by the departmental faculty Advisory Committee.

I hope that this summary, conclusion, and recommendation are responsive to the request for assistance in determining that parameter of the Manual's requirement that the membership of faculty appointment committees be "composed" of regular faculty members unless otherwise provided.

c.c.: Academic Vice President and Provost Steffen H. Rogers
Mesdames Betty M. Moore and Cathy T. Sturkie
Policy on Academic Misconduct for Former Students

It is possible that an act of academic misconduct will remain undiscovered until after a degree is awarded. In such a case, Clemson University reserves the right to revoke any degree based on new revelations about scholarly issues including, but not restricted to, admission credentials, all forms of course work, research, theses, dissertations, or other final projects.

I. Submission of Fraudulent Admissions Credentials

The submission of fraudulent admissions credentials in the student's application or any other documents submitted for admission to Clemson University may result in initiation of action under the Policy and Procedure on Revocation of Academic Degrees.

II. Academic Dishonesty In Course Work

A. In the event that the act is alleged to have occurred within the context of a course and is consistent with the general definition of academic dishonesty presented in Sections I of the Policy on Academic Misconduct for Enrolled Students, the same procedures in that policy will apply except for academic misconduct listed in III below.

B. Graduate Students:
   If the resulting penalty is either the assignment of a grade of "D" or "F" in a required graduate course, or the issuance of any grade that causes the student not to possess a cumulative "B" average in both graduate courses and in all courses, action under the Policy and Procedures on Revocation of Academic Degrees may be initiated.

   Undergraduate Students:
   If the resulting penalty causes the student to no longer have the necessary credit hours and/or coursework for receiving a degree, action under the Policy and Procedures on Revocation of Academic Degrees may be initiated.

III. Falsification of Data and Plagiarism in Theses, Dissertations, or Other Final Projects

Data falsification, plagiarism (as defined in the Academic Misconduct Policy) and other acts of academic dishonesty in a thesis, dissertation or other final project are serious acts of misconduct. Allegations of this type of misconduct may result in initiation of action under the Policy and Procedure on Revocation of Academic Degrees.
This policy is applicable to all researchers associated with Clemson University, including faculty, students and staff. If charges are brought against non-faculty members of Clemson University, appropriate substitutions should be made for the role of the Faculty Senate officers and dean. If charges are brought against a former student that could result in the student’s degree being revoked, those charges should be processed through the University’s Policy and Procedure on Revocation of Academic Degrees rather than through this policy.
POLICY AND PROCEDURE ON REVOCATION
OF ACADEMIC DEGREES

PREAMBLE

Academic institutions have a critical responsibility to provide an environment that promotes integrity, while at the same time encouraging openness and creativity among scholars. Care must be taken to ensure that honest error and ambiguities of interpretation of scholarly activities are distinguishable from outright misconduct. This policy is applicable to fraudulent or other misconduct in obtaining an academic degree which is so egregious that a mechanism for revoking an academic degree, either graduate or undergraduate, must be undertaken. The Clemson University Board of Trustees has the sole authority to revoke any degree previously awarded.

Definitions

As used herein, the following terms shall apply:

A. When the degree holder was an undergraduate student:
   1. "Dean" shall mean the Dean of the Academic College where student was enrolled.
   2. "Committee of Investigation and Recommendation" shall be composed of the members of the standing university undergraduate Continuing Enrollment Appeals Committee. An undergraduate student will be appointed to the Committee of Investigation and Recommendation by the President of the Student Body within ten (10) calendar days of notification by the President of the Faculty Senate. Any member of the Continuing Enrollment Appeals Committee who is a faculty member in the department which awarded the degree involved shall not be a member of the Committee of Investigation and Recommendation for that particular investigation. If there are fewer than three (3) non-disqualified faculty members, the President of the Faculty Senate shall appoint additional faculty members to bring the number of faculty committee members up to three (3). If the President of the Faculty Senate is from the same department that awarded the degree involved, the President-Elect of the Faculty Senate shall appoint the additional member.

B. When the degree holder was a graduate student:
   1. "Dean" shall mean the Dean of the Graduate School.
   2. "Committee of Investigation and Recommendation" shall be composed of the members of the standing university Graduate Admissions and Continuing Enrollment Appeals Committee, except for the Associate Dean of the
Graduate School who shall not be a member of the Committee of Investigations and Recommendation. A graduate student will be appointed to the Committee of Investigations and Recommendation by the President of Graduate Student Government within ten (10) calendar days of notification by the President of the Faculty Senate. Any member of the Graduate Admissions and Continuing Enrollment Appeals Committee who is a faculty member in the department which awarded the degree involved shall not be a member of the Committee of Investigation and Recommendation for that particular investigation. If there are fewer than three (3) non-disqualified faculty members, the President of the Faculty Senate shall appoint additional faculty members to bring the number of faculty committee members up to three (3). If the President of the Faculty Senate is from the same department that awarded the degree involved, the President-Elect of the Faculty Senate shall appoint the additional member.

Complaint

An allegation or complaint involving the possibility of misconduct can be raised by anyone. The allegation should be made in writing to the Dean.

Initial Review

The Dean will conduct the initial review to determine whether or not the allegation has merit. The Dean may discuss the matter with the former student's advisory committee (if any) and other faculty as appropriate. The Dean may also contact persons outside the university who may be able to provide factual information on the alleged misconduct or who may otherwise have expertise concerning issues involved in the alleged misconduct. If the Dean determines that the allegation has no merit, he/she will terminate the investigation. If the Dean determines that serious academic misconduct is suspected, the Dean will notify the President of the Faculty Senate in writing in a confidential manner. The Dean shall also notify the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost of the charge but will not discuss any details of the charge.

Committee of Inquiry

The President of the Faculty Senate shall, within ten (10) calendar days of receipt of the notification from the Dean, appoint three (3) faculty members to the Committee of Inquiry and notify the President of Graduate Student Government or the President of the Student Body, as appropriate, who shall appoint a graduate or undergraduate student, as appropriate, to the Committee of Inquiry within ten (10) calendar days of notification. The President of the Faculty Senate shall also notify the degree holder of the formation of a Committee of Inquiry.
If the Faculty Senate President is from the same department that awarded the degree involved, the President-Elect of the Faculty Senate shall appoint the Committee of Inquiry. The faculty members will be appointed from departments which did not award the degree involved. The Committee will elect its chairman from the faculty members on the Committee.

For each allegation, the Committee of Inquiry will review the complaint and any other information provided by the Dean and determine whether there is sufficient evidence to warrant a formal charge of academic misconduct and further investigation under this policy. While the Committee of Inquiry shall not make a recommendation as to whether a degree should be revoked, the purpose is to provide a review to separate frivolous, unjustified or mistaken allegations from those requiring a more detailed and formal investigation. The Committee of Inquiry will review the evidence and must determine that the alleged misconduct more probably than not occurred in order for the committee to recommend a formal charge and further investigation.

Within thirty (30) calendar days of the formation of the Committee of Inquiry, the Committee of Inquiry will submit a written report to the President of the Faculty Senate. If the Committee of Inquiry's report finds that the investigation should not proceed, the President of the Faculty Senate shall terminate the investigation and notify the appropriate persons. If the Committee of Inquiry's report finds that a formal charge and further investigation are warranted, the President of the Faculty Senate shall, within ten (10) calendar days of receipt of the report of the Committee of Inquiry, send a copy of that report to the Dean and to the Committee of Investigation and Recommendation. The President of the Faculty Senate shall also immediately notify the President of Graduate Student Government or President of Student Body (whichever is appropriate) that a student representative needs to be appointed to the Committee of Investigation and Recommendation. The President of the Faculty Senate shall also notify the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost of the Committee of Inquiry's recommendation. No details of the charge will be discussed. Note: A majority vote of the Committee of Inquiry is necessary to recommend that a formal charge and further investigation are warranted. A tie vote means that an investigation is terminated as stated herein.

Notification to Degree Holder

The Dean shall issue in writing, within ten (10) calendar days of receipt of the report of the Committee of Inquiry, a formal charge of academic misconduct to the degree holder. This written notice shall detail the factual allegations for the charge and the evidence supporting the charge. This written notice shall also inform the degree holder that if the charges are substantiated, the degree holder's degree could be revoked. This written notice shall also inform the degree holder of his/her right to appear at a hearing as stated in this policy. The Dean shall also send with this
notice a copy of this Policy and Procedure on Revocation of Academic Degrees to the degree holder. This notice shall be delivered to the accused in person or sent by certified mail, return receipt requested.

