Call to Order: The Faculty Senate Meeting was called to order at 2:33 p.m. by President Jeremy King.

Approval of Minutes: The Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes dated December 11, 2012 and General Faculty Meeting Minutes dated December 19, 2012 were approved as written and distributed.

"Free Speech": John Bednar, Professor Emeritus, talked about the structure of the Board of Trustees of Clemson University and his concerns about "life" membership. The full speech can be found on the Clemson Faculty Senate website under "Free Speech": http://www.clemson.edu/faculty-staff/faculty-senate/free-speech.html

Special Order of the Day: John Mueller, HR Director of Customer Service, provided a Human Resources update. He reminded University employees that retirement plan open enrollment is from January 1st through March 1st. Individuals can change their Optional Retirement Program (ORP) vendor or those between 1-5 years of University employment can move from an ORP to the South Carolina Retirement System Plan (SCRS). An email with further details will be sent to eligible employees soon.

Committee Reports:

a. Senate Committees:

Scholastic Policies – None
Finance – None
Research – Chair McCubbin, in an effort to streamline faculty time and efforts consumed by inefficient or unproductive regulations/requirements, is seeking faculty input of their perceptions of unnecessary federal regulatory requirements. President King suggested collaboration with the Office of Vice President for Research (VPR) and governmental affairs personnel on campus to respond to anticipated Congressional and OMB calls for public comments on specific rules and initiatives aimed at streamlining federal regulations.
Welfare – None
Policy – None

b. ad hoc Faculty Senate Committees

Budget Accountability Committee – Chair Antonis Katsiyannis announced that a representative from the Office of the Chief Financial Officer plans to discuss long-term infrastructure and maintenance issues at the February Senate meeting. Chair Katsiyannis also noted that the salary report should be published soon.
c. University Commissions and Committees: None

6. Old Business: None

7. New Business:
   a. Per the Faculty Manual. Grievance Board members, Counselors, and a Senior Lecturer Consultant were elected or appointed to fill the following vacancies.
      a.i. The following faculty were elected by secret ballot to serve on the University Grievance Board (two-year term): Chris Colthorpe (Library), Pradip Srimani (E&S), Ed Moise (AAH), and Bill Surver (AFLS).
      a.ii. The following faculty were elected by secret ballot to serve as Grievance Counselors (three-year term): Paul Dawson (AFLS) and Gypsey Teague (Library).
      a.iii. The Provost appointed the Grievance Counselor for academic administrators (three-year term): Kinly Sturkie (BBS).
      a.iv. The Executive and Advisory Committees, at their November 27, 2012 meeting, elected by secret ballot, a Senior Lecturer Consultant to the Grievance Board (two-year term): Kathleen Meyer (HEHD).
      a.v. The Advisory Committee, at their January 29th meeting, will elect the 2013 Grievance Board Chair.

8. President's Report:
   a. President King announced that the Faculty Senate President's January newsletter will be posted soon. Some highlights include the following.
      a.i. The NCAA Rules Working Group chaired by Clemson University President Barker has made recommendations that will be voted on by Division I Board of Directors at the January 19th NCAA Convention. President King highlighted this work in the August Senate newsletter: http://www.clemson.edu/faculty-staff/faculty-senate/president-newsletter.html. A summary of rule changes can be found here: http://www.ncaa.org/wps/wcm/connect/public/ncaa/resources/latest+news/2012/december/rules+working+group+makes+final+recommendations+for+first+phase.
      a.ii. A recent ABC Nightline expose' on the culture of Toradol, a powerful painkiller's use in college football on game days. President King saluted Clemson University for its honesty in admitting use of such drugs; Clemson was one of only a few of the top 25 football programs surveyed to respond. Unfortunately, the NCAA does not track or regulate use of these drugs.
      a.iii. The University of Virginia has been issued a warning by SACS due to governance concerns arising from removal of the institution's President summer 2012. The American Council of Trustees and Alumni has formally requested the U.S. Secretary of Education to investigate SACS' actions.
   b. President King also announced that the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) has proposed rules for public comment in the Federal Register January 2, 2013 concerning the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (PPACA) 30-hour requirement for employers: https://www.federalregister.gov/articles/2013/01/02/2012-31269/shared-responsibility-for-employers-regarding-health-coverage. Of interest to higher education institutions and faculty are guidelines on how to measure and count the hours of part-time faculty beyond that simply spent in the classroom: http://chronicle.com/article/IRS-Says-Colleges-Must-Be/136523/?cid=at&utm_source=at&utm_medium=en.
9. Announcements:
   a. President King thanked those who attended the Class of '39 dinner and Class of '39 Award for Excellence ceremony honoring Windsor Westbrook Sherrill.
   b. First 2013 Executive/Advisory Committees meeting – January 29th (5th Tuesday)
   c. Next Faculty Senate meeting – February 12th

10. Adjournment: President King adjourned the meeting at 2:59 p.m.

Denise M. Anderson, Secretary

Monica A. Patterson, Program Coordinator

Also present: Nadim Aziz (Vice Provost for Faculty Development), Gordon Halfacre (Ombudsman for Faculty and Students), Dori Helms (Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs), Debbie Jackson (Vice Provost of Assessment), Fran McGuire (Editorial Consultant of the Faculty Manual), John Mueller (HR Director of Customer Service), Monica Patterson (Faculty Senate Program Coordinator), Suzanne Rook Schilf (Alternate), Jackie Todd (Public Information Director, Internal Communications), Dan Warner (Immediate Past Faculty Senate President)

Absent: F. Chen, R. Hewitt (T. McDonald for), M. Mowrey, J. Ochterbeck, M. Ellison, N. Vyavahare, B. Pennington (D. Warner for), S. Griffin
MINUTES
GENERAL FACULTY MEETING
DECEMBER 19, 2012

1. Call to Order: The General Faculty and Staff Meeting was called to order at 1:00 p.m. by Doris R. Helms, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs.

2. Introduction of Stage Party: Provost Helms introduced members of the Stage Party:
   James F. Barker, President of Clemson University
   David Blakesley, Faculty Representative to the Board of Trustees
   Jeremy King, Faculty Senate President
   Julia Lusk, Staff Senate President

3. Approval of Minutes: The August 21, 2012 Victor Hurst Academic Convocation Minutes were approved as distributed.

4. Presentation of the Ralph D. Elliott Endowed Award for Outstanding Service of Off-Campus, Distance and Continuing Education - Provost Helms presented this Award to Dr. Elham Makram, South Carolina Electric and Gas Distinguished Professor of Electrical and Computer Engineering. Ralph D. Elliott was present. This award was established in 2006 by family and friends of Dr. Ralph Elliott in honor of his retirement as Vice Provost for Off-Campus, Distance, and Continuing Education & Professor of Economics.

5. Presentation of the Rowland P. Alston, Sr. Award for Excellence in Public Relations - Provost Helms presented this Award to Dr. Bob Polomski, Environmental Horticulture Specialist in the School of Agriculture, Forest and Environmental Sciences. Rowland Alston, Jr. was present. This award was established in memory of Rowland P. Alston Sr., Class of 1942, by his son, Rowland P. Alston, Jr., Class of 1970 and 1972 to recognize faculty/staff who, through programs and activities in the areas of agriculture and/or natural resources, have provided Clemson University with positive visibility.

6. Presentation of the Thomas Green Clemson Award for Excellence - Provost Helms presented this Award to Colonel Sandy Edge, Director of the College of Business and Behavioral Science Academic Advising Center, and Dr. Robert Horton, Professor of Secondary Mathematics Education in Eugene T. Moore School of Education. This award was established in 1999 to recognize Clemson University faculty and staff whose teaching, research or service is exemplary.

7. Remarks by the Faculty Representative to the Board of Trustees, David Blakesley -

   "Thank you, Provost Helms.

   It was a great honor to be asked by the Faculty Senate and Senate President Jeremy King to serve as the Faculty’s Representative to the Board of Trustees last September. Jeremy and I have enjoyed meeting nearly every day since then, usually on the CATBus on the way to campus from the Anderson WalMart.

   I came to the University just over two years ago to serve as the Campbell Chair in the English Department. After just a few months serving as the Faculty Representative, I can now report unequivocally and without reservation that I have been welcomed into the Clemson Family, embraced in a sea of orange, and have developed a love-hate relationship for the letters U-S-C (standing for my alma
mater in Southern California and some other South Carolina interloper). My wife and I will celebrate our 20th anniversary in a couple of weeks, and I’ve talked her into postponing a trip to Bali in favor of one to Atlanta for the Chick-Fil-A Bowl. If that doesn’t prove my assimilation, nothing will. Resistance was futile.

The Faculty Representative to the Board of Trustees serves as the voice of the faculty at the Board’s quarterly meetings and in the interim on the President’s Cabinet, Faculty Senate, Ombuds Office, and other groups that help meet our goals of shared governance, a principle to which I am committed. Toward that end, I encourage you to contact me by email (dblakes@clemson.edu), phone or text (765.409.2649), or in person in Strode 616 or anywhere else if you would like to talk about where we’ve been or where we’re headed. In fact, come say hello when you see me at the Clemson tailgater in Atlanta on New Year’s Eve. You can wish my wife, Julie, a happy anniversary and then we can chat about the Clemson 2020 Roadmap.

Until then, enjoy the holiday season, and I’ll see you in January when it starts all over again . . .

Thank you. Back to you, Provost Helms.”

Remarks by the Faculty Senate President, Jeremy King – “Thank you Provost Helms.

First, congratulations to today’s awardees who’ve provided inspiration to propel the faculty through the rest of the academic year.

We may need it given the confusing headlines:

The world is flat and the cheap cost of storing and transmitting information will make faculty obsolete as Harvard-like education is brought to a world population.

OR

The world is not flat and those in the valleys need the personal attention of place-based faculty who can counter the erosion of social capital that is causing us to disengage from our neighbors and communities and go bowling alone.

A national fiscal gap of $11 trillion per year and growth of global debt at twice the rate of GDP over the past 25 years present immense fiscal pressures that require faculty to orient themselves as agents of centrally-planned economic development to generate revenue.

OR

Such efforts over the past 50 years have yielded products that are but incremental derivatives of design. We need faculty to refocus on the public goods in public education and on humanity’s big picture socioeconomic, political and moral challenges as well as risk-laden fundamental research that really drive economic growth, true technological advance, and sustainable societies.

In sum: faculty are dead, long live faculty.

So, what IS the future of faculty? I knew Vice President Kelly Smith would point me to our most eminent modern philosopher to address that question.

And here’s what Yogi Berra said, “It’s difficult to make predictions, especially about the future.”

I can only suggest how to shape that future: by recognizing that all faculty share several responsibilities whose fulfillment or not will define our legacy:
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1. Engaging important issues and stepping up to intellectually challenge weak decisions...that's what we'd demand (I hope) from our engaged critically-thinking students.
2. Considering solutions that haven't been conceived of or haven't been implemented before.... that's the spirit we'd like our students to carry with them when they leave Clemson.
3. Providing leadership on issues—even if uncomfortable due to lack of experience or previous detailed knowledge...that's what we hope a Clemson education would do for our students.
4. Endeavoring to perform work for each area of our tripartite mission that is of distinctive or excellent quality like that we hope to see from our students.
5. Working with others in a transparent manner not merely to develop policy or implement strategy, but to try and enhance our culture. For, as the great Peter Drucker said, culture eats strategy for breakfast.

The Senate has been working to enhance that culture. We’ve made progress as a result of adopting the above principles—especially working WITH others....staff, students, the administration, the Board, and external stakeholders. How about a culture

• where we make conscious decisions to compensate faculty via a performance-driven market-based process that is supported by new tools to be operationally sustainable
• where there is more equitable valuation in the performance of the elements of the tripartite mission
• where faculty, staff, and students have primarily authored the institution mission statement.
• where faculty representatives are provided data and consulted on decisions for faculty hires to balance workload and strengthen strategic areas of scholarship.
• where the prospect of faculty being replaced by software in academic advising is averted
• where there is a uniform cross-campus expectation regarding faculty benefits

We’re not perfect—I’m sure we didn’t and won’t get everything completely right in these efforts. But, I believe we’re moving in the right direction.

The Senate needs to keep moving due to the challenges facing faculty:

• The development of an uncertain renewed role for our School of Ed colleagues in moving the needle on K12 education in the State.
• The nationwide movement to commoditize faculty via non-place-based virtual delivery models to reduce large swaths higher education to job training and to promote a monolithic model of higher education for everyone.
• Our own inability to define and hold the frontier of assessment of our own enterprise, and instead surrender this task to publishing executives who really are poorly qualified for this task.
• As faculty celebrate our 50th anniversary of integration, we find evidence that black male athletes in major championship athletic conferences lag behind in degree completion, institutional cultures emphasizing academic eligibility over degree completion, and growing medical evidence of the risk of “routine” subconcussive head trauma associated with some sports in their current form.
• Ensuring an accessible but fiscally sustainable university, which involves the confluence of faculty workload and evaluation, faculty-generated revenue streams, and issues (yes, that are still with us) surrounding the security, development, freedom, and status of lecturers.

Your fondness for difficult problems and questions is probably why you BECAME a faculty member. These issues are good reasons to REMAIN one, and should not be sources of dismay or disengagement. Rather, they should be sources of professional urgency and fulfillment. There’s never been a better time to be a faculty member!
The aforementioned challenges are upon us. THEY can shape our future as we REACT to them, or WE can shape our own future in RESPONDING to them by working together.