Committee of Investigation and Recommendation

The Committee of Investigation and Recommendation shall extend to the degree holder due process which shall, at a minimum, include the following:

1. Notice of the nature of the complaint;
2. Notice of the evidence supporting the complaint;
3. Notice of the hearing;
4. The opportunity to present evidence, including testimony;
5. The opportunity to hear the testimony against the degree holder;
6. The opportunity to ask questions of all witnesses;
7. The opportunity to have an attorney or advisor present at the hearing; however, the role of the attorney or advisor shall be solely to assist the party, and the attorney or advisor shall not be permitted to participate actively in the proceedings.

The degree holder shall not be entitled to know the identity of the person(s) who originally made the complaint unless that person agrees that his/her identity can be revealed.

The chair of the Committee of Investigation and Recommendation shall inform the degree holder of the time and date of the hearing.

The Dean or his/her designee shall present the accusation against the degree holder at the hearing and may have one additional representative present during the hearing. Under this section the term "Dean" is understood to include the Dean's designee, if such a designation is made.

The degree holder and the Dean may submit written materials to the Committee of Investigation and Recommendation prior to the hearing. The chair of the Committee of Investigation and Recommendation shall make available the materials received to the other party and to all committee members.

The hearing before the Committee of Investigation and Recommendation shall be held no sooner than thirty (30) calendar days and no later than ninety (90) calendar days after receipt of the report of the Committee of Inquiry unless the degree holder and the Dean agree to a different date. All matters pertaining to the hearing shall be kept as confidential as possible and the hearing shall be closed to the public. A verbatim record of the hearing will be taken and a type-written copy thereof transcribed and made a part of the hearing record.
The degree holder and the Dean shall be responsible for having any witnesses they wish to testify in attendance at the hearing. Witnesses will be present only while testifying.

The chair of the Committee of Investigation and Recommendation shall take whatever action is necessary during the hearing to ensure a fair, orderly, and expeditious hearing. No formal rules of evidence will be followed. If any objection is made to any evidence being offered, the decision of the majority of the committee shall govern. Irrelevant, immaterial, or unduly repetitious evidence shall be excluded.

The degree holder and the Dean shall be permitted to offer evidence and witnesses pertinent to the issues.

The Dean shall present the case against the accused first. The accused shall then present his/her response.

The chair will allow each party to ask questions of the other party and will allow each party to ask questions of the other party's witnesses at the appropriate time during the hearing as determined by the chair. Members of the committee may ask questions of any party or any witness at any time during the hearing.

Within fifteen (15) calendar days of the conclusion of the hearing, the Committee of Investigation and Recommendation shall submit a written report to the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost. The report shall contain findings and a recommendation as to whether the degree holder's degree should be revoked. The Committee of Investigation and Recommendation must find clear and convincing evidence that serious academic misconduct has been committed in order to recommend the revocation of the degree holder's degree. If the Committee of Investigation and Recommendation does not find clear and convincing evidence of serious academic misconduct, the Committee of Investigation and Recommendation cannot recommend revocation of the degree holder's degree and the matter shall be closed. Note: A majority vote of the Committee of Investigation and Recommendation is necessary to recommend the revocation of a degree holder's degree. This means that a tie vote will result in the matter being closed.

At the same time that the report is sent to the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, the chair of the Committee of Investigation and Recommendation shall send a copy of the report to the degree holder, the Dean, and other appropriate persons involved in the process.

If the Committee of Investigation and Recommendation recommends that the degree holder's degree be revoked, the chair shall also send a complete copy of the hearing record to the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost. The hearing record shall consist of the transcript of the hearing and all documents that were submitted to the committee. The chair of the Committee of Investigation and
Recommendation shall label which documents were submitted by each party when forwarding this information to the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost.

If the Committee of Investigation and Recommendation recommends that the degree holder's degree be revoked, the chair shall also send a copy of the transcript of the hearing to the degree holder and the Dean at the same time that it is sent to the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost.

Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost

If the Committee of Investigation and Recommendation recommends that the degree be revoked, the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost shall review the hearing record and the report of the Committee of Investigation and Recommendation. If the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost decides that the degree holder's degree should not be revoked, he/she shall notify the degree holder, the Dean, the Committee of Investigation and Recommendation and other appropriate persons involved in the process, in writing, within thirty-twenty-one (30) (21) calendar days of receipt of the transcript of the hearing, and the matter shall be closed. If the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost decides to recommend that the degree holder's degree should be revoked, the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost shall send that recommendation in writing to the President of the University within thirty-twenty-one (30) (21) calendar days of receipt of the transcript of the hearing. The Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost shall send to the President, along with his/her recommendation, the Committee of Investigation and Recommendation's report and the hearing record. The Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost shall send a copy of his/her recommendation to the degree holder, the Dean, the Committee of Investigation and Recommendation and other appropriate persons involved in the process.

If the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost is disqualified from reviewing the case, the Senior Vice Provost for Research and Graduate Studies and Chief Research Officer shall be substituted for the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost.

President

If the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost recommends to the President that the degree holder's degree should be revoked, the President shall transmit that recommendation along with the report of the Committee of Investigation and Recommendation and the hearing record to the Executive Secretary of the Board of Trustees within thirty (30) calendar days of receipt. If the President wishes to make a recommendation, he/she shall review the recommendation of the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, the report of the Committee of Investigation and Recommendation, and the hearing record and forward his recommendation to the Executive Secretary of the Board of Trustees within thirty (30) calendar days of receiving the recommendation of the Vice
President of Academic Affairs and Provost.

Board of Trustees

The Executive Secretary of the Board of Trustees shall send to all trustees the hearing record, the recommendation of the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, the report of the Committee of Investigation and Recommendation, and the recommendation of the President, if any. A majority vote by the Board of Trustees, at a duly constituted Board meeting, is required to revoke an academic degree. The decision of the Board of Trustees shall be final.

Guiding Principles

All actions taken by committees shall be effective by a majority vote. All investigations, hearings and actions shall be kept as confidential as possible except for notice of any revocation approved by the Board of Trustees.

A decision not to proceed at any stage of the proceedings set forth in this policy does not necessarily mean that the original complaint was groundless.

For good cause shown, at the request of either party and the approval of the other, the Vice President of Academic Affairs and Provost may extend any time limit set forth in this Policy. Good cause shall include the fact that a deadline falls during finals week or during a period such as vacations, holidays, winter sessions, or summer sessions if parties or decision makers are absent from the University. Any such time extension shall be communicated in writing to all appropriate parties.

Administrative Action If Degree is Revoked

If a degree is revoked by the Board of Trustees, the former student's transcript will be modified to reflect that the degree was revoked, and the former student will be informed of the revocation and requested to return the diploma. If the former student was enrolled in a program requiring a thesis or dissertation, all bound copies will be removed from the Clemson University Library. In addition, for doctoral students, University Microfilms, Inc. will be notified and requested to take appropriate action.

Students whose degrees have been revoked may be eligible to reapply for admission according to normal university procedures and policies in effect at the time of reapplication.
This policy is applicable to all researchers associated with Clemson University, including faculty, students and staff. If charges are brought against non-faculty members of Clemson University, appropriate substitutions should be made for the role of the Faculty Senate officers and dean. If charges are brought against a former student that could result in the student’s degree being revoked, those charges should be processed through the University’s Policy and Procedure on Revocation of Academic Degrees rather than through this policy.
Intra-University Policy

"Any undergraduate student who meets the Continuing Enrollment Policy after attempting 12 credit hours at Clemson University, (or who is allowed to continue by virtue of a semester 2.2 GPR on 12 earned credits, or who is allowed to continue through appeals to the Continuing Enrollment Appeals Committee, or by other authorization of this committee) may transfer from one major to another at will. Any college or department which seeks an exception to this policy must have the approval of the Collegiate Dean and the Provost."
The Academic Disciplinary Hearing Committee met on Thursday, 6 November 1997, to discuss an alcohol violation by fraternity. A one-semester suspension had been requested. The decision of the review board was to change the request for suspension to a two-year term of disciplinary probation. Mechthild Cranston, Faculty Senate Member

Dr. Mechthild Cranston
309 Strode Tower, Clemson University
South Carolina, 29634-1515
864-656-3048
e-mail: Cransto@Clemson.edu
The committee on alcohol issues held a meeting on Wednesday, October 15, 1997 at 10:30 AM in Room 807 of the Union. The following items were discussed:

- Thea issued a resource file to each member. Bill Purkerson issued a list of programs currently being offered.
- George informed the committee that Redfern and CAPS do not track numbers for alcohol related illnesses and cannot provide us with any statistics. Stats from David Fleming’s office show that 50% of the student population is over 21. Only about 900 of the approx. 6,500 students that live on campus are over 21.
- The CUPD has tracked 25 of the alcohol arrests that were made this semester and 21 of those were directly related to on-campus and under-age drinking. Four were related to incidents off-campus.
- All freshman orientation has information and speakers that address alcohol issues and responsible drinking. Jeanine Ward-Roof does a session at orientation and Bill Purkerson does a session through health education.
- Individual departments can give information in their particular orientation sessions to reinforce the correlation between amount of drinking and grades.
- Thea provided stats for the past five years regarding alcohol related arrests: 1992 = 89; 1993 = 152; 1994 = 270; 1995 = 213; 1996 = 169; 1997 = 896.
- This Homecoming Weekend went very well. Made 3 arrests on Bowman Field. M.J. keeps stats on community damage relative to losing or winning games. There seems to be a direct correlation to major games and winning with binge drinking. Will bring report on statistics back to committee.
- The Oconee County ER has been in contact with C.U. and emphasized that the Clemson campus has a very serious binge drinking problem along with alcohol poisoning.
- IFC and NPHC representatives will attend our next meeting. Mandy Hays has been asked to appoint these representatives.
We do need to get statistical information regarding police incidents, Oconee Hospital stats and Redfern & CAPS stats. We need to keep our focus for this committee on evaluating our programs rather than researching data.