I believe our administration and Board is committed to the latter. With Senate elections a month or two away, please consider working with them, serving your colleagues, and creating the future for Clemson faculty.

I wish you a safe and rejuvenating holiday break!"

Remarks by the Staff Senate President, Julia Lusk - "Hello everyone and thank you for allowing me the opportunity to speak with you on behalf of staff.

I started working at Clemson in December, 1999 and I've been involved with Staff Senate on and off since 2000 so I have always known how important it is for Staff Senators to represent the issues and concerns of staff. I also know how critical staff are in making this University run. We are the backbone of Clemson from right here on the main campus to all of our extension agencies. This fall we had an extra 200 students admitted. These students were oriented by staff, housed by staff, financial aid was given by staff, advising for courses was done by staff, registration issues were taken care of by staff, finding classroom space was done by staff. The set up of this meeting, done by staff. Tomorrow’s TWO graduations will be successful because of the logistical accomplishments of staff. (I think you get the picture) I would be remiss to not take a moment to let all staff know how much I appreciate them and to tell them we successfully completed one more semester, so Job Well Done!!!

As Staff Senate President, I hope I have been a good representative for staff. I wanted to become Staff Senate President not because I had a particular agenda, but because I thought it would be fun. And it has been! I have had so much fun participating in various events across campus and getting to know so many really amazing people. Staff Senate has done a lot of fun things to benefit the University, the staff, and the community.

The Homecoming Habitat House that was started on Bowman Field in 2011 was a joint effort among students, faculty, staff and the area Catholic churches. The students started the house on Bowman and when it moved to its permanent location in Central, faculty, staff, and community folks helped to complete it. On September 9th it was dedicated to the Arredondo Family and that was such a moving service. Diana, the matriarch, was so overcome with emotion that she could barely find the words to thank all who helped make her family’s dream home a reality. For those of you who participated in that build – Thank You!

On Saturday, October 27th, Staff Senate participated in the inaugural Team Up for Clemson Regatta. This was a joint effort between the University and the City of Clemson to raise money for local charities (Clemson Community Center, Clemson Free Clinic, Littlejohn Community Center, etc). The six team members from Staff Senate were Angela Nixon (team captain), Matt Bundrick, Terri Vaughan, Judy Tribble, Brandie Bargeloh and myself. I must say prior to the event I was a bit nervous about how to get in and out of those skinny little crew boats. But my fears were unwarranted as we were able to complete the race without tipping the boat over! We came in dead last, but at least we finished. All 33 teams had a lot of fun! According to the City of Clemson’s website, over $8,000 was raised. Can’t wait for next year’s regatta!

Speaking of inaugural events, Staff Senate hosted its inaugural 5K fundraiser on November 3rd to raise money for our Scholarship Fund. There were 89 runners, walkers and more than 20 children participated
in the Fun Run. Over $4,000 was raised for our Scholarship Fund. We received a lot of positive feedback to help us make next year’s 5K even more successful. Thanks to President Barker for running in it and showing his support of Staff Senate. I think he will agree with me that the hill going to the Rowing Center was a killer! I do believe Staff Senate can now claim to have the most challenging 5K course on campus.

Speaking of our Scholarship Fund, because of generous support from faculty and staff who give through payroll deduction and other ways, we were able to increase the amount of money we give for scholarships. Ten scholarships are given yearly to children of staff members. This year we increased the amount from $1,150 to $1,500 per year. Yesterday I received a very nice thank you letter from Sara Webb, one of the recipients.

Other fun events I’ve participated in this semester are the Integration with Dignity Anniversary events. I thoroughly enjoyed listening to Harvey Gantt as he kicked off the academic year at August’s Convocation, to attending a speech by Dr. Blakey, Professor of Anthropology at William and Mary, who gave an informative account of how one looks at race through an anthropological viewpoint, to seeing displays at Cooper Library. More events are planned after the new year and I encourage you to attend these events commemorating such an important milestone in Clemson’s history.

In February, Staff Senate’s Activities Committee will be having its annual Food Drive with the theme of “Have a Heart.” As you make your grocery run, please take a moment to put aside a few extra non-perishable goods to give to this effort in February.

I want to thank President Barker for keeping staff in mind during the development of the 2020 roadmap and the compensation plan. Staff Senate looks forward to continuing to be part of that process.

Finally, I want to thank President Barker, once again, for his continued support of the Staff Development Program. This program gives staff members the opportunity to develop personally, professionally, and become involved with service activities at Clemson and in the community. It is in its third year with fifty graduates and 24 current members. Some comments from the program’s graduates: Meg Williamson, Plant Diagnostician, “A year long program with results that last a lifetime.”; Jim Piekutowski, Information Technology Manager, “I have learned a lot about myself and what I am capable of doing when I set my mind to it. I am happy with the results and I look forward to volunteering more in the future.” (he now volunteers with the SDP Steering Committee); Robin Lay, Accountant/Fiscal Analyst, “SDP gives us the ability to be proactive in our own careers and helps us take the initiative to get where we want to be.”

Thank you again and I wish everyone a very happy and safe holiday season. But above all else – Have Fun!!!

Remarks by the Clemson University President, James F. Barker – “Good afternoon.

Thank you all for being here, and congratulations to all our faculty and staff award winners. We are grateful for your service to our university and our students. We are proud of you and I’m honored to be your colleague.

Faculty and Staff leaders, this academic year is turning out to be a year of significant anniversaries and milestones.

At Fall Convocation, I talked about the 150th anniversary of the Morrill Act, which established our nationwide system of public, land grant universities.
Harvey Gantt was our speaker in August, in recognition of the activities leading up to the 50th anniversary of his historic admission, in 1963, as Clemson's first black student. The highlight of that celebration will take place in January.

Also in 2013, we will celebrate 100 years of architectural education at Clemson, as well as the 40th anniversary of the Charles E. Daniel Center in Genoa, Italy.

That will come during a new regional event -- Upstate International month in March -- and Clemson is a sponsor of that effort to recognize the extent to which Upstate South Carolina is, truly, an international community.

* * * *

Let me just briefly this morning touch on some highlights of the Fall semester -- as we look toward our spring semester together.

- Work was completed on the new Life Sciences building. Faculty and staff are moving in and getting settled. A formal dedication and grand opening is planned for February, so watch for details on that.

- We implemented the 2nd year of our 5-year Compensation Plan. Combined with the 3% across the board raise from the State, that was good news. I've noticed a few more smiles on campus recently.

- **Clemson is Hiring.** We are in the investment phase of our Divest to Invest strategy. Ads will appear in January in the Chronicle of Higher Education and Inside Higher Education announcing that Clemson is recruiting for 100 new tenured and tenure-track faculty positions to support high-quality undergraduate education and to build research in strategic focus areas identified in our Clemson 2020 Plan.

There was a proposal process with significant faculty input in determining these strategic hires. Thank you to all who participated.

These 100 positions include 10 Endowed Chairs and a number of named professorships.

Search committees are also at work to find Deans for two colleges -- Engineering and Science ... and Business and Behavioral Science.

- For our **SACS Self-Study and Reaccreditation:**
  We submitted our Compliance report in September and had an off-site peer review in November. The issues raised by that review are being addressed.

Our QEP (Quality Enhancement Plan on Critical Thinking) will be submitted in late February, after which we will welcome our On-site Review Team in April.

I'd like to thank Dr. Debbie Jackson and all the faculty and staff members who have given so much time and attention to these efforts. I appreciate your service and everything you do for Clemson.

* * * *

I'll close with a reminder of why we are here ... and the significance of ceremonial events like graduation tomorrow.

It will be a day of celebration and gathering together for many, many families, including the family of Christy Hambright.
Christy will receive her BS degree in nursing at our 1:30 ceremony. Watching will be her husband Clay and her son Dylan Adams. They won't be in the audience at Littlejohn, however. They will be watching online and cheering from half a world away in Afghanistan, where they are both deployed with the same Army National Guard unit.

As if we needed any reminding, the events of the last two weeks remind us once again of a truth of the human condition. No community is untouched by armed conflict abroad and violent crime at home.

A Clemson student was the victim of a homicide 11 days ago. Our hearts go out to his family and to the families of Newtown, Connecticut – one of the safest communities in America – which this week is mourning the loss of 20 children and 6 elementary school teachers in another senseless school shooting.

We know that bad things can and do happen anywhere. Student safety is, and must be, our top priority – as a university and as a nation. We must review, again, our efforts to keep our students safe from harm.

Yet we must also resolve to look with clear eyes at a culture than enables too many tragedies like these to occur. As a university with a mission to confront, research and solve problems … and a spirit for public service based in our Land Grant heritage … Clemson and higher education has a role to play in that clear-eyed search for answers and solutions.

In the days and weeks immediately before us, however, we will gather ourselves and our loved ones close … and celebrate things like graduation and Christmas in spite of our heartbreak.

We will count our blessings in our families, and in this family called Clemson.

Thank you, and God bless you. See you in January.”

8. **Old Business:** None

9. **New Business:** None

10. **Adjournment:** Provost Helms adjourned the General Faculty Meeting at 1:45 p.m.

Denise Anderson, Secretary, Faculty Senate

Monica A. Patterson, Program Coordinator
Presentation to the Faculty Senate, Tuesday, January 8, 2013

The subject of my presentation today is one that I have already mentioned in public, at a town hall meeting early last year and in a letter to the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of South Carolina more than a year ago. It merits continued attention, in my opinion ... and that is why I am here.

I am talking about the structure of the Board of Trustees of Clemson University and my concerns about the example being set by its seven “life” members (there are 13 in all). I think that they are cheating, yes, cheating. Or at the very least, they are demonstrating that they are content to weasel out of what, on the surface, looks like a direct violation of the oath that they sign before being seated ... much like a student who tries to weasel out of the fact that he or she has written a paper copying practically word for word some article off the Internet but with one or two words changed. I don’t think that this comes close to meeting the standard of a “high seminary of learning.” And I suggest that this example, set at the very top of our administrative pyramid, can have a devastating effect on morale at every level.

Let me start with the oath. I am reading now from a document entitled “Life Trustee Oath.” It has the seal of Clemson University at the top of the page and David Wilkins’ name at the bottom. It reads as follows:

“I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I voluntarily accept the duties of a Life Trustee of Clemson University, to which office I have been elected, and I will, to the best of my ability, discharge the duties and responsibilities thereof in accordance with the laws of this State and the policies of the Life Trustees, as they may be changed from time to time by the Life Trustees, and that I will preserve, protect and defend the constitution of this State and the United States.”

Pretty clear and straightforward.

Before I go any further, let me say in passing that the term “Life Trustee” is not only used in this oath. It is used on the Board of Trustee’s WEB site and by the entire Clemson community when referring to them.

Now, let me turn to the laws of this State and its constitution. In Chapter 1, General Provisions, of Section 8-1-10, Public Officers, we read: “The term “public officers” shall be construed to mean all officers of the State that have heretofore been commissioned and trustees of the various colleges of the State, members of various State boards and other persons whose duties are defined by law.” There can be no doubt about the fact that Clemson’s “life” trustees are therefore officers of the State, all the more because this fact has been claimed by Clemson’s own legal counsel in two different law suits over the past few years and ruled as such by both judges.

In the Constitution under Article XVII, Miscellaneous Matters, Section 1B, we read: “No person shall be elected or appointed in this State for life or during good behavior, but the terms of all officers shall be for some specific period of time, except Notaries Public and officers of the Militia.”

And lastly, in Section 11 of the same article, we read: “All officers, State, executive, legislative, judicial, circuit, district, County, township and municipal, who may be in office at the adoption of this Constitution, or who may be elected before the election of their successors as herein provided, shall hold their respective offices until their terms of office have expired and until their successors are elected and qualified as provided in this Constitution, unless sooner removed as may be provided by law.”
The will of Thomas Green Clemson was accepted by the Legislature under the Constitution of 1865 and the current Constitution was adopted in 1895. I interpret this to mean that the “life trustees” originally appointed to serve when the Clemson Agricultural College was created could serve out their terms, either until they died or resigned, but that their successors were bound by law to conform to the current Constitution. To my knowledge, the last of these original trustees died in 1920.

Just on the merits of these observations, it appears that the “life” trustees of Clemson University are in violation of their oath and have been for almost a hundred years.

Now, when the majority members of the governing body of our university apparently are able to get away with violating their solemn oath, when they in essence cheat, I ask you as representatives of the faculty of this educational institution to ponder the impact of their conduct. If it is acceptable for them to do this, what example are they setting? If they can cheat, why should the administrators, faculty, staff and students be held to any other standard?

To my way of thinking, this is a concern that should be at the heart of everyone in this room.

Now, I am fully aware of the potential consequences of any action concerning this matter. Some will argue that any violation of the terms of Thomas Green Clemson’s will would nullify the State’s acceptance and force it to return the property to Mr. Clemson’s heirs. I personally doubt that those heirs would insist upon that, given the size and importance of the University today. But one never knows. Others will argue that the status quo has existed for so long and has been accepted for so long that precedent should prevail. Or others could bring up the fact that the Supreme Court has already ruled on this matter in favor of Clemson. But in that case, a century ago, Clemson cleverly argued that it was a municipality and not a state institution. Still others will try to say that, in fact, the “life members” have imposed upon themselves an age limit for retirement and that they therefore comply with the Constitution. But the “life trustees” have already changed that limit once to accommodate a fellow trustee and could make it any age they want by a simple internal vote.

In conclusion, and probably for the last time that I will come before you with controversial matters, I humble suggest that you give some thought to this, that you share this information with your constituents, and that you discuss it among yourselves. The ethical conduct of any educational institution, taken as a whole, is, after all, at the core of the institution’s values. If Clemson aspires to the status of a “higher seminary of learning,” this matter should be resolved … for the good of Clemson University.

Thankyou.
LIFE TRUSTEE OATH

I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I voluntarily accept the duties of a Life Trustee of Clemson University, to which office I have been elected, and that I will, to the best of my ability, discharge the duties and responsibilities thereof in accordance with the laws of this State and the policies of the Life Trustees, as may be changed from time to time by the Life Trustees, and that I will preserve, protect and defend the constitution of this State and of the United States.

David H. Wilkins
The State Retirement open enrollment period for all Optional Retirement Program (ORP) participants is from January 1 through March 1 of each year. During this period of time, ORP participants can change vendors, or if eligible, irrevocably switch to the South Carolina Retirement System Plan (SCRS). In order to switch to the SCRS plan, participants must have a minimum of 12 months of participation, but no more than 60 months of participation by March 1, 2013. There are many rules and regulations associated with changing to the SCRS plan so staff who are interested in this option are encouraged to meet with an HR Representative.

All changes associated with open enrollment must be made no later than March 1, 2013. Additional information and resources about retirement plans can be found online at http://www.retirement.sc.gov/employees/default.htm.

For questions about State Retirement open enrollment or to request a meeting with an HR Representative, please contact the Office of Human Resources online at Ask-HR or by phone at 864-656-2000.
1. Call to Order: The Faculty Senate Meeting was called to order at 2:34 p.m. by President Jeremy King.

2. Approval of Minutes: The Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes dated January 8, 2013 were approved as written and distributed.

3. "Free Speech": None

4. Slate of Officers: The Slate of Officers was presented by the Executive/Advisory Committees and nominees provided brief statements regarding their interest and experiences.
   - Vice President/President-Elect: Denise Anderson (HEHD)
     Antonis Katsiyannis (HEHD)
   - Secretary: Alan Grubb (AAH)
     Graciela Tissera (AAH)

5. Special Order of the Day: G. Graham “Goz” Segars, Chair of the Board of Directors, Clemson University Foundation; Hack Trammell, Foundation President & CEO; and, Brian O’Rourke, Executive Director of Development provided an overview of the Foundation’s mission, vision, core values, six strategic goals and an update regarding the Will To Lead campaign. Goal number one, Fundraising and Culture of Philanthropy, includes raising at least $100 million annually and goal three, Endowment Building, includes a commitment of $60 million in cash for endowment funds raised in the second phase of the campaign. The Will To Lead campaign, Clemson’s third capital campaign, is in its seventh year with $660 million raised thus far. Clemson’s goal of reaching $1 billion will be a first for a public institution of Clemson’s alumnae size. There are 393 new scholarships and $43 million for endowed chairs, which are matched by the state. Faculty are encouraged to introduce themselves to their development officer (Brian O’Rourke can help with this), become a priority in your department, and engage prospective donors.

Jackie Todd, Clemson’s new Director of Internal Communications, presented changes in internal communications at Clemson. Major changes in development include a “one source” Faculty-Staff website for University information. Inside NOW email notices are now one page with links to full stories and the University calendar. Todd asked Faculty Senate for feedback regarding their communications preferences in both channel and content and announced a faculty communications survey to collect additional information.

Tanya DeOliveira, a Planner with Clemson University Planning & Design, discussed the idea to designate part of the central campus as more pedestrian-friendly through the concept of a Walk Zone. This concept has been in development over the fall 2012 semester by the University Planning and Design Office in collaboration with the University Police Department and vetted through Undergraduate and Graduate Student
Governments. The Walk Zone project does not impact, nor are there plans to consider, automobiles.

Michelle Piekutowski, Interim Chief Human Resources Officer, provided the 2012 compensation plan summary. The University provided $10.7 million in performance and market-based salary increases. There were raises for 274 of 312 professors, with an average increase of $13,598 and raises for 576 of 659 associate and assistant professors and lecturers. Staff and administrator pay was found to be at the average of the market. There was also a three percent across-the-board pay raise for all employees, which was partially funded by the state. Piekutowski said objective, competitive, and data-driven compensation decisions will continue as part of the 2020 Road Map goal of recruiting and retaining top people.

Vice President/President-Elect Kelly Smith received information that many faculty were missing performance feedback in their salary adjustment notification letters from Department Chairs, resulting in the perception of too much reliance on market data. Provost Helms reminded the Senate that Chairs submitted required performance-based matrices to justify adjustment requests, and that performance information should have been distributed to faculty.

6. Committee Reports:
   a. Senate Committees:

   Scholastic Policies – Chair David Tonkyn submitted and outlined the Committee Report dated January 24, 2013 and a draft survey for Department Chairs on the use of student teaching evaluations.

   Chair Tonkyn provided a summary of applicable items discussed at the Council on Undergraduate Studies (CUGS) December 14th meeting: phasing in of Banner, statistics on applications and transfers, and the recent judgment by SACS on our Gen Ed curriculum. At this meeting, faculty were cautioned that they are accountable for everything in their syllabi, such as meeting office hours, posting mid-term grades, etc., or face possible grievances. Perry Austin of Undergraduate Student Government provided Scholastic Policies with the Final Report of the Student Senate General Education Revision Task Force, which was sent to Dr. Jan Murdoch. This report was neither supported nor opposed by Scholastic Policies, but provided to Faculty Senate for its information.

   Chair Tonkyn reported that the Senator Graciela Tissera developed the survey on the use of student teaching evaluations with Linda Nilson (Director, Office of Teaching Effectiveness and Innovation) and Debbie Jackson (Vice Provost for Academic Affairs). Editorial Consultant, Fran McGuire suggested that Post Tenure Review Committees and their Chairs receive the same information, including the survey.

   Finance – Chair Antonis Katsiyannis announced that in a joint Finance and Budget Accountability Committees meeting, scheduled for February 19th, the Vice President for Finance and Operations will discuss the University’s long-term maintenance plan.

   Research – Chair Jim McCubbin submitted and outlined the Committee Report dated January 22, 2013. Chair McCubbin reported that the committee discussed changes in the university research office and how to provide feedback to the new Vice President for
Research on perceptions of institutional support for research. The Committee then went into executive session for discussion of a personnel matter.

Welfare – Chair Diane Perpich submitted the Committee Report dated January 15, 2013 which Senator and committee member, Susanna Ashton outlined. Senator Ashton reported that the January meeting as a planning meeting for February when they will host Vice Provost for Faculty Development, Nadim Aziz to discuss results of the Provost Summary of the COACHE report. The committee will raise issues regarding benefits, faculty recognition and mentoring, and departmental level leadership – all areas where faculty indicated they had concerns.

Policy – Chair Bill Pennington stated that a proposed Faculty Manual change to Part IV. Personnel Practices, Section E. Annual Performance Evaluation will be presented under New Business.

b. ad hoc Faculty Senate Committees

Budget Accountability Committee – Chair Antonis Katsiyannis announced that in a joint Finance and Budget Accountability Committees meeting, scheduled for February 19th, the Vice President for Finance and Operations will discuss the University’s long-term maintenance plan.

c. University Commissions and Committees: None

7. Old Business: None

8. New Business:

a. Policy Chair Bill Pennington outlined the proposed changes from Faculty Senate Executive/Advisory Committees to the Faculty Senate Procedural Bylaws. This includes the addition of number (9) Faculty Senate Delegates and change to number (2) Regular meeting agenda. The modification proposed would add two lecturers from each college (excluding the Library where there are no lecturers) to the Faculty Senate. These delegates can vote in committee, but not in Senate meetings. There was no discussion and the vote to accept the proposal passed with required 2/3 approval.

b. Finance and Budget Accountability Chair Antonis Katsiyannis outlined a proposed Resolution from Faculty Senate Executive/Advisory Committees where “…Faculty Senate gratefully recognizes the support of and efforts by the University administration and Board of Trustees in implementing performance-driven and market-based salaries for University faculty”. The Senate recommends that “a robust, sustainable, and more transparent process be established in order to ensure performance-driven and market-based salaries going forward”. There was no discussion. The vote to accept the proposal passed with requisite 2/3 approval and is titled FS13-02-1 P.

c. Policy Chair Bill Pennington outlined the Policy Committee’s proposed Faculty Manual change (already approved by the Senate Executive/Advisory Committees) to Part IV. Personnel Practices, E. Annual Performance Evaluation. The modification proposed would eliminate hard copy forms 1, 2 and 3 and offer online check boxes to indicate approval. Where there is a disagreement in the establishment of goals between faculty member and chair/director, the dean, after consultation with the faculty member, will
have final responsibility to determine duties and goals and to set the percentage of
emphasis distributed among goals.

Senator Goddard objected, offering that the proposal was too specific for the *Faculty
Manual*. Following discussion, the Senate voted to accept the proposal with the requisite
2/3 approval. President King suggested that the Policy Committee include Provost Helms
and Vice Provost Debbie Jackson with Director of Institutional Research, Wikes
Westcott, III, when updating online forms.

d. Scholastic Policies Chair Dave Tonkyn received an informal Senate endorsement
of the Committee’s survey on the use of student teaching evaluations. Senator Grubb
suggested stronger emphasis of the survey’s purpose, in that the Committee is seeking to
collect current practices rather than aspirations.

9. President’s Report:
a. Year-end Senate Committee Reports and recommendations are due to the Faculty
Senate Office for the April 9th Senate meeting.
b. The allocation of Senate seats has been determined and this information will be sent
to lead Senators and Deans by the end of this week and thereafter to all faculty.
AFLS lost two seats and E&S gained two seats.
c. At their January meeting, the Board of Trustees, endorsed a joint task force to
evaluate and revise the sections of the *Faculty Manual* regarding administrative
searches.
d. Krissy Kaylor, HR Director of Benefits, will meet with the Senate’s Welfare
Committee regarding benefits for faculty with special rank.

10. Announcements:
a. Next Faculty Senate meeting – March 12th
b. Next Executive/Advisory Committees meeting – March 26th (4th Tuesday)
c. John Mueller, HR Director of Customer Service, made an announcement
regarding the insurance Premium Increase and Semi-Monthly Payroll. The Office of
Human Resources will provide information on the South Carolina Supreme Court’s
decision regarding insurance premium increases when it becomes available. This
decision only impacts employees enrolled in the Standard State Health Plan or Savings
Plan. Employees enrolled in the HMO BlueChoice Plan were notified on December 20
about the 2013 increase.

Beginning June 2013, Clemson University will transition to a semi-monthly pay
cycle. As a result of the change, there will be fewer paydays each year, but the amount of
money in each check will be slightly larger. An online tool has been developed which you
can use to see how this change will impact your pay: Semi-Monthly Pay Calculation
Tool. For additional information, visit the Semi-Monthly Paycheck Changes Web
page. For questions, contact the Office of Human Resources online at Ask-HR or by
phone at 864-656-2000.

d. Adjuonment: President King adjourned the meeting at 4:35 p.m.
Also present: Nadim Aziz (Vice Provost for Faculty Development), Dave Blakesley (Faculty Representative to the Board of Trustees), Matt DeLlasala (PhD Student, Educational Leadership), Gordon Halfacre (Ombudsman for Faculty and Students), Dori Helms (Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs), Debbie Jackson (Vice Provost of Assessment), Fran McGuire (Editorial Consultant of the Faculty Manual), John Mueller (HR Director of Customer Service), Monica Patterson (Faculty Senate Program Coordinator), Lori Pinder (PhD Student, Educational Leadership), Suzanne Rook Schilf (Alternate), Rumame Samuels (HR Director, Recruitment, Compensation & Benefits)

Faculty Senate Presentation
February 12, 2013

What is the Vision of the Clemson University Foundation?
The Clemson University Foundation will be a longterm, stable and
significant provider of resources in supporting Clemson University's goals.

Why am I passionate about it?

Who will help us realize our Vision?
Our Mission

The mission of the Clemson University Foundation, established in 1933, is to support Clemson University by promoting growth and stewardship of resources entrusted to us which fulfill our covenants with donors.

Our Core Values

In all that we do, the Clemson University Foundation will conduct itself with the strictest adherence to the following core values:

- Integrity
- Transparency
- Accountability
- Donor focus

These core values, when lived out, will inspire the confidence of our key stakeholders, create the most productive and rewarding work environment and best position the foundation in fulfilling its vision.
Development of the 2020 Strategic Plan

- As the Foundation has grown into more than a $500 million endowment, we have made a commitment to align ourselves with University priorities through a new 2020 Strategic plan.
- The plan incorporates six broad goals with specific strategies and measurable outcomes for each.
- We have partnered with the Development Enterprise and the Will to Lead Campaign to bring in the funding needed to support this plan.