This year 70 arrests were made from the beginning of school as opposed to last year's 14 incidents. We are seeing more women arrested but alcohol poisoning incidents are mostly male. The individual is usually dropped off or "dumped" in their room and left without care. Females seem to take care of each other and stick by the individual making sure they are okay.

George stressed that the committee must establish some parameters:

1. Alcohol beverages are a legal commodity in S.C. for persons over the age of 21. We do not want to ban alcohol on the Clemson campus.

2. Educational awareness is imperative but cannot alone significantly change established drinking habits.

3. We must provide an alternative environment and programs that are fun and interesting but not focused around drinking.

4. Define what is a drinking problem. This is difficult to define because it is more of an individual assessment. We should focus on high risk vs. low risk activity.

5. Realizing that students both under-age and over 21 are drinking, we must stress that if they choose to drink while under-age they must accept the responsibilities and possible repercussions.

Committee members were asked to look at statistical information and bring suggestions to be implemented by the task force on alcohol. Next meeting will be scheduled for the week after Thanksgiving.

Recorded by Karen Addis

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

2. **“Free Speech.”** Beth Jarrard, Director of News Services, asked for help in improvements to the news system at Clemson. An Internal Communications Survey will be distributed in January to faculty, staff, and students to determine what kind of information is desired, and what method of delivery is desired.

3. **a. Committee Reports**

   1) **Research** - Senator Ed Pivorun, Chair, submitted and explained the Committee Report (Attachment A).

   2) **Scholastic Policies** - Senator Nancy Ferguson submitted a draft of revised questions for student evaluation of teaching for review and suggestions (Attachment B). A resolution regarding this subject will be brought to the Faculty Senate in January, 1998. Much discussion was held regarding the draft questions and the exam schedule.

   3) **Welfare** - Senator John Leininger noted for the Committee that they are in the process of scheduling a meeting.

   4) **Finance** - Senator Robert Campbell stated that this Committee has made progress on the complex work regarding the PSA Budget. Their work has resulted in a better understanding of some of the budget issues. Senator Campbell also noted that access has been finally given to the University databases and that the Committee hopes to learn more about what is in them, how often they are updated, how reliable the information is, and who is responsible for updating this information.

   5) **Policy** - Senator John Huffman submitted and briefly explained the items contained within the Policy Committee Report dated December 9, 1997 (Attachment C).

b. **University Committee and Commissions**

   1) **Faculty Senate Select Annual Review Committee** - Senator Raj Singh announced that this Committee had completed the final Report which has been submitted to the Policy Committee for review and thanked Committee members for their diligent work and the Provost for his support during the tenure of this Committee.

   2) **Faculty Senate Select Committee on the Library** - Senator Elizabeth Dale submitted and discussed the Final Report from this Committee (Attachment D)
4. President's Report - President McGuire remarked on the following items:

a. a proposal was made and approved during the December Academic Council meeting not to automatically send hard copies of student grades home to parents.

b. there are six candidates for the Ombudsperson position.

c. read aloud a letter from Chalmers M. Butler, the 1997 recipient of the Class of '39 Award for Excellence thanking the Faculty Senate for this honor.

d. reminded the Senate that the Provost has granted permission for any faculty member to request to see the college budgets and asked the Provost to institutionalize this process by sending the budgets to the lead senators.

e. that the committees of the Board of Trustees will meet on January 5th and 6th and that Faculty Senate representatives are to attend each meeting. If Senate representatives are not able to attend, please send a substitute.

f. Thornton Kirby, Executive Secretary to the Board of Trustees, notified President McGuire that the Board is supportive of a formal faculty representative to the Board, hopefully, to be in place by January 30, 1998. In addition, President McGuire reported that the Board remains supportive of the Senate’s efforts regarding the implementing concepts.

5. Old Business

a. Vice President/President-Elect Pat Smart submitted a Draft of the Faculty Senate Response to the Implementing Concepts from the Faculty Senate ad hoc Committee and explained suggested changes. Discussion followed. During discussion two amendments were offered, seconded, and approved by the Faculty Senate (Attachment E). The following resolution was also drafted during discussion by Senator JoAnne Deeken:

Whereas, the Board of Trustees has asked for input on the statements and concepts; and

Whereas, the Faculty Senate, the Classified Staff Commission, the Graduate Student Government, and the Student Senate have all prepared responses to the vision/mission statements and the implementing concepts;

Resolved, that the Faculty Senate encourages the Board of Trustees to meet with representatives of all four (4) constituent groups to discuss their respective responses; and

Further resolved, that the Faculty Senate encourages the Board of Trustees to consider carefully all input that they have received.

Resolution was seconded. Vote to accept resolution was taken and passed unanimously (FS97-12-1 P).
6. **New Business**  
   a. President McGuire reminded the Senate of the reception to celebrate and honor the Class of '39 on January 12, 1998.

   b. The Resolution on Graduation Ceremony was submitted for approval by Senator Ferguson. Vote to accept was taken and passed (Attachment F) (FS97-12-2 P).

   c. Senator Huffman submitted for approval a paragraph to be added to the Policy on Research Ethics and explained the history and reason behind the request for approval. Vote to accept was taken and passed unanimously (Attachment G).

   d. Senator Huffman submitted for approval additional responsibilities for Chief Financial Officer to be incorporated in the **Faculty Manual**. The required two-thirds vote was received by the Senate in order to bring this issue to the floor for consideration. Vote to accept these **Faculty Manual** revision was taken and passed unanimously (Attachment H).

7. **Adjournment**. President McGuire adjourned the meeting at 4:20 p.m.

   Kathy Neal Headley, Secretary

   Cathy Toth Sturkie, Administrative Assistant

Absent: H. Wheeler, M. Jacobi, M. Morris (P. Smith for), M. Cooper, S. Anand, E. Makram
The Faculty Senate Research Committee discussed the following concerns:

1) The need for the physical plant to interact with the research faculty to inform and do all possible to keep buildings on line when power or heating problems arise. Needs for generators, etc. The shut down of Jordan hall for 18hrs during Thanksgiving is a recent problem that was solved by the leasing of generators.

2) What protocol does the University Research Office adopt when new centers of excellence are conceived? The Biomedical Institute has now resurrected itself. What is the status of TIWET?

3) How do we get various news agencies to highlight the research efforts at Clemson?

The following two memos (in draft form at present) will be forwarded to Dr. Shah:

A) During the required shut down of power to Long and Jordan Halls over the Thanksgiving holiday, every effort was made by the physical plant to minimize deleterious effects of this planned shutdown. The University leased a power generator truck and was able to keep each building on line during the 18 hour transformer PCB replacement procedure. The University and the physical plant are to be commended for these efforts. However, this leasing of a generator solved a short term problem. The University must address the need for a onsite portable power generator. Research projects involving sophisticated equipment, computers, and ultracold storage facilities are (will be) compromised if emergency power is not readily available during prolonged power outages. Power outages are potentially life threatening to whole animal and tissue culture facilities.