Plan Strategic Goals

1. Fundraising and Culture of Philanthropy
2. Stewardship
3. Endowment Building
4. Investment Management
5. Governance
6. Nimble Partner
Development Enterprise
*Will to Lead* Campaign

What does it mean to us?

Campaign Plan Priorities

1. Students
2. Faculty
3. Facilities
4. Student Engagement
How are we doing?

as of 2/1/13

Goal (in millions)

Actual (in millions)

Program Counts

by campaign priorities

as of 2/1/13

19 new endowed chairs w/ matching state funds.
Totals by Gift Type
as of 2/1/13

4 Ways You Can Help

1. Get to know your Development Officers.
2. Become a priority in your College.
3. Bring folks to the table.
4. Provide superior stewardship of your gifts.
A Clemson Initiative

We need your help to make this happen.
2020 Clemson University Foundation
Strategic Plan

**OUR MISSION**
To support Clemson University by promoting growth and stewardship of resources entrusted to us which fulfill our covenants with donors.

**OUR VISION**
To be a long-term, stable and significant provider of resources in supporting Clemson University's goals.

**OUR CORE VALUES**
- Integrity
- Transparency
- Accountability
- Donor focus

To inspire the confidence of our key stakeholders, create the most productive and rewarding work environment, and best position the Foundation in fulfilling its vision.

**OUR STRATEGIC GOALS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal #1: Fundraising and Culture of Philanthropy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Foundation will provide counsel to the University and provide leadership, relationships, infrastructure and financial support to enable the University to achieve its fundraising goals and support the concept of intergenerational equity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Challenges:** Increased fundraising is fully dependent upon the provision of additional resources, both by the University and the Foundation. CUF must receive the "right kind" and increasing amounts of gifts. The generation of a specific administrative management fee can only be sustained if the long-term endowment investment returns can cover payout, administrative management fee and inflation.

**Commitment:**
- Endorse the goal and provide resources to the Development Enterprise in support of a consistent, annual fundraising total of at least $100 million
- Add significant additional staff and enhance support functions, tools and technology
- Benchmark performance and real accountability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal #2: Stewardship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Foundation will provide Clemson benefactors a superior donor experience through fulfillment of donor intentions, appropriate use of funds and expressions of impact and gratitude.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Challenges:** Redefine, allocate resources and communicate stewardship across campus in support of private giving, a critical success factor.

**Commitment:**
- Support the University’s Stewardship Vision Statement
- Educate students, faculty, administrators and staff about philanthropy’s impact on the Clemson experience
- Establish accountability through modification of job descriptions, recruitment, selection and ongoing evaluation of personnel; include accountability theme in key University communications
- Provide appropriate systems support and annual impact reports tailored to donor’s level of giving; assign responsibilities to key officers; measure donor satisfaction
Goal #3: Endowment Building
The Foundation will grow the endowment through intentional fundraising and policy in accordance with its fiduciary duty, in the interest of intergenerational equity and in support of students and faculty.

Challenges: The 2020 Road Map has numerous initiatives that need sustainable streams of income that will come only through endowment payouts. Clemson's endowment size relative to those rated in the top 20 public institutions is below average.

Commitment:
- A minimum of $60 million in cash for endowment funds raised in the second phase of the Will To Lead campaign
- The CUF Board to provide leadership in conveying the importance and significance of endowment giving among donors and other University stakeholders
- Provide education, product development, policy alignment and metrics to track progress

Goal #4: Investment Management
The Foundation will achieve, over the long term, an average annual total return that exceeds the sum of the Foundation's approved payout plus inflation plus investment management and related fees. CUF will effectively steward payout and administrative fee practices with an aim to achieve intergenerational equity and maintain an individual endowment's purchasing power.

Challenges: Great uncertainty and substantial volatility in the financial markets present challenges across the global economy. Producing investment returns that cover the three identified components at current levels will require substantive competence and execution.

Commitment:
- Continually refine processes to drive best practice and stakeholder communication -
  - Distributions & Capital Preservation - employ prudent fiscal practices that aim to support the needs of Clemson University today and tomorrow
  - Investment Process & Approach - continually improve our investment science to ensure policies and practices generate resources for the current and future needs of Clemson University
  - Performance & Risk Management - critically review all facets of the portfolio to ensure proper management and safeguarding of assets

Goal #5: Governance
The Foundation will govern with integrity, best practices, adherence to Foundation values and the highest ethical standards.

Challenges: Serving our mission of support for Clemson University and fulfilling our fiduciary duty to our donors require us to continue to have an engaged, equipped and appropriately structured governance.

Commitment:
- Monitor other foundations' best practices and internal perspectives in order to benchmark our constitution and code of conduct
- Monitor board member attendance and proactively build dialogue opportunities into committee meetings; evolve our nominations process; survey the board annually to identify areas of needed improvement
- Enhance reporting and dialogue with key University officials and trustees

Goal #6: Nimble Partner
The Foundation will partner with the University on high priority initiatives where CUF can provide "landscape-changing" impact.

Challenges: CUF holds limited unrestricted resources, representing less than 4% of its overall endowment. To best serve its mission, CUF benefits by growing its unrestricted endowment to serve its identified roles (e.g., endowment payout stability, generating income as part of its funding model). There must be a balance between the growth of these unrestricted resources for future initiatives and advantaging the University by deploying those same scarce resources to provide outsized impact.

Commitment:
- Provide willing support to "landscape-changing" initiatives and maintain processes to monitor the growth of its unrestricted resources
- Evaluate the impact of supported initiatives and be open to these opportunities
Changing Internal Communications

Where we are now
Where we want to go

How do we get there?

- Better categorize news and information
- Introduce guidelines concerning dissemination of news
- Ask your audience what they want
Inside NOW—What it was

• Email with 9-12 pages of text
• Viewed as “too long,” “a marketing tool,” a vehicle for advertising events
• No graphics
• Lack of identity

Inside NOW—in transition

• Is one page
• Links in place of text
• Events/seminar/classes go in the University calendar with links from Inside NOW
• Future state—graphics!
Faculty-Staff webpage
http://www.clemson.edu/faculty-staff/index.html

- Position as the “one source”
- Reduce the “chaff”
- Future state – customization, trending, better interactivity
- Example: http://today.duke.edu/working

What I need from you

- Feedback
- Two-way communication
- Patience as we transition 😊
What is a Walk Zone?

- Designated area of high pedestrian activity
- Not a place for bicyclists, rollerbladers, skateboards, and other kinds of wheeled transport

Designated area
Dismount Zone Close Ups

- Prevents extension of street network
- In the middle of campus paths
Special Order: Michelle Piekutowski
Interim Chief Human Resources Officer

Mrs. Piekutowski provided the 2012 compensation plan summary.

No presentation was submitted.
FACULTY SENATE SCHOLASTIC POLICIES
Agenda for meeting held Thursday, January 24, 2013
12:30 am - 2:00 pm
Room 301 of the Academic Success Center

SCHOLASTIC POLICIES COMMITTEE 2012-2013
Wayne Goddard (goddard) (E&S)
Alan Grubb (agrub) (AAH)
John Leininger (ljohn) (BBS)
Domnita Marinescu (dcm) (E&S)
Graciela Tissera (gtisser) (AAH)
David Tonkyn (tdavid) (AFLS)

Attending: Alan Grubb, John Leininger, Graciela Tissera, David Tonkyn

Invited guests: Linda Nilson (Director, Office of Teaching Effectiveness and Innovation), Debra Jackson (Vice-Provost for Academic Affairs)

Old business

Evaluation of Instruction Form: Graciela Tissera presented a draft department chairs’ survey on the use of student teaching evaluations, developed with assistance from Linda Nilson and Debra Jackson. Both were in attendance while we discussed this survey, and we proposed several additional changes. These changes were incorporated in a new draft which was distributed to the committee and approved by email vote (5 in favor with 1 abstention) to forward to the full Senate for action. The approved text is provided as a separate attachment, while the formatted version can be viewed at https://clemsonia.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_2nTfpylw7LaF0qx

Bridge Program: Alan Grubb continues to gather information on admission criteria, performance and graduation rates of Bridge students compared with traditional students.

Faculty Advisory Board on Online Education: John Leininger reported that the December 13th meeting of the Board was the first to be chaired by an elected Chair, who is a faculty member. DeWitt Salley, Director of Online Education, was present but wants this to be run by faculty. This first meeting was a brainstorming one.

Council on Undergraduate Studies: David Tonkyn attended the CUGS meeting on Dec. 14, and raised three items of interest to this committee: the Bridge program, the chairs’ evaluation of teaching, and granting transfer credit to 3xx level courses taught at 2 year colleges as part of articulation agreements. CUGS also discussed the phasing in of Banner, statistics on applications and transfers, and the recent judgment by SACS on our Gen Ed curriculum. Faculty were cautioned that they are accountable for everything in their syllabi, such as meeting office hours, posting mid-term grades, etc., or face possible grievances.
Undergraduate Admissions Committee  David Tonkyn attended the Dec. 17 meeting, which approved the minimal admissions standards for the fall of 2013, by program and residence status (in-state or out). The only change was to make admission possible for students with a 2.60 GPA for applicants to the BFA program in CAAH.

General Education changes  At previous SP meetings, we have discussed with Perry Austin of the Student Senate their ideas on reforming the General Education requirements. Perry did not attend this meeting but afterwards copied us on the Final Report of the Student Senate General Education Revision Task Force, which was sent to Dr. Jan Murdoch. By email vote (5 in favor and 1 abstention), we approved forwarding this to the Faculty Senate for its information. We have not discussed this report as a committee, so we are neither in support nor opposition to any of its ideas, but we thought it important for all to see, and ask for guidance on how to proceed. It is forwarded separately from this report.

FAS Advisory Committee  The FAS advisory Committee met at 2:00 pm on Thursday, Jan. 24, after the SP meeting, so there were no decisions to report. However, each of the Advisory Committee members was asked to interview faculty at all ranks plus a department chair with specific questions on FAS, and the meeting was planned to identify critical issues to address. David Tonkyn is one of two Faculty Senators on this committee.

New business
Because we spent so much time finalizing the chair’s survey, we simply ran out of time to discuss several new items that have arisen. These will be taken up at the next meeting.

Permanent fall break  Wayne Goddard has raised this issue of a permanent fall break, separate from mandated election day holidays, as a solution to the problems we had last year.

Informing students of alternate sources for required materials  We have been asked to address this issue, which has just come up.

Racial inequalities in Div. I Championship conferences report  Jeremy King sent out a report last December from the Penn State Center for the Study of Race and Equity in Education which clearly documents lower graduation rates for male black athletes in Division I schools than for other black or white students. There is no directive on which, if any, Faculty Senate committees might explore this issue.

Financial exigency/closure  Jeremy King has asked a number of Faculty Senate committees to look at the new AAUP financial exigency/program closure guidelines. Again, it is not clear which Faculty Senate committees have responsibility here.
Purpose of this survey: This survey is a request from the Faculty Senate to gather information about the Student Assessment of Instructors and the process used by Chairs to evaluate faculty in the area of teaching.

1. Which of the following do you use to assess lecturer's/instructor's teaching for annual evaluations? (Select all that apply)

- Evidence-based measurements of student learning (such as pre and post testing or student work samples) that meet defined student learning outcomes.
- Evaluation (by peers and/or administrators) of course materials, learning objectives, and examinations.
- In-class visitation by peers and/or administrators.
- A statement by the faculty member describing his/her methods and/or a teaching philosophy.
- Exit interview/surveys with current graduates/alumni.
- Additional criteria as appropriate for the discipline and degree level of the students.
- A statement by the faculty member of methods or philosophy that also describes and documents how feedback from student rating of course experiences or evaluation instruments were used to improve teaching.
- Student Assessment of Instructors standard form.

2. Which of the following do you use to assess tenure-track faculty's teaching for annual evaluations? (Select all that apply)

- Evidence-based measurements of student learning (such as pre and post testing or student work samples) that meet defined student learning outcomes.
- Evaluation (by peers and/or administrators) of course materials, learning objectives, and examinations.
- In-class visitation by peers and/or administrators.
- A statement by the faculty member describing his/her methods and/or a teaching philosophy.
- Exit interview/surveys with current graduates/alumni.
- Additional criteria as appropriate for the discipline and degree level of the students.
- A statement by the faculty member of methods or philosophy that also describes and documents how feedback from student rating of course experiences or evaluation instruments were used to improve teaching.
- Student Assessment of Instructors standard form.

3. Which of the following do you use to assess tenured faculty's teaching for annual evaluations? (Select all that apply)

- Evidence-based measurements of student learning (such as pre and post testing or student work samples) that meet defined student learning outcomes.
- Evaluation (by peers and/or administrators) of course materials, learning objectives, and examinations.
- In-class visitation by peers and/or administrators.
- A statement by the faculty member describing his/her methods and/or a teaching philosophy.
- Exit interview/surveys with current graduates/alumni.
- Additional criteria as appropriate for the discipline and degree level of the students.
- A statement by the faculty member of methods or philosophy that also describes and documents how feedback from student rating of course experiences or evaluation instruments were used to improve teaching.
- Student Assessment of Instructors standard form.
4. Do you integrate student evaluations of faculty into your criteria for your evaluations in your department.

- Yes
- No

If you answered Yes to question 4, please explain.