B) In light of your current initiative to reformulate a Life Sciences Institute on campus, the Research Committee of the Faculty Senate requests that you outline a clear set of operating principals for this or any institute on campus. We are particularly interested in your thoughts on the following:

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 also wish to know your ideas on specific goals which might apply to any institute. Finally, we 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 your office and the faculty to the end that any institute will benefit the existing research initiatives on campus. As you are aware, at Clemson, institutes have at times compromised college and departmental budgets and other resources. In so doing they have limited existing programs that are meritorious. We contend that such conflicts and the ill will that results can be avoided if institutes are promulgated under a set of guidelines acceptable to the faculty.
The Scholastic Policies Committee offers the following DRAFT of revised questions for student evaluation of teaching for your review and suggestions. This evaluation would replace the current “red form” and should be used university-wide. Use of this evaluation would not prevent departments or colleges from using additional forms. Fred Switzer in the Psychology Department has reviewed these and finds them “pretty good”.

**Question 20 regarding instructor availability is one of the Performance Indicator Measures for Performance Funding and MUST be written as shown and MUST be asked during spring 1998 evaluation.**

The optional questions are exclusively for the faculty member and would not be forwarded with evaluations for tenure and promotion purposes. Questions 1-20 and the open-ended answers would be provided to chairs, deans, etc during the tenure/promotion process if required.

The Senate should try to act on the revised evaluation form during the January meeting.
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.
12. Overall, this course is among the best I have ever taken.
13. Overall, this instructor is among the best teachers I have known.

Student information
14. I have put much effort into this course.
15. I am satisfied with my accomplishments in this course.
16. I have confidence that these ratings will be taken seriously.

Responses for questions 1-16.

\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 \\
\text{Strongly agree} & \text{Agree} & \text{No opinion} & \text{Disagree} & \text{Strongly disagree}
\end{array}
\]

17. I expect to earn an A, B, C, D, F, or P in this course.
18. This was a required course for me. (yes or no)
19. I am majoring in the area in which this course is being taught. (yes or no)
20. The South Carolina Commission on Higher Education requires that the following question be asked as one of the Performance Indicator Measures for Performance Funding.

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.

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\
\text{Very} & \text{Dissatisfied} & \text{Satisfied} & \text{Very Satisfied}
\end{array}
\]

Dissatisfied

Open-ended questions
1. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the course and/or instructor?
2. What suggestions do you have to improve this course?
3. optional open-ended question written by instructor/department/college
12 optional questions chosen from the list below or written by the instructor be included in the evaluation.

**Classroom teaching performance**
1. The instructor used real world problems or case studies to explain topics effectively.
2. The instructor encouraged classroom discussion.
3. Regular attendance was necessary in order to learn and understand course material.
4. The instructor effectively demonstrated skills to be learned.
5. Within time limits of the course, the instructor covered course topics in sufficient depth.
6. The instructor’s teaching made you want to improve your course-related skills.
7. The instructor’s citation of personal experiences increased your understanding of the subject matter.
8. The instructor’s use of examples of his/her own research facilitated students’ learning.
9. The instructor encouraged creative approaches to problems and projects.
10. The instructor encouraged students to share information with others and contribute to class learning.
11. The instructor used students comments and questions to assess needs for additional lecture.
12. The instructor provided notes or other handouts which facilitated learning of course material.
13. The instructor’s inclusion of student presentations was beneficial to the course.
14. The instructor demonstrated a thorough knowledge of course topics.

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

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

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

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

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

**Additional class and class environment items/audio-visual aids**
1. The room in which class was held was of adequate size for the class.
2. The size of the class was appropriate to the nature of the course objectives.
3. It was not difficult to hear the instructor or other speakers.
4. Classroom lighting was adequate.
5. The temperature of the classroom was comfortable.
6. The instructor made adequate use of audio and visual aid equipment.
Report from the Policy Committee

December 9, 1997

The Policy Committee met on November 18, 1997. The committee members present were John Huffman, JoAnne Deeken, Matt Saltzman and Eleanor Hare. Also present were Editorial consultant for the Faculty Manual, Bob Waller and Director of the Honors Program, Steve Wainscott. The following matters were discussed, and the indicated actions were taken.

1. A suggestion has been made by the current Chair of the Scholarships and Awards Committee to revise the faculty manual to make the Director of the Honors Program the Chair of the Scholarships and Awards Committee. The Director of the Honors Program, Steve Wainscott, met with the committee to suggest that the Director of Financial Aid should chair the Scholarships and Awards Committee. The rationale was that the Scholarships and Awards Committee had effectively become a financial aid policy body, and the Director of Financial Aid's office had the resources to oversee the Scholarships and Awards Committee. The Policy Committee decided to meet with the current Chair of the Scholarships and Awards Committee, and the Director of Financial Aid before drafting a Manual revision.

2. Evaluation of Administrators: Bob Waller prepared a draft copy of a Manual revision, based on the University of Rhode Island procedure. After discussion, some revisions were suggested. 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 the Clemson form, which is being developed. There is also provision for direct input by individual faculty members. No further action was taking pending evaluation of the draft form by members of the psychology faculty.

3. Paragraph deleted by the Senate from the University General Counsel's proposed revision to the Policy on research Ethics. This paragraph was approved for addition to the Policy on Research Ethics, with the appropriate heading to indicate where it is to be added to the policy.

4. Resolution FS97-2-1 which was rejected by Provost: The chair has not had time to discuss this with the Provost. Senator Saltzman indicated that he was planning to discuss FS96-4-1 with the Provost. This resolution also deals with faculty compensation.

5. Documents from the Research Committee: The proposed Research Data Access and Retention Policy was discussed. The policy will be discussed with appropriate individuals in the Cooper Library to insure that there is no conflict with existing policies. The research Ethics Policy was returned to the research Committee for clarification.

6. A draft Faculty manual change which places the "Office of Human Resources" under the Chief Financial Officer was approved. However, it was noted that once again the President had acted without input and/or advice from any faculty group.

7. The Policy Committee has finally received the ad hoc Committee report on the "Periodic Review." We will begin considering this document at the December meeting.

The Policy Committee meets at 3:30 P.M. on (usually) the third Tuesday of each month. Our next meeting will be Thursday, December 11th, presumably in the library conference room (LL3).
To: Scott Ludlow, CFO, and the University Budget Committee  
From: The Faculty Senate Select Committee on the Library  
Cc: Provost Steffen Rogers, the Faculty Senate, the Academic Deans, and the Department Chairs

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING THE LIBRARY

THE PROBLEM

SUMMARY

• In a survey of students, 39% of the seniors reported that they had had problems completing assignments because of the lack of materials in Clemson’s library; 49.3% of the graduate students responding reported similar problems; and over half the faculty responding indicated that they could not do their own research at our library.

• Faculty members report that they cannot create new courses, or require research papers in the courses they teach, because the library’s materials are too limited. One faculty member obtained borrowing cards from the University of Georgia for each student in his graduate seminar, because that was the only way his students could do the research necessary for the course. Others describe buying the books and journals necessary for their own work, of that of their students.

THE CAUSE

• We should have roughly 1,827,290 volumes in our library, we do have only 935,584 catalogued books.

• As a result of Clemson’s decision to cancel serials, we are beginning to have serious deficiencies in our journal collection as well.

• Clemson’s library should have a budget of at least $10 million a year (and given the problem of under-funding in the past, the budget should be higher). Our library budget is roughly half of that.

As a result:

• We are adding only 2/3s (or less) of the books and serials being added by our peer institutions.

• In 1996, we spent only $26.28 on books per student, and only $139.66 per student on serials. That same year, USC spent $99.51 on books per student, and $173.18 per student on serials.

• We should have approximately 47 librarians, we have 32 (when fully staffed); we should have a support staff of 87, there are 68 people on the support staff.

• In the view of most faculty and students, neither technology (the web, the internet, on line journals or services) or interlibrary loan can completely make up for what the library lacks.

THE SOLUTION

Clemson’s historical response to the problem of the Library - onetime funds in a variety of small sums - cannot solve a problem of this magnitude. We propose several solutions, including:

• a significant, and permanent increase in the library’s actual budget;

• a fund raising drive coordinated by a development officer assigned only to work on the library;

• student fees (including, but not limited to, the possibility of shifting the student money presently used to pay off the stadium bond to the Library when the bond is paid in 2000); and

• resource sharing programs modeled on Illini-net or Ohio-net.

These proposals are not intended to preclude continued investigation of technological alternatives, or other efforts to control costs. But such efforts, which are at best long term, cannot solve the problem we have now. And if the problem we have now is not solved quickly, in the not too distant future we will not have a library.
DISCUSSION

We cannot continue to pretend that the library's problems stem from the rapidly increasing cost of serials or books. While there is no escaping the fact that journals cost a great deal, and that prices for books and serials have risen on an annual basis, that is not the root cause of our present problem. Rather, our problem is that we have failed to fund the library at the level it needs to be funded to be an adequate undergraduate library, let alone an adequate library for a school with our graduate programs.