5. Are the criteria for evaluation of faculty in the area of teaching in your department based on national standards?

- Yes
- No

If you answered Yes to question 5 please provide the sources.

If you answered No to question 5, please explain what criteria you use and who advises you concerning these criteria.

6. Do you discuss with faculty the criteria for your evaluation of their teaching?

- Yes
- No

If you answered Yes to question 6, please explain the procedure.
7. How important are the questions in the Student Assessment of Instructors for your evaluations of faculty? Please consider the following items:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Objectives of the class, organization, and class materials (Questions 1, 2, 3 in the Student Assessment of Instructors form)</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Not Very Important</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B. Interaction between the class and the instructor, verbal communication, and teaching methods. (Questions 4, 5, 6 in the Student Assessment of Instructors form)</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Not Very Important</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C. Explanations about assignments, tests, feedback, and student progress in the course. (Questions 7, 8, 9 in the Student Assessment of Instructors form)</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Not Very Important</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D. The instructor is an effective teacher. (Question 10 in the Student Assessment of Instructors form)</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Not Very Important</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E. Fair grading and evaluations (Questions 11 in the Student Assessment of Instructors form)</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Not Very Important</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F. Amount of work in courses, difficulty level, and required courses (Questions 12, 13, 14 in the Student Assessment of Instructors form)</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Not Very Important</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G. Availability of the instructor outside the classroom. (Question 17)</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Not Very Important</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Do you average the scores across items and use those averages in faculty review?

- Yes
- No

If you answered No to question 8, please explain which questions you use.

9. Do you assign ratings (Excellent, Very Good, Good, Fair, Marginal, or Unsatisfactory) based on the numbers received on the Student Assessment of Instructors?

- Yes
- No
If you answered Yes to question 9, please explain how you assign the ratings.


10. Do you include department questions in the Student Assessment of instructors?

- Yes
- No

If you answered Yes to question 10, please list the questions.


11. Do your faculty share with you their items (their own questions) for the evaluation?

- Yes
- No

If you answered Yes to question 11, please provide some samples.


12. Do you inform faculty that the student comments in the Student Assessment of Instructors are the property of faculty and that they have the option to provide the comments or not?

- Yes
- No

If you answered No to question 12, please explain.
13. Do you receive the student comments from faculty?
   □ Yes
   □ No

   If you answered Yes to question 13, please explain how the comments are used.

14. Do you request the student comments from faculty?
   □ Yes
   □ No

   If you answered yes to question 14, please explain how the comments are used.

15. Do you use student evaluations of faculty to compare faculty in your department?
   □ Yes
   □ No

   If you answered Yes to question 15, please explain.

16. Do you take into account difficulty level of courses and number of course preparations in the evaluation of faculty?
   □ Yes
   □ No

   If you answered Yes to question 16, please explain.
17. Do you have suggestions to improve the Student Assessment of Instructors?
   O Yes
   O No

If you answered Yes to question 17, please explain.

18. Do you require other items from faculty, aside from the Student Assessment of Instructors, to assess teaching?
   O Yes
   O No

If you answered Yes to question 18, please explain.

19. Do you consider other factors in the area of teaching aside from the Student Assessment of Instructors in faculty review?
   O Yes
   O No

If you answered Yes to question 19, please list the other factors and explain the weight for each and if these factors are published and where.

20. Does the student's response rate on the Standard Assessment of Instructors influence your
evaluation of the faculty?

- Yes
- No

If you answered Yes to question 20, please explain.

21. May we contact you for more information?

- Yes
- No

If you answered Yes to question 21, please provide your contact information.
Faculty Senate Research Committee Minutes
Report on meeting held Tuesday, January 22, 2013
3:00pm-4:30pm
419 Brackett Hall

Research Committee Membership 2012-2013:
Chair- Jim McCubbin- CBBS
Peter van den Hurk- CAFLS
Robert Hewett- AAH
Megan Mowrey-CBBS
Mike Ellison- CES
Sarah Griffin—HEHD
Julie Northcutt-CAFLS
Julia Frugoli- Non Senate Member

Attending: McCubbin, Griffin, van den Hurk, Frugoli

Agenda

Update on old business- Discussion of changes in the university research office and how to provide feedback to the new VP on perceptions of institutional support for research.

New business

Committee went into executive session for discussion of a personnel matter.
Faculty Senate Welfare Committee Report to EAC
January 15, 2013

Attending were Alan Winters, Tina Robbins, Susanna Ashton, Dale Layfield, Jay Ochterbeck, and Diane Perpich.

Our January meeting was a planning meeting for our February meeting. At the latter we will host Vice Provost for Faculty Development, Nadim Aziz to discuss the results of the Provost Summary of the COACHE report. We will be raising issues regarding benefits, faculty recognition and mentoring, and departmental level leadership - all areas where faculty indicated they had concerns. In some cases we'll be asking Vice Provost Aziz to update us on where things stand with a given set of issues, in other cases we may suggest the development new programs or policies or ask to be involved in on-going developments.

We also took a look at the “Healthy Communities” proposal headed by Alan Grubb in 2003. The committee commended the idea, but expressed hesitation about the amount of work it might take to revive the proposal. We will reconsider it late in the semester as a possible item for next year.

Additionally, on February 5th Alan Grubb, as the Welfare Committee representative for parking issues, met with Dan Hoffman (along with representatives from Staff Senate).
Proposed Change to Senate Procedural Bylaws

#2 Regular Meeting Agenda

#9 Faculty Senate Delegates (new)

9. Faculty Senate Delegates

The Faculty Senate shall confer the status of "Delegate to the Faculty Senate" on two (full time) lecturers or senior lecturers from each College in recognition of the role of these special faculty ranks in the core University enterprise and of the importance of broad input into faculty-related concerns and policy. These delegates are elected in March by (full time) Lecturers and Senior Lecturers in each College, and serve 3-year non-successive terms. Delegates to the Faculty Senate shall not vote and are not considered members of the Senate in the Faculty Manual, but have the right to attend Senate functions and make themselves heard.

2. Regular Meeting Agenda

Robert's Rules, which is the official guideline to procedure for the Senate, does not grant voice in debate to any but members of the Body (elected Senators and alternates). This limitation does not apply to either Special Orders with invited guests or to the Free Speech period, if any. In addition to those two exceptions, the following standing exceptions are noted with respect to participation in debate:

- The President and the Provost of the University, the Faculty Senate representative to the Board of Trustees, and the immediate Past President of the Faculty Senate, Honorary Faculty Senators, and Delegates to the Faculty Senate shall have voice but not vote in any Senate matters.
- The Program Coordinator to the Faculty Senate shall have voice in any administrative matters.
- The parliamentarian shall have voice on any matters pertaining to parliamentary procedure.
- The Faculty Manual Editorial Consultant shall have voice on any matter pertaining to either the contents of or proposed revisions to the Faculty Manual.

Other visitors to the Senate may request through any member of the Faculty Senate Advisory Committee that they be given voice on a specific issue, and that member of the Advisory Committee may request that privilege from the residing officer.
WHEREAS the 2020 roadmap is a recognized strategic guide to decision-making at the University, and

WHEREAS that roadmap calls for enhancing student performance, providing students with engagement opportunities, and fostering innovation to meet the great challenges of the 21st century, and

WHEREAS retaining and rewarding a quality faculty is critical to such objectives, and

WHEREAS University faculty salaries had languished below market benchmarks as enrollment has increased,

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Clemson University Faculty Senate gratefully recognizes the support of and efforts by the University administration and Board of Trustees in implementing performance-driven and market-based salaries for University faculty, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Clemson University Faculty Senate recommends that a robust, sustainable, and more transparent process be established in order to ensure performance-driven and market-based salaries going forward.
E. Annual Performance Evaluation

The annual performance evaluation by the Chair or Director shall be conducted on a performance year basis using the Faculty Activity System (FAS). The FAS performance period will extend from the beginning of the summer semester to the end of the spring semester. These reviews must incorporate attention to “Best Practices for a Performance Review System for Faculty,” Appendix E. For teaching faculty, student evaluations must be used as indicated in Section IX.D.11.

The FAS has three separate sections - Goals, Performance Record, and Evaluation. These are to be completed during the performance period as required by the Provost. The Goals section for each performance period shall be completed within three weeks of the beginning of the fall semester classes and after interactions between Chair and Faculty member have been completed. The Record section would be maintained and updated by the faculty member throughout the summer and following academic year. The Chair or Director and the Faculty member would complete the Evaluation section by the end of the summer term. [The Timeline provided in Figure xx illustrates the timing of these three milestones].

1. Establishment of Goals using the Faculty Activity System Goal Section (FAS - Appendix F):

Between the period extending from three weeks prior to the end of the Spring semester classes and three weeks after the beginning of the subsequent Fall semester classes the faculty member enters his/her goals for the next year in the Goals section of FAS. The Faculty member's goals and assigned duties for that year, and the percentage of emphasis given to each goal area, are established by the Faculty member in consultation with the Chair or Director. These goals and assigned duties are to be described within the FAS Goals section, and must be agreed upon by both the Chair or Director and the Faculty member. Agreement by all parties will be indicated electronically by appropriate check boxes within FAS.

Where there is a disagreement, the Dean, after consultation with the faculty member, has the final responsibility to determine duties and goals and to set the percentage of emphasis distributed among goals; a Faculty member who disagrees may file a disclaimer within the Goals section indicating his or her disagreement. The Chair then freezes this Goals section for the remainder of the performance period – this closure of the Goals section is to take place prior to the beginning of the Fall Semester.

If a revision of goals is required because of a significant change in departmental needs or in response to input from the dean these must be entered into a revised form of the Goals section. These revisions must be completed within three weeks after the beginning of the Fall semester classes. Revision of the Goals section must be agreed upon by both the Chair or Director and the Faculty member and indicated by appropriate check boxes within FAS.

2. Statement of Accomplishments using FAS Performance Record Section (Appendix F):

Within ten days of the conclusion of the Spring semester the Faculty member completes the entries into the FAS Performance Record section regarding teaching and research accomplishments and achievements attained in the past performance period. While this report will, in most cases, correspond to goals laid out in the Goals section, faculty need to record the fullest account of yearly activity, especially concerning matters that might not otherwise come to the attention of the chair or director. This annual report is restricted to activities related to the Faculty member's professional responsibilities and/or professional development.

3. Annual FAS Evaluation Section (Appendix F):

The FAS Evaluation section records the Chair's or Director's summary evaluation of the faculty member performance. On the basis of material in the Goals and Performance Record sections, personal observations, and an interview, the Chair or Director together with the Faculty member completes the Evaluation section and forwards it to the Dean no later than thirty days after the
The Chair or Director is to present a narrative in the Evaluation section within FAS with three parts: (a) a description of the individual’s effectiveness with emphasis upon demonstrated strengths regarding teaching, service, or scholarship, (b) an indication of the area(s) where improvement is needed, and (c) suggestions of ways by which the Faculty member can reach a higher stage of professional development.

In addition to a narrative evaluation, the Chair or Director will assign a “Total Performance Rating,” chosen from a six-step scale ranging from “excellent” to “unsatisfactory.” After reading the completed evaluation, the Faculty member will acknowledge its receipt by check box and return it to the Chair or Director. Signing this FAS section does not imply agreement with the evaluation. The Faculty member has the right to file a disclaimer to the Chair or Director evaluation within ten calendar days of its receipt.

Upon receipt of the acknowledged FAS evaluation from the Faculty member, the Chair or Director will respond to any disclaimers and revise the evaluation if appropriate. The Chair or Director will then forward the FAS including any attachments and disclaimers to the Dean for the Dean’s entry of his/her evaluation into the FAS Evaluation section. The Dean then has the remaining time before the beginning of the Fall semester in which to read, comment, and sign the faculty member’s performance section and the Chair’s evaluation using the Evaluation section for these entries. The response must be concluded prior to the beginning of the Fall term. The Dean will respond to any disclaimers and revise the evaluation if appropriate. Finally, the FAS must be released to the Faculty member who will read and sign the annotated Evaluation section. The Faculty member’s signature does not imply agreement and a disclaimer to the Dean’s evaluation can be filed within ten calendar days of receipt. Any annual evaluation to which a disclaimer has been filed (i.e., all disclaimers, all responses, and any other supporting documents) must be forwarded electronically to the Provost for information before being returned to the Dean’s office, to the Chair’s office, and, finally to the Faculty member. Filing a disclaimer does not preclude or delay filing a grievance under Grievance Procedure II. The time period for the grievance process begins as soon as the disclaimer is acknowledged by the Provost.

The FAS with these three sections of Goals, Performance Record, and Evaluation, including all supporting documents, all disclaimers, all responses, and any other supporting documents, is an official document to be used in faculty development and to provide important information for decisions concerning reappointment, promotion, tenure, and salary. It becomes a part of the Faculty member’s permanent, confidential file retained by each college Dean and the HR record. The Faculty member has the right of full disclosure of his/her confidential file.

In departments with four or more faculty, excluding the chair, a Faculty member may request and receive in a timely fashion a report on how the six categories of the “total performance rating” were distributed among his/her colleagues, i.e., how many rated “excellent,” “very good,” etc. Where there are sufficient numbers of faculty so that confidentiality can be maintained, a more precise distribution appropriate to the rank and tenure status of the inquiring faculty member will be reported.
Performance Period 15 May -> end of spring term Evaluation

Goals-Performance Record-Evaluation Timeline

Goals setting—Professional and service objectives (to be completed between end of spring and beginning of fall semesters)

Goals revisions—primarily

Service Issues

Goals setting—Evaluation timeline

15 May

By 15 May

FAS completes by Faculty Member

Dean receives FAS + Chair Evaluation/Rating and any attached disclaimer

To 1 July

Dean interacts with Chair and Faculty Member as well as Eval. Report and rating (E, VG, G, F, P, Unsat) agreement or disagreement—If disagreement, then disclaimer filed. FAS receives electronic signatures from Chair and Faculty Member as well as Eval. Report

From 1 July

Dean receives FAS + Chair Evaluation/Rating and any attached disclaimer

By 1 September

Return to Chair—Chair returns to Faculty Member

Goals-Performance Record-Evaluation Timeline

Academic Year

Spring

Fall

Summer
MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
MARCH 12, 2013

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

2. Approval of Minutes: The Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes dated February 12, 2013 were approved as written and distributed.

3. Elections of Officers:
For 2013-14, Antonis Katsiyannis will serve as Vice President/President-Elect and Alan Gubb will serve as Secretary. Gordon Halfacre, Ombudsman for Faculty & Staff and Debra Jackson, Vice Provost for Assessment (per President King’s request) counted the ballots. The slate for Vice President/President-Elect included Denise Anderson (HEHD) and Antonis Katsiyannis (HEHD). The slate for Secretary included: Alan Grubb (AAH) and Graciela Tissera (AAH).

4. “Free Speech”: None

5. Special Order of the Day: Dan Radakovich, new Athletic Director (AD) and Janie Hodge, Faculty Athletic Representative (FAR) provided an annual presentation of the Athletic program. Mr. Radakovich provided information across both external and internal operations as well as an update on the current status of athletics. Dr. Hodge presented the “academic dashboard”. Hodge reported that the FAR, Dean of Undergraduate Studies, Faculty Athletic Council, Director of Athletic Academic Services, and the AD review student-athlete grades at the end of each semester.

Questions were solicited prior to and during the meeting. Several of the questions centered around topics featured across several Faculty Senate President’s Newsletters including Black Male Student-Athletes and Racial Inequalities in NCAA Division I College Sports (Harper, Williams and Blackman, 2012), the use of the anti-inflammatory medicine, Toradol, and the cognitive effects of repeated sub-concussive head trauma. At the meeting Faculty expressed concern that academic travel and off-season training were encroaching on the academic week.

Radakovich announced that there would be several new personnel – Athletic Academic Services Director, Financial Officer, and a new head women’s basketball coach. He also said that Elaine Richardson, Director of Academic Success Center and a committee of four other faculty members will review data, interview personnel in athlete academic services, and use the National Association of Academic Advisors for Athletics as a guide to asses and improve academic services for Clemson athletes.

Tim Drake, Chair of Clemson’s Staff Development Program (SDP) provided an overview and update. SDP is an employee-driven, performance-based, peer-reviewed initiative designed to enhance staff productivity and engagement. Completed applications are due mid-April. The qualifications for the program have been modified to allow more staff to apply – staff members with at least five years of service can now apply to the program.
The SDP allows for up to 25 staff members to complete 150 hours of professional development, personal development and university involvement/service activities over 10 months; upon successful completion, participants will receive a permanent base salary increase. Participants work with their supervisors and a mentoring committee to develop a concrete list of goals and a plan on how they will achieve those goals that will benefit both themselves and the university. SDP is in its third year run by volunteers and centrally funded (participants and departments are not charged).

David Tonkyn and Bill Pennington, Senators and committee members of the Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) provided an update on Clemson Thinks2. Through second-year Critical Thinking (CT) Seminars, a cohort of CT faculty scholars, faculty development, rigorous assessment and scholarly research, the committee hopes to focus on critical thinking to transform learning and teaching. There are plans to link critical thinking, Clemson’s Creative Inquiry, and engagement. A committee is evaluating current courses that meet qualifications or could be modified. To better inform future direction, the Steering Committee is proposing a formal pilot phase, with results informing and changing the direction of implementation. Training for interested faculty is available this June with one day in August. Provost Helms said Clemson is currently evaluating departmental workload and CT2 will become part of this, answering the question about departmental incentive. A monetary incentive of $5,000 has been proposed for CT Faculty scholars.

6. Committee Reports:
   a. Senate Committees:

   Scholastic Policies – Chair David Tonkyn submitted and outlined the Committee Report dated February 21, 2013. New business information of the committee includes: (1) Suzanne Price, Associate Director of Residential Life for Academic Initiatives presented the Probationary Student Initiative which was developed jointly by Student and Academic Affairs to move students off of probation, a negative predictor of graduation; (2) tasked by President King, SP requested that University Counsel propose a revision to the Faculty Manual regarding new AAUP financial exigency/program closure guidelines; and, (3) in regard to a substitution issue, SP reminded the University that decisions on course substitutions among other curriculum matters belongs to faculty.

   Finance – None

   Research – Chair Jim McCubbin submitted and the Committee Report dated March 5, 2013. The report was not discussed. The report minutes indicate that a draft committee report, Clemson University Faculty Perceptions of Institutional Support for Research, was forwarded to the Interim Vice Provost for Research with a copy to the Dean of the Graduate School.

   Welfare – Chair Diane Perpich submitted the Committee Report dated February 19, 2013. Senator and committee member, Susanna Ashton reported that the committee discussed results of the COACHE survey with Vice Provost for Faculty Development, Nadim Aziz who is investigating several issues including: (1) whether there is more data in regard to reported dissatisfaction areas and if the report can be made public to all faculty, (2) two “best practices” memos, one for nominating and promoting Clemson faculty for national level recognition and mentoring of junior and mid-level faculty. The Welfare committee
is developing proposals regarding retirement recognition, research fellowship program, administrative internships, and parental leave policy.

Policy — Chair Bill Pennington submitted and outlined the Committee Report dated February 19, 2013. Chair Pennington reported that Janie Lindle, Grievance Board Chair and Camille Cooper, Grievance Counselor presented possible revisions to Part V. Grievance Procedures of the Faculty Manual. A main concern is that category II procedures are taking longer than the more serious category I procedures; Policy will better articulate number of witnesses and that length is determined by the hearing panel. Two Faculty Manual revisions were presented under New Business for Senate vote.

b. ad hoc Faculty Senate Committees

Budget Accountability Committee – Chair Antonis Katsiyannis submitted the Committee Report dated February 19, 2013. Senator and committee member, Calvin Sawyer reported that Brett Dalton, Vice President for Operations and Finance reviewed the 2020 Capital Plan for addressing deferred maintenance, which is estimated to cost $329 million. Presently, 39% of academic infrastructure is over 50 years old; 27% between 25 and 50 years with an average renovation of 41 years. Auxiliary infrastructure is 35 years old on the average. VP Dalton will provide a similar presentation to the full Senate at their April 9, 2013 meeting.

c. University Commissions and Committees: University Grievance Board Chair, Janie Lindle, explained the Annual Report of the Grievance Board Chair (available on the Faculty Senate website). Data from 2012 Grievance Petitions were shared. Additionally, a five-year (2009-2012) grievance policy review was provided and included: a benchmark review, an analysis of Findings of Facts from Hearing Panel Reports, and a survey of grievance policy participants. Recommendations from Grievance Counselor, Camille Cooper’s benchmarking were provided to the Senate Policy Committee at their February 2013 meeting for consideration and possible modifications to Part V. Grievance Procedures of the Faculty Manual. A Handbook for the Grievance process was constructed by Chair Lindle to define terms, clarify roles and serve as a working document for common practices. This handbook should be available online by this August 2013.

7. Old Business: None

8. New Business:

a. The following items were voted to move to the April 9, 2013: (a) Survey of Chairs on use of student teaching evaluations (SP Feb 21 Report); (b) Report on Bridge Program (SP Feb 21 Report); (c) Articulation Agreements (SP Feb 21 Report); (d. iii) Part IV. Section H. Post Tenure Review; (d. iv) Part III. Section F. Endowed Chairs and Titled Professorships; and, (e) appointment of Centennial Professorship Selection Committee. There was a unanimous vote to accept the motion to move items to April meeting under Old Business for 2012-13 Senator vote.

b. Policy Chair Bill Pennington submitted and outlined the proposed Faculty Manual change to Part IV. Section E. Annual Performance Evaluation. The proposed major revision of this section is to transform the Goals, Performance Record, and Evaluation process from hard copy (Forms 1, 2 and 3) over to the FAS electronic system. This passed in April Senate meeting, but upon closer inspection the wording of the
change was inconsistent with what was perceived to be on the floor. The Executive/Advisory Committees approved the proposal at their February 26, 2013 meeting and the Senate voted to accept the change. Senator Goddard opposed.

c. Policy Chair Bill Pennington submitted and outlined the proposed Faculty Manual change to Part II. Section D. Alleged Violations of the Manual. The proposed change gives the Senate sole authority in determining whether violations have occurred, but gives the Provost the final authority on resolutions to violations. The Executive/Advisory Committees approved the proposal at their February 26, 2013 meeting and the Senate voted unanimously to accept the change.

9. President’s Report: President King announced that

a. Google analytics indicate 200-250 unique IP reviews of the Faculty Senate website with 300-350 unique IP reviews of the Faculty Senate President’s Newsletter.

b. There was an overwhelming response to the offer of Linda Nilson’s text, *Teaching at Its Best: A Research-Based Resource for College Instructors* (3rd edition). As Director of Clemson’s Office of Teaching Effectiveness and Innovation (OTEI), Nilson provided the first 70 copies. The Provost and President funded another 70 copies, which were distributed across campus.

c. A second joint Staff and Faculty Senate executive committees meeting was held the morning of March 12th to review common concerns which centered around payroll changes. The next meeting will occur in September 2013.

d. State legislation may contain some component of performance-based monetary reward; President King was not sure if this would be new money provided for good performance or money taken away and put back in.

10. Announcements:

a. Next Faculty Senate meeting – April 9, 2013; when Senate Committee year-end reports are due which will be placed on the Senate website.

b. Annual Spring Reception – April 9, 2013 in the First Sun Connector, Madren Center, immediately following Faculty Senate Meeting.

c. Next Executive/Advisory Committees meeting – April 30, 2013 (5th Tuesday)

d. Awards: Alan Schaffer Faculty Senate Service Award nominations are due to the Senate Office by March 18, 2013 and Centennial Professorship nominations by April 1, 2013.

e. College Senate election results should be reported to the Senate Office by Friday, March 29, 2013 in preparation for the April 9, 2013 Senate transition meeting.

11. Adjournment: President King adjourned the meeting at 4:33 p.m.

Denise M. Anderson, Secretary

Monica A. Patterson, Program Coordinator
Also present: Nadim Aziz (Vice Provost for Faculty Development), Jared Halter (PhD Student, Educational Leadership), Gordon Halfacre (Ombudsman for Faculty and Students), Dori Helms (Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs), Debra Jackson (Vice Provost of Assessment), Fran McGuire (Editorial Consultant of the Faculty Manual), John Mueller (HR Director of Customer Service), Monica Patterson (Faculty Senate Program Coordinator), Suzanne Rook Schilf (Alternate), Jackie Todd (Director of Internal Communications)

### Academic Dashboard for Clemson Athletics

Four-Year Data - UPDATED September 2012

- **[Z]** Denotes that Clemson is above (or equal to) the midpoint of the peer group.