WHERE WE SHOULD BE

A. BOOKS

In 1995, the Association of College and Research Libraries reissued their standards for college libraries.1 The standards set out a formula for determining how many volumes a university library should hold, based on number of faculty members, number of graduate and undergraduate students, and degrees offered.

Applying that formula to Clemson, it appears our Library should have 1,827,290 volumes. In contrast, we have only 935,584 (a figure that includes all catalogued government documents).

The total of 1,827,290 books is based on the following figures, derived using the ACRL formula (see also Chart A):

- Any university library should have a basic collection of 85,000 books;
- Clemson has 1,235 faculty members, that means we should have an additional 123,500 books (100 volumes per FTE faculty member);
- Clemson has 16,526 students, that means we should have an additional 247,890 books (15 volumes per student);
- Clemson has 94 undergraduate majors and minors, that means we should have an additional 32,900 volumes (based on 350 volumes per major or minor);
- Clemson should have an additional 1,338,000 books to serve its graduate programs (see chart A for explanation of figure).

In addition to offering a formula to determine how many books a university needs, the ACRL Standards offer a rough guide to evaluating the adequacy of a library's book holdings. Those standards provide:

Libraries that can provide 90 to 100 % of as many volumes as are called for in Formula A shall be graded A in terms of library resources; from 75 to 89% shall be graded B; 60 to 74 % shall be graded C; and 50 to 59 % shall be graded D.

Clemson’s holdings are 51 % of what the ACRL recommends, a D- rating, and virtually off the scale.

CHART A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Allowance</th>
<th>Clemson has</th>
<th>Clemson should have</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic collection</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td>85,000</td>
<td>85,000 volumes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowance per FTE faculty member</td>
<td>100 volumes</td>
<td>1,235 faculty 4</td>
<td>123,500 volumes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowance per FTE student</td>
<td>15 volumes</td>
<td>16,526 students 3</td>
<td>247,890 volumes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowance per undergraduate major or minor field</td>
<td>350 volumes</td>
<td>94 fields 4</td>
<td>32,900 volumes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowance per terminal master's degree field</td>
<td>6,000 volumes</td>
<td>32 fields 5</td>
<td>192,000 volumes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowance per master's field where there is also PhD in field</td>
<td>3,000 volumes</td>
<td>32 fields 6</td>
<td>96,000 volumes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowance per doctoral field</td>
<td>25,000 volumes</td>
<td>42 fields 7</td>
<td>1,050,000 volumes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>943,941 volumes</td>
<td>1,827,290 volumes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Even though we have far fewer books than we need, we spend less on books per student than any of our peers. In 1996, we spent $26.28 per student on books. That same year USC spent $99.51, Auburn spent $48.12, Georgia Tech spent $59.60. (Chart B)

B. JOURNALS

It appears that our serial holdings are also inadequate, and were inadequate prior to the recent cuts. The ACRL offers no formula for estimating the proper number of serials a library should have, noting that needs for periodical holdings vary so widely that a generally applicable formula cannot be used. In general, the ACRL recommends that a library have any title that is needed more than five times per year. The ACRL Standards go on to recommend that a broad undergraduate program in the liberal arts would require, at minimum roughly 650 journals. Graduate studies increase the number of journals needed, as do programs in fields (such as the sciences and some of the social sciences) that are journal based.

2Per Clemson University Fact Book, 1996
3Ibid.
4Per 1997-98 Undergraduate Announcements
5Per 1997-98 Graduate Announcements
6Ibid.
7Ibid.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Materials budget</th>
<th>Mat/bud/student</th>
<th>Serials budget</th>
<th>Serials/student</th>
<th>Monograph</th>
<th>Mono/student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clemson</td>
<td>$2,561,150.00</td>
<td>$165.94</td>
<td>$2,155,547.00</td>
<td>$139.66</td>
<td>$405,607.00</td>
<td>$26.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USC</td>
<td>4,701,778.00</td>
<td>272.69</td>
<td>2,986,011.00</td>
<td>173.18</td>
<td>1,715,767.00</td>
<td>99.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn</td>
<td>3,700,532.00</td>
<td>167.28</td>
<td>2,636,020.00</td>
<td>119.16</td>
<td>1,064,522.00</td>
<td>48.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cal-Davis</td>
<td>5,243,310.00</td>
<td>227.06</td>
<td>3,048,700.00</td>
<td>132.02</td>
<td>2,194,610.00</td>
<td>95.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>5,856,009.00</td>
<td>148.48</td>
<td>4,426,931.00</td>
<td>112.25</td>
<td>1,429,087.00</td>
<td>36.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Tech</td>
<td>3,502,671.00</td>
<td>268.69</td>
<td>2,725,698.00</td>
<td>209.09</td>
<td>776,973.00</td>
<td>59.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa State</td>
<td>4,914,573.00</td>
<td>201.16</td>
<td>3,570,034.00</td>
<td>146.13</td>
<td>1,344,521.00</td>
<td>55.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State</td>
<td>5,438,592.00</td>
<td>133.80</td>
<td>3,697,609.00</td>
<td>90.97</td>
<td>1,740,983.00</td>
<td>42.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC State</td>
<td>5,501,622.00</td>
<td>199.77</td>
<td>3,735,977.00</td>
<td>135.67</td>
<td>1,765,645.00</td>
<td>64.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purdue</td>
<td>5,026,523.00</td>
<td>144.92</td>
<td>4,070,212.00</td>
<td>117.35</td>
<td>956,311.00</td>
<td>27.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Tech</td>
<td>4,729,376.00</td>
<td>199.77</td>
<td>3,686,732.00</td>
<td>155.73</td>
<td>1,042,644.00</td>
<td>44.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke</td>
<td>8,074,987.00</td>
<td>701.44</td>
<td>5,286,276.00</td>
<td>459.20</td>
<td>2,788,711.00</td>
<td>242.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida State</td>
<td>4,356,138.00</td>
<td>143.92</td>
<td>3,320,135.00</td>
<td>109.69</td>
<td>1,036,003.00</td>
<td>34.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Unavailable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNC</td>
<td>8,409,356.00</td>
<td>344.10</td>
<td>5,823,379.00</td>
<td>238.28</td>
<td>2,585,977.00</td>
<td>105.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>6,268,570.00</td>
<td>347.19</td>
<td>3,534,894.00</td>
<td>195.78</td>
<td>2,733,676.00</td>
<td>151.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wake Forest</td>
<td>4,168,226.00</td>
<td>704.93</td>
<td>3,312,355.00</td>
<td>529.51</td>
<td>855,871.00</td>
<td>144.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer average</td>
<td></td>
<td>187.88</td>
<td></td>
<td>135.37</td>
<td></td>
<td>52.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC average</td>
<td></td>
<td>338.76</td>
<td></td>
<td>949.03</td>
<td></td>
<td>114.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These figures are for 1996.*
Before the recent serials cut, we received 11,574 serials, and spent $2,155,547 on serials. A rough estimation of our serial needs may be derived from comparing our serial holdings and expenses with some of our peer schools. The result, set out in Chart B, indicates that of eleven schools in the Southeast (6 of which are "bench marks" and five of which are ACC schools), we spent the smallest amount on serials and we had the fewest holdings. That same chart demonstrates that in 1996 USC spent $173.18 on books per student, while we spent only $139.66.

We generally compare poorly with other southeastern schools. As Chart C demonstrates, of the 31 schools in the Association of Southeastern Research Libraries, Clemson's total of 11,574 serials received ranked us 23rd, above only Georgia State, William and Mary, George Mason, Florida International, Virginia Commonwealth, South Florida, Central Florida, and Alabama-Birmingham. In addition, we while we received 771 serials fewer than the 22nd ranked school (Memphis), we received only 344 serials more than the 24th ranked school (Georgia State).

**CHART C⁹**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Library</th>
<th>Total serials received 1996</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>47,392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>46,169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>43,571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke</td>
<td>33,205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>26,775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>26,394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emory</td>
<td>24,687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC State</td>
<td>21,586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>19,601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn</td>
<td>19,193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA Tech</td>
<td>18,737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA State</td>
<td>18,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>18,047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>17,478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanderbilt</td>
<td>17,009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida State</td>
<td>16,394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wake Forest</td>
<td>15,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulane</td>
<td>14,876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>14,425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>13,139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Tech</td>
<td>12,726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memphis</td>
<td>12,345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clemson</td>
<td>11,574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia State</td>
<td>11,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William and Mary</td>
<td>11,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Mason</td>
<td>10,362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida International</td>
<td>9,012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Commonwealth</td>
<td>8,273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Florida</td>
<td>7,329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Florida</td>
<td>5,278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama-Birmingham</td>
<td>5,262</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⁹From the Association of Southeastern Regional Libraries statistics for 1996.
It also bears noting that the highest-ranking school, the University of Virginia, received 4 times as many serials (47,392) than we did. Finally, we received only 64% of the serials that USC, the 13th ranking school, received (USC received 18,047 serials).

These comparisons suggest that our serial holdings are inadequate.

C. BUDGET

Even though it is obvious that we have not adequately funded the library, the extent of our failure needs to be made clear.

The ACRL standards recommend that a typical university library budget should be at least 6% of the “total institutional budget for education and general purposes.” At Clemson, where the 1995-96 budget for Instruction, Research and Academic Support was $168,900,000, a library budget set at 6% would be $10,134,000.

In comparison, the library budget for Clemson in the current year is $5,612,423. This represents a budget of just over 55% of what the ACRL standards indicate it should be. Nor does this adequately capture the problem. While the ACRL Standards clearly indicate that our library budget must be increased, dramatically, we caution against relying on the $10 million dollar figure as a magic number. The ACRL Standards indicate that the 6% figure should be increased in two circumstances, both of which apply to Clemson.

- First, where past deficiencies need to be rectified, the 6% figure is too low. This is clearly the situation at Clemson.
- Second, where the library “bears responsibility for acquiring, processing, and servicing” materials like audiovisual or computer resources, the 6% figure is not high enough. At Clemson, where the library does have computer needs, as well as obligations with respect to copiers and some video equipment, the 6% figure is probably too low.

As a result of these two factors, a budget goal of $10,134,000 should be considered no more than a bare minimum.

Other information supports the conclusion that our library’s budget has been grossly inadequate. As Chart B demonstrates, in 1996 we spent $165.94 per student on materials (serials and books). That was less than our peers spent per student, on average they spent $187.88 per student on materials. USC spent over a hundred dollars more than we did per student on materials in that same year.

Further evidence that our budget has been inadequate comes from comparing our purchases with the number of books produced in selected disciplines. A rough indication of what disciplines rely on books can be gained by comparing the number of books published in various fields in a given year. Such a comparison, using 13 disciplines (all of them taught at Clemson), demonstrates that the top five fields in terms of number of titles published in 1995 were: literature and language, business, history, engineering, and psychology and sociology (which are combined as a single field). Architecture and Arts (again a single field) came in a close sixth on the list. (See Chart D)

This suggests that those are fields where the emphasis should be on buying books. Actual practice is quite different. Of the five fields, business (where 10% of books published were actually purchased) did
the best. History, where only 4.5% of books published were purchased, did the worst (and had the lowest percentage over all fields covered). Engineering ran business a close second in terms of percent of books purchased (with 9%), while literature and the combination of psychology and sociology were in the middle, with 6.5% of books and 5.5% of books purchased respectively.

**CHART D**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th># of titles in 1995</th>
<th>Average price in 1995</th>
<th>Total cost</th>
<th>Clemson allocation in 1996</th>
<th>% of total publications purchased by Clemson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>1,230</td>
<td>$76.41</td>
<td>$82,914</td>
<td>$14,514</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture and arts</td>
<td>4,444</td>
<td>48.85</td>
<td>217,089</td>
<td>15,928</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botany and zoology</td>
<td>2,128</td>
<td>80.96</td>
<td>170,408</td>
<td>18,457</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>6,294</td>
<td>48.65</td>
<td>306,203</td>
<td>30,537</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>153.12</td>
<td>77,479</td>
<td>5,776</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>35.10</td>
<td>77,220</td>
<td>19,446</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>5,076</td>
<td>74.82</td>
<td>379,786</td>
<td>33,059</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>6,279</td>
<td>33.28</td>
<td>208,965</td>
<td>9,661</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature and language</td>
<td>12,285</td>
<td>29.58</td>
<td>363,390</td>
<td>24,514</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math and computer science</td>
<td>3,109</td>
<td>57.13</td>
<td>177,617</td>
<td>14,853</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics and astronomy</td>
<td>1,161</td>
<td>91.73</td>
<td>106,499</td>
<td>5,954</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political science</td>
<td>1,681</td>
<td>47.83</td>
<td>80,402</td>
<td>4,430</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology and sociology</td>
<td>4,938</td>
<td>38.03</td>
<td>178,424</td>
<td>10,619</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If Clemson had purchased every academic book published and distributed in the United States and Canada in 1995 in those disciplines, our book budget would have been at least $2,426,396 (books in other fields not covered by the list and books in foreign languages which were not distributed in the United States or Canada would increase this figure, as might the purchase of some books not considered "academic"). In contrast, in 1996 Clemson spent $207,748 (slightly less than half its annual book budget) on books in the chosen fields, not even 9% of that rough figure.

**THE PROBLEM IN CONTEXT**

We cannot delude ourselves that the effects of these budgetary decisions have not had a significant impact on the education Clemson provides its students (both graduate and undergraduate) and the work of its faculty.11

As part of our research into the Library, we surveyed faculty (in all departments), graduate students, and undergraduates.12 This portion of the report is based on those survey results.

**A. UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS**

While it has been suggested that our library is a reasonably good undergraduate library, the survey results demonstrate this is not true.

A survey sent to all students (graduate and undergraduate) who are on the university wide student email list, established that our library fails to adequately serve undergraduates. As Chart E demonstrates, while freshmen are generally satisfied with the library, the level of satisfaction dropped significantly among students in the upper classes.13 In particular, seniors rated the adequacy of the materials in the library as 3.04 on a scale or 1-5 (with 5 being outstanding, and 1 being poor), a significant drop off from the 3.79 score freshman gave the library's materials.

Even more disturbing, over 39% of all seniors responding to the survey indicated that they had had problems completing an assignment because of the lack of material in the library.14

---

11 In addition, the limitations of the library have an impact on the larger upstate community, which we must serve by virtue of being a land grant university. There are 1000 people who have paid for "courtesy cards" (which are sold to residents of South Carolina and provide them with borrowing privileges). To some extent, the limitations of the library harm these people as well.

12 These surveys were distributed by email. In the case of faculty, the survey was initially sent to the department chairs for distribution to their departments. The faculty survey was then resent to all the faculty using the various college email mailing lists, sent out by lead senators for each college on the Faculty Senate.

The graduate and undergraduate surveys were sent to all students using University wide email lists. We received 90 faculty responses (the estimate reflects the fact a handful of faculty communicated their thoughts orally, rather than in writing); 42 grad student responses; and over 900 undergraduate responses.

The library staff was also surveyed. Their major concerns were lack of space (for collections, for student study areas, for staff working areas), deteriorating condition of the building, problems resulting from lack of staffing, the need for better computer hardware and software, other equipment improvements, and a more proactive administration.

13 This chart is based on a sample of over 300 survey responses.

14 This response is particularly disheartening since faculty members referred frequently to their efforts to plan assignments that took the failures of the library into account.
CHART E

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>FR (n=53)</th>
<th>So (n=65)</th>
<th>Jr. (n=57)</th>
<th>Sr. (n=82)</th>
<th>Gr. (n=69)</th>
<th>Total (n=326)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Study space</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>3.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff helpfulness</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>3.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material adequacy</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall library</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% reporting difficulty</td>
<td>7.55%</td>
<td>27.69%</td>
<td>35.09%</td>
<td>39.02%</td>
<td>49.28%</td>
<td>33.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>doing assignments using</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>library resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This problem has a particular impact on our Honors College. The head of that program, Stephen Wainscott, reports that many of the funding requests the Honors Program gets from students seeking financial aid in researching their honors papers are requests to buy books.

A separate survey of faculty members indicates that faculty are aware of the problem for undergraduates. (Chart F) In that survey, faculty were asked to comment on the adequacy of the library holdings with respect to preparation for courses and undergraduate course work needs. Of the 90 faculty members who

CHART F15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>very poor or inadequate</th>
<th>adequate or fair</th>
<th>good or okay</th>
<th>excellent</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How is the library for your course preparation?</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How is the library for your undergraduate course work needs?</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How is the library for your graduate course work needs?</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How is the library for your graduate students' thesis needs?</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How is the library for your own research needs?</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15All numbers are actual number of faculty members giving such an answer. The total responses were 90, the totals in each column do not add up to that number because some faculty members did not answer some questions.
responded, only 15 indicated that the library's holdings were good or excellent in the area of course preparation and only 16 said that the library's holdings were good or excellent in terms of their undergraduates' needs. 24 characterized the library's holdings as very poor (or inadequate) in terms of general course preparation and 34 characterized it as adequate or fair in that area. 31 indicated that the library was inadequate for their undergraduates' course work needs, and 31 said it was adequate or fair.