#### (A) NCAA Graduation Success Rate (GSR)


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Top 10 NCAA Public</th>
<th>ACC Median</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>CLEMSON Median</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Top 10 ACC Division I Universities* Median</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MEN:</td>
<td></td>
<td>(N=12)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(N=352)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(N=11)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball</td>
<td></td>
<td>85</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track</td>
<td></td>
<td>68</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td></td>
<td>62</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>67**</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer</td>
<td></td>
<td>84</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming</td>
<td></td>
<td>96</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td></td>
<td>71</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOMEN:</td>
<td></td>
<td>(N=12)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(N=335)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(N=11)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track</td>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowing</td>
<td></td>
<td>98</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer</td>
<td></td>
<td>88</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td></td>
<td>63</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### (B) NCAA Academic Progress Rate (APR)

2007-08, 2008-09, 2009-10, 2010-11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Top 10 NCAA Public</th>
<th>ACC Median</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>CLEMSON Median</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Top 10 ACC Division I Universities* Median</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MEN:</td>
<td></td>
<td>(N=12)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(N=352)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(N=11)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball</td>
<td></td>
<td>980</td>
<td>985</td>
<td>965**</td>
<td>976</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td></td>
<td>953</td>
<td>961</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>963</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track</td>
<td></td>
<td>941****</td>
<td>981***</td>
<td>965***</td>
<td>975***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td></td>
<td>983</td>
<td>971**</td>
<td>952**</td>
<td>949</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf</td>
<td></td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>974**</td>
<td>988</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer</td>
<td></td>
<td>972</td>
<td>972</td>
<td>968</td>
<td>969</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming</td>
<td></td>
<td>974</td>
<td>988</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>982</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td></td>
<td>988</td>
<td>985</td>
<td>973</td>
<td>994</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOMEN:</td>
<td></td>
<td>(N=12)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(N=335)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(N=11)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td></td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>971**</td>
<td>978</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track</td>
<td></td>
<td>974</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>971</td>
<td>984</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowing</td>
<td></td>
<td>977</td>
<td>985</td>
<td>985</td>
<td>987</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer</td>
<td></td>
<td>992</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>980**</td>
<td>989</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming</td>
<td></td>
<td>974</td>
<td>985</td>
<td>985</td>
<td>990</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td></td>
<td>977</td>
<td>984</td>
<td>983</td>
<td>993</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### (C) Federal Graduation Rate (FGR)


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Top 10 NCAA Public</th>
<th>ACC Median</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>CLEMSON Median</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Top 10 ACC Division I Universities* Median</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MEN:</td>
<td></td>
<td>(N=12)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(N=352)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(N=11)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball</td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>56**</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf</td>
<td></td>
<td>86</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer</td>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming</td>
<td></td>
<td>87</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOMEN:</td>
<td></td>
<td>(N=12)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(N=335)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(N=11)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td></td>
<td>71</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track</td>
<td></td>
<td>69</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowing</td>
<td></td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer</td>
<td></td>
<td>61</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming</td>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball</td>
<td></td>
<td>83</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### (D) Difference Between Athlete Graduation Rates and Institutional Graduation Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Top 10 NCAA Public</th>
<th>ACC Median</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>CLEMSON Median</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Top 10 ACC Division I Universities* Median</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MEN:</td>
<td></td>
<td>(N=12)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(N=352)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(N=11)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball</td>
<td></td>
<td>-46</td>
<td>-40</td>
<td>-40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td></td>
<td>-38</td>
<td>-35</td>
<td>-44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track</td>
<td></td>
<td>-25</td>
<td>-23</td>
<td>-29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf</td>
<td></td>
<td>-32</td>
<td>-17</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming</td>
<td></td>
<td>-22</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td></td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOMEN:</td>
<td></td>
<td>(N=12)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(N=335)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(N=11)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td></td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowing</td>
<td></td>
<td>-17</td>
<td>-9</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming</td>
<td></td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* US News & World Report Top 10 Public Universities that are members of NCAA Division I (FBS):
  - Cal-Berkeley; UCLA; UVa; Michigan; UNC; GA Tech; Washington; Texas; Wisconsin; Penn State; Illinois

** Football Bowl Subdivision (FBS) only (N=119).

*** Computed as follows for each institution:
  - (Federal Graduation Rate of Student-Athletes in the Sport at the Institution) - (Federal Graduation Rate of All Students at the Institution).

**** Outdoor Track was used to represent Track APR

Notes: Clemson's Institutional Federal Graduation Rate is 78% for the entering classes of 2001, 2002, 2003, and 2004
Baseball FGR Data Review Fall 2012:

Beginning with the 07-08 cohort through the 10-11 cohorts, baseball has had 32 scholarship first time freshmen of which 9 are currently enrolled this fall (28%), 5 have graduated (16%), and 12 have signed professional contracts (38%). This is a total of 81%. In order to be considered professional or transfer, the student athlete must be academically eligible as defined by the university, ACC, and the NCAA. Of the remaining 19%, half transferred to another institution and the other half left eligible. The faculty senate must realize that the GSR and the federal rates as posted on the NCAA web site consist of data that is from 7 to 10 years old. The table below summarizes this information.

Data compiled by Ronnie Chrestman from Institutional Research. The list of baseball scholarship athletes were identified from the squad lists that have been previously submitted to the NCAA. The outcomes were pulled from the APR reports that have also been submitted to the NCAA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort</th>
<th>Entering</th>
<th>Enrolled Fall 2012</th>
<th>Graduated</th>
<th>Professional</th>
<th>Transfer</th>
<th>Left Eligible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Total</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled, Graduated, Professional</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Clemson University

FRESHMAN-COHORT GRADUATION RATES

2005-06 Graduation Rate
Four-Class Average
Student-Athlete Graduation Success Rate

All Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Freshman Rate</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>4-Class</td>
<td>2005-06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am. Ind./AN</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nat. Haw./PI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-R Alien</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1227</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>4745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1467</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>5795</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. Student-Athletes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Freshman Rate</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>4-Class</td>
<td>GSR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am. Ind./AN</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nat. Haw./PI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-R Alien</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freshman Rate</td>
<td>Freshman Rate</td>
<td>Freshman Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2005-06 4-Class GSR</td>
<td>2005-06 4-Class GSR</td>
<td>2005-06 4-Class GSR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am. Ind./AN</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>0-a 0-a 0-a</td>
<td>50-a 50-b 83-b</td>
<td>20-a 20-c 27-c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nat. Haw./PI</td>
<td>0-a</td>
<td>0-a</td>
<td>0-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-R Alien</td>
<td>0-a</td>
<td>0-a</td>
<td>0-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>50-a 100-a</td>
<td>0-a 0-a 0-a</td>
<td>100-a 100-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>40-a 35-e 79-d</td>
<td>33-a 46-c 75-b</td>
<td>88-b 74-e 86-e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33-b 35-e 77-e</td>
<td>33-a 46-c 75-b</td>
<td>62-c 51-e 67-e</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Men's Basketball</th>
<th>Freshman Rate</th>
<th>Freshman Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005-06 4-Class GSR</td>
<td>2005-06 4-Class GSR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am. Ind./AN</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>50-a 50-b 83-b</td>
<td>20-a 20-c 27-c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nat. Haw./PI</td>
<td>0-a 0-a 0-a</td>
<td>0-a 0-a 0-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-R Alien</td>
<td>100-a 100-a</td>
<td>25-a 67-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>0-a 0-a 0-a</td>
<td>100-a 100-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>33-a 46-c 75-b</td>
<td>88-b 74-e 86-e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33-a 46-c 75-b</td>
<td>62-c 51-e 67-e</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Women's Basketball</th>
<th>Freshman Rate</th>
<th>Freshman Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005-06 4-Class GSR</td>
<td>2005-06 4-Class GSR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am. Ind./AN</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>100-a 100-a</td>
<td>100-a 100-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>67-a 53-c 67-c</td>
<td>67-a 100-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nat. Haw./PI</td>
<td>50-a 50-b 100-b</td>
<td>50-a 50-b 100-b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-R Alien</td>
<td>100-a 100-a</td>
<td>100-a 50-a 50-b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>0-a 0-a 0-a</td>
<td>100-a 100-a 100-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>100-b 100-e 100-e</td>
<td>86-e 83-e 96-e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100-b 100-e 100-e</td>
<td>92-c 78-e 89-e</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Men's CC/Track</th>
<th>Freshman Rate</th>
<th>Freshman Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005-06 4-Class GSR</td>
<td>2005-06 4-Class GSR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am. Ind./AN</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>20-a 20-c 27-c</td>
<td>50-a 60-a 100-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nat. Haw./PI</td>
<td>25-a 67-a</td>
<td>67-a 100-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-R Alien</td>
<td>100-a 100-a</td>
<td>100-a 50-a 50-b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>100-a 100-a</td>
<td>82-c 100-c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>86-e 83-e 96-e</td>
<td>86-e 81-e 94-e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>86-e 81-e 94-e</td>
<td>86-e 81-e 94-e</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Values for N (a. 1-5, b. 6-10, c. 11-15, d. 16-20, e. greater than 20)
2. Undergraduate-Enrollment Data (All full-time students enrolled Fall)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Am. Ind./AN</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Am. Ind./AN</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>1023</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nat. Haw./PI</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Nat. Haw./PI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-R Alien</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>N-R Alien</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>Two or More</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>7208</td>
<td>6112</td>
<td>13320</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8573</td>
<td>7263</td>
<td>15836</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>344</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c. Student-Athletes # By Sports Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Basketball</th>
<th>Baseball</th>
<th>CC/Track</th>
<th>Football</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am. Ind./AN</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nat. Haw./PI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-R Alien</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Basketball</th>
<th>CC/Track</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am. Ind./AN</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nat. Haw./PI</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-R Alien</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#Only student-athletes receiving athletics aid are included in this report.
INFORMATION ABOUT THE GRADUATION RATES REPORT

Introduction.

This information sheet and the 2012 NCAA Graduation Rates Report have been prepared by the NCAA, based on data provided by the institution in compliance with NCAA Bylaw 18.4.2.2.1 (admissions and graduation-rate disclosure) and the federal Student Right-to-Know and Campus Security Act. The NCAA will distribute this sheet and the report to prospective student-athletes and parents, as specified in Bylaw 13.3.1.2 (report distribution).

The Graduation Rates Report provides information about two groups of students at the college or university identified at the top of the form: (1) all undergraduate students who were enrolled in a full-time program of studies for a degree and (2) student-athletes who received athletics aid from the college or university for any period of time during their entering year. [Note: Athletics aid is a grant, scholarship, tuition waiver or other assistance from a college or university that is awarded on the basis of a student’s athletics ability.]

The report gives graduation information about students and student-athletes entering in 2005. This is the most recent graduating class for which the required six years of information is available. The report provides information about student-athletes who received athletics aid in one or more of eight sports categories: football, men’s basketball, baseball, men’s track/cross country, men’s other sports and mixed sports, women’s basketball, women’s track/cross country and other women’s sports. For each of those sports categories, it includes information in six self-reported racial or ethnic groups: American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian, Black or African-American, Hispanic or Latino, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, nonresident alien, two or more races, White or non-Hispanic and unknown (not included in one of the other eight groups or not available) and the total (all nine groups combined).

A graduation rate (percent) is based on a comparison of the number (N) of students who entered a college or university and the number of those who graduated within six years. For example, if 100 students entered and 60 graduated within six years, the graduation rate is 60 percent. It is important to note that graduation rates are affected by a number of factors: some students may work part-time and need more than six years to graduate, some may leave school for a year or two to work or travel, some may transfer to another college or university or some may be dismissed for academic deficiencies.

Two different measures of graduation rates are presented in this report: (1) freshman-cohort rate and (2) Graduation Success Rate (GSR). The freshman-cohort rate indicates the percentage of freshmen who entered during a given academic year and graduated within six years. The GSR adds to the first-time freshmen, those students who entered midyear, as well as student-athletes who transferred into an institution. In addition, the GSR will subtract students from the entering cohort who are considered allowable exclusions (i.e., those who either die or become permanently disabled, those who leave the school to join the armed forces, foreign services or attend a church mission), as well as those who would have been academically eligible to compete had they returned to the institution.

Graduation Rates Report.

1. Graduation Rates Data. The box at the top of the Graduation Rates Report provides freshman-cohort graduation rates for all students and for student-athletes who received athletics aid at this college or university. Additionally, this box provides GSR data for the population of student-athletes. [Note: Pursuant to the Student-Right-to-Know Act, anytime a cell containing cohort numbers includes only one or two students, the data in that cell and one other will be suppressed so that no individual can be identified.]
a. All Students. This section provides the freshman-cohort graduation rates for all full-time, degree-seeking students by race or ethnic group. It shows the rate for men who entered as freshmen in 2005-06, and the four-class average, which includes those who entered as freshmen 2002-03, 2003-04, 2004-05 and 2005-06. The same rates are provided for women. The total for 2005-06 is the rate for men and women combined and the four-class average is for all students who entered in 2002-03, 2003-04, 2004-05 and 2005-06.

b. Student-Athletes. This section provides the freshman-cohort graduation rates and also the GSR for student-athletes in each race and ethnic group who received athletics aid. Information is provided for men and women separately and for all student-athletes.

c. Student-Athletes by Sports Categories. This section provides the identified graduation rates as in 1-b for each of the eight sports categories. (The small letters indicate the value of N.)

2. Undergraduate Enrollment Data.

a. All Students. This section indicates the number of full-time, undergraduate, degree-seeking students enrolled for the 2011 fall term and the number of men and women in each racial or ethnic group.

b. Student-Athletes. This section identifies how many student-athletes were enrolled for the 2011 fall term and the number of men and women in each racial or ethnic group.

c. Student-Athletes by Sports Categories. This section provides the enrollment data as identified in 3-b for each of the eight sports categories.
Black Male Student-Athletes and Racial Inequities in NCAA Division I College Sports

BY SHAUN R. HARPER, COLLIN D. WILLIAMS JR., AND HORATIO W. BLACKMAN
Executive Summary

Transparency, not shock value, is the primary aim of this report. In fact, statistics presented herein concerning the overrepresentation of Black male student-athletes are unlikely to surprise anyone who has watched a college football or men's basketball game over the past 20 years. Likewise, scholars who study race in intercollegiate athletics will probably deem unsurprising our findings on racial inequities in six-year graduation rates. What we find shocking is that these trends are so pervasive, yet institutional leaders, the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA), and athletics conference commissioners have not done more in response to them. Also astonishing to us is that it seems the American public (including former Black student-athletes, sports enthusiasts, journalists, and leaders in Black communities) has accepted as normal the widespread inequities that are cyclically reproduced in most revenue-generating college sports programs.