Many professors spoke of having to adapt their undergraduate courses to fit the limitations of the library, either by restricting the research papers they assigned, or by deciding not to assign research papers. While this is done to shield students from the limitations of the library, it does so at the cost of watering down their classes and denying them the opportunity to engage in independent research. This hinders their intellectual development, harming both those who want to go on to graduate study and those who need simply to learn to plan and undertake independent tasks so that they can be successful in business or the professions.

Our ability to instruct our students is compromised in other ways. Some faculty members indicated that they could not develop courses that they were interested in because of the library's limitations. Some of the faculties' objections were specific to their fields. Those with an interest in foreign language, history, geography and culture noted that the library had serious deficiencies in those areas. (Concerns borne out by evidence that the library makes only the most limited purchases in those particular areas. Chart D) Likewise, professors and students who worked in the areas of computer science, nursing, education, and psychology, lamented the absence of recently published texts in their fields and noted that this kept students from learning up-to-date techniques.

While those comments reflected problems specific to some departments and fields of study, other concerns were more general. Several faculty members expressed distress that the lack of holdings in the library limited students' ability to learn to learn independently by browsing in the library, reading recent works, and generally exposing themselves to materials that interested them but were unrelated to their class work.

One striking message from the faculty survey was the extent to which faculty members have felt called upon to make for the library's failings. Many professors described purchasing books or buying journal subscriptions themselves, and loaning those books and journals to students. While some professors were able to do this with grant money, the vast majority apparently subsidized the library's limitations out of their own pockets, often at significant personal cost.

B. GRADUATE STUDENTS

That same survey demonstrated that graduate students were even less satisfied with the library than the undergraduates. Once again, the greatest area of dissatisfaction was felt in the area of materials. Graduate students rated the adequacy of the materials as 2.74 on a 5 point scale, and reported that 49.28% of the time they had difficulty doing assignments because of lack of materials.

A second survey sent to graduate students provided some context for those objections, as did the survey of faculty members. Both noted that graduate students often had to rely on interlibrary loan and trips to other libraries (USC and Georgia were the typical examples, though in some cases Georgia Tech and the Library of Congress were listed). One history professor described arranging to have all the students in his seminar get cards for the University of Georgia, so that they could do the work they needed to for his class. 45 of the faculty members who responded to the survey concluded that the library was inadequate for their graduate student courses, only 9 said the library was good or excellent for graduate student
courses. 40 faculty members who responded said that the library was inadequate for their graduate students thesis needs, only 7 said it was good or adequate. Here, many of those who said the library was adequate referred to interlibrary loan, and noted the library would be inadequate without that facility.

The library’s impact on graduate students must be considered a serious problem. As several people suggested, the graduate school experience involves learning how to do independent scholarship. At a stage where graduate students should spend hours in the library, browsing through journals and recently published books, our graduate students are unable to do this. Rather than go to our library to learn, they must go somewhere else. For those who do so, the loss of time traveling to and from the other libraries is extraordinary. For many, the necessity of traveling several hours to other libraries probably dissuades them from undertaking the activity.

This means that the condition of our library not only interferes with our graduate students’ opportunities to do their research on campus, it interferes with their professional development. Several faculty members who commented on this wondered how much this hindered our students when they tried to compete for jobs (or placement in other graduate programs) with students from other universities.

C. FACULTY

The faculty was also asked to rate the library in terms of their own research needs, and in terms of keeping up with their field and developing courses. As Chart E demonstrates, 52 of the faculty members who responded indicated the library was inadequate for their research needs, only 11 said it was good or excellent. Most faculty members (including those who characterized the library as adequate, good or excellent) indicated that they needed to rely on other libraries, on interlibrary loan, and on their own investments to sustain their research. As several people noted, the problem with this “privatization” of library materials is that we no longer have a library that is a university wide resource. Instead, we have created a system in which faculty members have to create their own mini-libraries. Unfortunately, each of those libraries leaves if the faculty member who created it leaves, and in general these personal libraries are not accessible to the entire campus, depriving some people of their benefit.

Many faculty members stated that they relied heavily on interlibrary loan (although some noted that interlibrary loan did not work in their research areas because necessary materials were not available.).16 Here, there were two different views, which seemed to reflect the particular needs of the professor responding. For some, interlibrary loan was an adequate replacement for the books and journals that were not available in our library. For others, it was not.

For those who fell into the first category, access to materials was enough, it did not matter if we held the materials. In this case, if access came through interlibrary loan, that was adequate. For others who needed books or journal articles rapidly, or on a long term basis, or who needed to be able to compare several books and articles to one another at the same time, interlibrary loan was inadequate. Several professors in this category reported research projects delayed by weeks and months because books they needed were not readily available, or could not be consulted for comparative purposes. Likewise, those who wished to browse a particular field, found interlibrary loan cumbersome and an inadequate replacement for general holdings.

---

16This is consistent with the Association of Southeastern Research Library statistics for 1996. We make about 1/3 more interlibrary loan requests than our peers, and four times as many requests as Georgia Tech. See the statistics from the Association of Southeastern Research Libraries at http://www.lib.memphis.edu.
Several people offered examples of the serious problems that resulted from the lack of holdings. One professor reported that several journal articles he had authored had been criticized for their lack of reference to the literature in the field, literature that was unavailable to him at Clemson. Others recalled times that reviewers or commentators on papers had referred them to works that were unavailable here. Others recalled instances where their efforts to familiarize themselves with new areas were compromised by the complete lack of holdings in that area.

While many relied on interlibrary loan, others explained that they did all their research by taking regular trips to Columbia or Athens to the libraries at USC and University of Georgia. Others said they had to depend on colleagues at other schools, or attendance at conferences, to inform them about important new work. Once again, while this may adequately inform a particular professor, it means the University as a whole lacks access to this information. In addition, the time spent traveling to other collections, and time spent in other libraries, is time that faculty members are not on campus and cannot work with students.

D. TECHNOLOGY

While some professors in a few departments felt that technology adequately replaced the library’s traditional holdings, most did not. Only 6 faculty members indicated that their needs were mostly supplied by electronic holdings. 43 indicated that electronic holdings sometimes replaced other library services, and 38 said it never did so. Of the 43 who said technology was sometimes a replacement, most indicated that at best technology supplemented other resources, and many remarked that technology could never replace books. Several of those who indicated that technology sometimes replaced other services, commented that what technology actually did was indicate how limited our library’s holdings were. Nor can this be dismissed as the hostility of an older generation to new technology. Graduate and undergraduate students confirmed that the internet and data bases helped them with only a portion of their research needs.

By and large, the web was dismissed as a superficial research tool, which often provided misinformation as much as information. Several faculty members expressed concern that students relied too heavily on the web, in part because they had no other resources. On line access to other libraries was considered a more helpful resource, as were some on line journals (though again, people often noted that these on line systems typically provided only part of journal articles, or were only available at excessive cost).

Technology, in the words of one faculty member, might be helpful sometime, but it wasn’t now. Others noted that by investing heavily in technology at the expense of books, we turned the library into a nothing more than a computer lab — a result that diminished the library’s central role in a university and community.

CONCLUSIONS

As it currently exists, our library cannot fulfill the needs of our undergraduates, our graduates, or our faculty. It compares poorly with the libraries of our peers and other schools in the region. Although technology may replace some materials, at present, it does so for a very small part of the University population. Nor do we believe that technology will ever completely replace books as a vital tool for scholarship.

To correct these problems, we must not only increase our funding for the library significantly, we must also reorient our expenditures. Our investments in technology may place us at the cutting edge of
libraries, our failure to invest in any other sort of material has meant our library can no longer supply the
basic needs of this campus.

PROPOSED SOLUTIONS

In keeping with our mandate, we also investigated a variety of solutions to the problem. What follows are
simply preliminary recommendations, they are intended to be complimentary (rather than mutually
exclusive) and they are not offered in order of importance.

- Increase the university library budget immediately and significantly.

- Seek increased funding from the state. Part of the solution, especially in the immediate future, has to
come from increasing the library budget significantly. Assuming that the University budget cannot
bear the entire strain, we propose that a detailed request be made to the state legislature. Given the
story on the front page of recent Greenville News (Tuesday, Nov 11, 1997) indicating the state should
have a budget surplus of $367 million in 1999, and should end this year with a surplus of $60 million
dollars, it cannot be argued that financial circumstances preclude such a request. Nor, given our
library’s role as a resource for the rapidly growing upstate community, should such a request be
dismissed as inappropriate.

- Assign a development officer exclusively assigned to the task of soliciting funds for the library. (We
have made preliminary contact with Debbie DuBose, who has expressed interest in such a program.)
Such a program should include several aspects:

  • “High profile” spokesperson: Our sources recommended having a high profile person lead the
funding drive. At Penn State, Joe Paterno the football coach and his wife did this in a very
successful campaign, other possibilities include a distinguished alum, a professor emeritus, or
anyone else with a high profile who would be willing to commit to being the lead spokesperson
for the library. This person should strive to become associated in the public mind with the library
(the way certain celebrities are associated with particular products) and should not simultaneously
support other fund raising efforts.

  • Targeted development efforts: Other libraries had success targeting several specific groups.
Among them were retirees in nearby communities (whether or not they were alums), middle aged
professionals with some discretionary income (again, regardless of alumni status), alums who had
not made contributions to the university in the past (Ball State found that people who gave to the
library often had never contributed before); and professional groups who could be asked to give
in certain specific areas (engineering, architecture, law related materials, medical and biological
materials, etc).

  • Perks for donors: Successful fund raising efforts for friends of the library programs involve
receptions, book signings by local authors or faculty, lectures, and other goodies for people who
make contributions. It also involves a newsletter, updating the donors on library activities (as
well as other campus activities of interest, including concerts, lectures, performances). None of
our sources indicated that these perks ate into the library budget, or were not cost effective. On
the contrary, many indicated that they were not expensive (especially when events involved
faculty or student presentations which required no payment for the speaker or performer), and
that the expenses were well worth it in terms of income.
• Student library fee: Here, we thought of three alternatives:

• In the year 2000, it is our understanding that the bond that paid for some of the stands in Death Valley will be paid off. That bond is currently being paid for out of student activity fees, which all students pay. We also understand that the student government has some say in determining what will happen once the bond is paid off. We propose that the students be consulted about whether they would be willing to put some or all of that money into the library.

• In the alternative, we propose adding a library fee to the student tuition bills. One way of doing this, modeled on a method used by the University of Oklahoma, is to prorate the fee based on student hours.

• A third possibility is to charge the fee to students taking certain kinds of classes, which might require significant library resources (upper level undergraduate courses, which often have research papers, for example).

• Give the library an increased share of indirect costs generated from research grants.

• Try to work with other schools in South Carolina to create a library network: In Illinois and Ohio, to name just a couple of states with this process, consortiums of college and university libraries have organized borrowing networks.

These networks do not extend to the point where the libraries coordinate their purchases, rather, they permit faculty and students from the various schools in the network to borrow books and journals from the libraries of the other schools. Under this arrangement, borrowing can be done electronically (so that a student from Furman, for example, could log into Eddie at Clemson and request a book from our library), books are shipped around the network using a courier, so that delivery is within a day or two of a request, materials are loaned to both students and faculty of the participating institutions for the period they would be loaned at the loaner institution, and undergraduates and graduate students can utilize the network.

In some respects this mirrors interlibrary loan, and so it is subject to the criticisms of such a system (see above). At the same time, it is faster than interlibrary loan, books can be held for a longer period of time, and it is more accessible (especially for students).
Suggested changes are indicated by CAPS. Note that the changes occur in numbers 2, 5, 6, 8, and 12.

The mission and vision of Clemson University are to be implemented through the following concepts:

1. The University's priorities are: (a) The education of students through enhanced learning experiences and degree programs of highest quality; (b) Internationally significant research built around centers of excellence and interdisciplinary programs attuned to the economic prosperity of the state and nation; and (c) Extended public service bringing the teaching and research of the land-grant university to the people of South Carolina.

2. **WITHIN THE COMPREHENSIVE LIBERAL AND PRACTICAL EDUCATION WE ARE REQUIRED BY THE MORRILL ACT TO PROVIDE, WE WILL STRIVE TO PLACE emphases ...** upon programs in agriculture, engineering, natural resources, science, and technology, with additional focus upon architecture, business, education, HEALTH AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT. A STRONG COMMITMENT TO THE HUMANITIES, SOCIAL SCIENCES, AND CREATIVE ARTS WILL ALSO BE FUNDAMENTAL TO OUR UNIVERSITY.

3. Clemson will remain a university of choice, attracting a capable, dedicated, and diverse student body from the nation and beyond, while according priority to South Carolina residents. Enrollments will expectedly increase in response to the needs of South Carolinians and the excellence of academic programs; however, this growth should not occur at the expense of the academic capabilities of the student body or the essential character of the campus.

4. Clemson will recruit an intellectually stellar, ethnically and culturally diverse faculty and professional staff committed to Clemson's mission and vision and to its students.

5. the undergraduate program will retain its essential residential character, integrating curricular and co-curricular programs. [OMIT: The "Clemson Experience" built around a] A sense of place, common experiences among students, and interaction between faculty and students will BE at the heart of the undergraduate experience AT CLEMSON.

6. The University will respond to continuing education needs of the people of South Carolina IN THE PROFESSIONS with relevant graduate and professional development programs delivered through campus-centered, on-site, and distance learning delivery systems.
7. The University will enrich the learning experience of students and promote the quality and distinctiveness of its undergraduate program through individual mentoring and extensive opportunities for internships, field placements, service learning, cooperative education, work-study programs, and international study opportunities.

8. In all AREAS - academic, administrative, athletic, and regulatory - achieving and sustaining ACADEMIC excellence WILL be pursued and not compromised.

9. The University will be administered efficiently and effectively, and in accord with the public trust. Identified benchmark universities will serve as reference points.

10. Clemson values the men and women who have committed their talents and careers to the University. Their work should be supported, their performance professionally evaluated, their compensation nationally competitive, and their professional development encouraged.

11. The “Clemson Family” represents not only those who work and study on campus, but includes alumni and friends who support and sustain Clemson. The University will continue to welcome all to the campus, provide opportunities for alumni and friends to identify with and support Clemson, and renew the sense of family that binds all who love Clemson.

12. A. CLEMSON’S PUBLIC SERVICE WILL GO BEYOND THE CLASSROOM AND INCLUDE ALL THE DISCIPLINES. AS A UNIVERSITY, WE WILL PROVIDE A SERVICE TO THE PEOPLE OF SOUTH CAROLINA THROUGH CULTURAL, EDUCATIONAL, AND PROFESSIONAL OUTREACH.

   B. Clemson’s extended public service will focus on productivity and prosperity: agricultural AND FORESTRY, MANUFACTURING, economic and community development, environmental AND NATURAL RESOURCE conservation, food safety and nutrition, and youth AND FAMILY development.
RESOLUTION ON GRADUATION CEREMONY

FS12-2-P

Whereas, Graduation ceremonies are an important University function and faculty participation has declined,

Whereas, The Academic Ceremony Committee (Faculty Manual, Part VI, C.8, p.41) is to formulate and recommend policy relating to academic ceremonies and coordinates Faculty participation in such ceremonies,

Resolved, The Faculty Senate urges the Academic Ceremony Committee to evaluate the conduct of graduation ceremonies, to develop and implement strategies to enhance the quality of ceremonies, and to foster improved faculty attendance at graduation ceremonies.

Passed by the Faculty Senate on December 9, 1997.
This policy is applicable to all researchers associated with Clemson University, including faculty, students and staff. If charges are brought against non-faculty members of Clemson University, appropriate substitutions should be made for the role of the Faculty Senate officers and dean. If charges are brought against a former student that could result in the student's degree being revoked, those charges should be processed through the University's Policy and Procedure on Revocation of Academic Degrees rather than through this policy.
To: Policy Committee Chair John W. Huffman

Thru: Faculty Senate President Frang^vMcGuire

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

Re: Additional Responsibilities for Chief Financial Officer

The recent announcement from President Curris about a realignment of administrative responsibilities following the departure of the Vice President for Administration and Advancement requires a Faculty Manual adjustment in the description of responsibilities for the Chief Financial Officer.

On page 52 of the August 1997 Faculty Manual there is a list of "Committees and Boards" reporting to the Chief Financial Officer. To that roster the "Office of Human Resources" needs to be added as a fourth entity. The heading should be modified also to read: "Committees, Boards, and Units Reporting to the Chief Financial Officer."

By the same token, the reference on page 12 of the Office of Human Resources reporting to the Vice President for Administration and Advancement (subsection f.) needs to be deleted.

This change represents the tip of the iceberg in terms of other modifications required by focusing the replacement vice presidency on just "advancement" rather than "administration and advancement," but a start has to be made while other decisions are being finalized.

c.c.: President Constantine W. Curris
Vice President and Provost Steffen H. Rogers
Acting Vice President Deborah B. DuBois
Chief Financial Officer Scott A. Ludlow
1997-98 Policy Committee members
Mesdames Betty M. Moore and Cathy T. Sturkie