Perhaps more outrage and calls for accountability would ensue if there were greater awareness of the actual extent to which college sports persistently disadvantage Black male student-athletes. Hence, the purpose of this report is to make transparent racial inequities in the Atlantic Coast Conference (ACC), Big East Conference, Big Ten Conference, Big 12 Conference, Pac 12 Conference, and the Southeastern Conference (SEC). Data from the NCAA and the U.S. Department of Education are presented for the 76 institutional members of these six athletic conferences. Specifically, we offer a four-year analysis of Black men's representation on football and basketball teams versus their representation in the undergraduate student body on each campus. We also compare Black male student-athletes' six-year graduation rates (across four cohorts) to student-athletes overall, undergraduate students overall, and Black undergraduate men overall at each institution.

Thank you for taking time to read our report; feel free to pass it along to others who may find it interesting and useful. Please direct questions, feedback, and reactions to us via e-mail at sharper@upenn.edu, leslieasc.upenn.edu, and horatioh@upenn.edu. I hope this document heightens public awareness and ignites serious action in response to one of the most vexing racial equity issues in U.S. higher education.

Major results of our study include:

1. Between 2007 and 2010, Black men were 2.8% of full-time, degree-seeking undergraduate students, but 57.1% of football teams and 64.3% of basketball teams.

2. Across four cohorts, 50.2% of Black male student-athletes graduated within six years, compared to 66.9% of student-athletes overall, 72.8% of undergraduate students overall, and 55.5% of Black undergraduate men overall.

3. 96.1% of these NCAA Division I colleges and universities graduated Black male student-athletes at rates lower than student-athletes overall.

4. 97.4% of institutions graduated Black male student-athletes at rates lower than undergraduate students overall. On no campus were rates exactly comparable for these two comparison groups.

In the pages that follow, we summarize previously published studies on Black male student-athletes and provide more details about our research methods. We then present lists of high- and low-performing institutions. Statistics are also furnished for each individual college/university in the six athletic conferences. The report concludes with implications for college and university presidents, athletics directors, commissioners of the six major sports conferences, the NCAA, and journalists. Please consider this report a call to action.

"Perhaps nowhere in higher education is the disenfranchisement of Black male students more insidious than in college athletics" (Harper, 2006, p. xx)
Though many aspire to play professional sports after college, the National Football League (NFL) and the National Basketball Association (NBA) will draft fewer than 2% of student-athletes each year.

source: Martin (2009)
Message from Kenneth L. Shropshire

One quandary scholars and policymakers have sought to unravel is the proper role of sports in our society. Intercollegiate athletics is one sector that has received much scrutiny.

Policy decisions are often based on belief rather than facts. In the African American community, the reference is often to "mother wit," a feeling that something is right or wrong. People often adhere to long-held beliefs when making policy recommendations rather than looking at evidence and cutting-edge research.

My old pastor once began a sermon with the query, "which is correct: two heads are better than one, or too many cooks spoil the broth?" He stared into the congregation and asked, "they can't both be right, can they?" His point was that we should not rely on lyrical beliefs that have been handed down to us, as they are often contradictory. He was guiding us to look to the Bible for answers. That was not a bad suggestion. Another recommendation for social issues and educational inequities is to look to statistics. That is where Professor Harper and his co-authors lead us in this report.

The percentage of Black men that compose the ranks of student-athletes gives us reason to pause and incentive to look further. While representing only 2.8% of full-time undergraduate students, they constitute 58.4% of the football and men's basketball teams at colleges and universities in the six major NCAA Division I sports conferences. Intercollegiate athletics provide college opportunity to young Black men and take them off the streets, or major sports programs take advantage of these students without serious care for their personal and academic success. They can't both be right, can they?

What can we learn about racial inequities in higher education by examining six-year graduation rates? At all but three institutions in this study, Black male student-athletes graduated at rates lower than teammates from other racial groups. Is it that coaches only care if these students are academically eligible for athletic competition with playing time and NCAA or other conference championships? No, these coaches reward their teams for winning based on winning percentage, which is often higher for teams with less diversity.

In the six major NCAA Division I conferences, Black men on college sports teams graduated at higher rates than did their same-race male peers who did not participate in athletics. Yes at about one quarter of the institutions in this study, no at the overwhelming majority of others. The NCAA and other conferences, as well as coaches, want their teams to win. It seems logical that coaches would want their teams to win. This is reflected in the allocation of resources to winning, which is often higher for teams with less diversity.

What can we learn from this study about mother wit? It seems that mother wit has its place, but data do a better job of making sense of reality. The authors provide data that are necessary to improve policies to address these issues. The authors provide a path forward that we must take.

This study represents the path we must take to distinguish right from wrong and lyrical beliefs from statistical realities. The authors provide data that are necessary to improve policies to address these issues. This study provides statistical insights into problems that are in need of accountability and policy response. Mother wit has its place, but data do a better job of making sense of reality.

Warmest Regards,
Kenneth L. Shropshire, J.D.
Professor Shropshire is a founding affiliate in the Penn GSE Center for the Study of Race and Equity in Education. His books include "Agents of Opportunity: Sports Agents and Corruption in Collegiate Sports."
Background and Research Methods

The importance of student-athletes in the classroom, has been well established in the literature (Comeaux, 2007; Oseguera, 2010). Because Black men are so overrepresented in college athletics, Harper (2009b) contends the myth also negatively affects those who are not student-athletes, as their White peers and others (e.g., faculty, administrators, alumni, and administrators) often erroneously presume they are members of the track and field team. Harper (2006) explains that these are the two sports that garner the most media attention (which also generates television contracts and corporate sponsorships), attract the most fans (who pay to attend games), and yield the most revenue from merchandise sales (e.g., jerseys and other sports apparel).

Considerable effort has also been devoted to exploring racial differences in academic preparation and participation in intercollegiate athletics (Comeaux, and Plecha, 2006; Beamon, 2000); the ways in which colleges and universities reap enormous financial benefits at the expense of Black male student-athlete success (e.g., Beamon, 2006; Beacon, 2006). These conferences were chosen for our analysis because every NCAA conference when men's basketball teams at member institutions advance to the NCAA Division I Final Four championship. Above all, we are focusing on the most lucrative competition level. Most emphasis in the literature has been on the NCAA Bowl Championship Series (BCS), a post-season series of five nationally televised football contests. According to the BCS website, “Each conference whose team qualifies automatically for the BCS receives approximately $22 million in net revenue. A second team qualifying brings an additional $6 million to its conference” (www.bcsfootball.org). Millions are also paid to conferences whose football conference champions receive automatic bids to the Bowl Championship Series (Hodge, Burden, Robinson, & Bennett, 2008; Hughes, Satterfield, & Giles, 2008).

Notwithstanding, Black male student-athletes rarely accrue benefits and find the most revenue from merchandise sales (e.g., jerseys and other sports apparel). They are often relegated to lower-level conferences when men's basketball teams at member institutions advance to the NCAA Division I Final Four championship. Above all, we are focusing on the most lucrative competition level. Most emphasis in the literature has been on the NCAA Bowl Championship Series (BCS), a post-season series of five nationally televised football contests. According to the BCS website, “Each conference whose team qualifies automatically for the BCS receives approximately $22 million in net revenue. A second team qualifying brings an additional $6 million to its conference” (www.bcsfootball.org). Millions are also paid to conferences whose football conference champions receive automatic bids to the Bowl Championship Series (Hodge, Burden, Robinson, & Bennett, 2008; Hughes, Satterfield, & Giles, 2008).

In this report, we provide data on representation trends and six-year graduation rates at 76 colleges and universities that comprise six major conferences. These conferences were chosen because every NCAA conference when men's basketball teams at member institutions advance to the NCAA Division I Final Four championship. Above all, we are focusing on the most lucrative competition level. Most emphasis in the literature has been on the NCAA Bowl Championship Series (BCS), a post-season series of five nationally televised football contests. According to the BCS website, “Each conference whose team qualifies automatically for the BCS receives approximately $22 million in net revenue. A second team qualifying brings an additional $6 million to its conference” (www.bcsfootball.org). Millions are also paid to conferences whose football conference champions receive automatic bids to the Bowl Championship Series (Hodge, Burden, Robinson, & Bennett, 2008; Hughes, Satterfield, & Giles, 2008).

Across four cohorts of student-athletes, 47% of Black men graduated within six years compared to 60% of White men and 62% of female students. This report builds on Harper's (2006) analysis of Black male student-athletes at 21 four-year institutions of higher learning.
Studies cited in this section illuminate problems that are both longstanding and pervasive, especially in big-time college sports programs. They advance a sociocultural understanding of the status of Black male student-athletes, one of the most stereotyped populations on college campuses. Our report complements the literature by furnishing a statistical portrait of these students and highlighting racial inequities that disadvantage them in the six conferences that routinely win NCAA Division I football and men's basketball championships.

Data Sources and Analysis

This report is based on quantitative data from the U.S. Department of Education's Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) and the NCAA Federal Graduation Rates Database. We used IPEDS to calculate Black men's share of undergraduate student enrollments across four cohort years at each of the 76 colleges and universities in this study. These percentages were juxtaposed with Black men's share of scholarship student-athletes; numbers of Black male students on football and basketball teams at each institution were retrieved from the NCAA database. These statistics reflect the 2007, 2008, 2009, and 2010 academic school terms. Five institutions (DePaul University, Marquette University, Providence College, Seton Hall University, and St. John's University) do not have NCAA Division I intercollegiate football teams; only Black men's representation on basketball teams was calculated for them.

We also analyzed each institution's NCAA graduation rates report and compared Black men's graduation rates to those of student-athletes overall, undergraduate students overall, and Black undergraduate men overall. These graduation rates were averages across four cohorts, as opposed to a single year. These rates can be found in Table 1. The number of Black men at each institution varied, and we included only institutions with at least 5 Black men on each team.

Limitations

This study has two noteworthy limitations. First, the NCAA database is inclusive of only scholarship student-athletes. It is possible (but not likely) that a team had significantly more or substantially fewer Black male members who were not athletic scholarship recipients. Second, graduation rates do not account for undergraduates who transfer from one institution to another. Transfer students are counted as dropouts. This could bias the results, as Black male student-athletes may be more or less likely to transfer than other student-athletes. However, no evidence suggests that Black male student-athletes are any more or less likely than other racial groups to transfer.
Racial Equity: Winners and Losers

25 Universities at which Black Male Student-Athletes are Most Overrepresented

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANK</th>
<th>UNIVERSITY</th>
<th>BLACK MALE STUDENT-ATHLETES</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Marquette University</td>
<td>77.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>University of Mississippi</td>
<td>73.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>University of Miami</td>
<td>72.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Florida State University</td>
<td>71.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Providence College</td>
<td>70.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Mississippi State University</td>
<td>70.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>University of Georgia</td>
<td>69.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>University of Illinois</td>
<td>67.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>University of South Carolina</td>
<td>67.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>University of Alabama</td>
<td>67.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>University of Tennessee</td>
<td>66.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>University of North Carolina</td>
<td>66.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Virginia Polytechnic Institute</td>
<td>66.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>University of Texas</td>
<td>66.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Georgia Institute of Technology</td>
<td>66.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Oklahoma State University</td>
<td>65.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>University of Louisville</td>
<td>64.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>University of Kentucky</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>University of South Florida</td>
<td>64.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Seton Hall University</td>
<td>64.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Texas A&amp;M University</td>
<td>63.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Louisiana State University</td>
<td>63.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Auburn University</td>
<td>63.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Rutgers, The State University</td>
<td>63.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>University of Maryland</td>
<td>63.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Numbers represent percent differences between Black men's representation in the undergraduate student body versus their representation on revenue-generating sports teams. For example, Black men were 5.1% of undergraduates at the University of Mississippi, but comprised 78.1% of football and men’s basketball teams (thus, the percent difference is 73.0%).

Ten Universities with Highest Black Male Student-Athlete Graduation Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANK</th>
<th>UNIVERSITY</th>
<th>GRAD RATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Northwestern University</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Rutgers, The State University</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>University of Michigan</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>University of Georgia</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>University of Florida</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>University of Texas</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>University of Kentucky</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>University of South Carolina</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>University of Alabama</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Mississippi State University</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Across four cohorts, 9% of Black men at these institutions graduated with a degree, compared to 75% for all undergraduates. For example, 83% of Northwestern University's Black male student-athletes graduated, compared to 75% of undergraduates at the university.

Winners are institutions that graduate Black male student-athletes at the highest rates, as well as those at which these students graduate at rates equal to or higher than the three comparison groups. On the one hand, we think it is important to call attention to institutions that are performing exceptionally well on metrics that we have identified as important in our study. On the other hand, we cannot simply neglect those who are not performing as well.

In addition to these winners, we also highlight institutions that are performing well in terms of graduation rates but who have not yet raised their graduation rates to the levels of the comparison groups. These institutions are highlighted in this section and are colleges and universities with exceptionally high and low statistical indicators of equity for block male student-athletes.
that graduate Black male student-athletes at the absolute lowest rates, as well as those at which these students are most overrepresented on revenue-generating sports teams. Regarding the latter, our concern is not that there are so many Black men on football and basketball teams. Nowhere in this report (including the recommendations section) do we suggest that athletics departments should award fewer scholarships to talented Black male student-athletes. What we deem troubling, however, is the disgracefully small number of Black male students in the undergraduate population versus their large representation on revenue-generating sports teams. These are campuses on which admissions officers and others often maintain that academically qualified Black men cannot be found; yet their football and basketball teams are overwhelmingly comprised of Black male student-athletes.

Data presented on the lowest graduation rates list, as well as statistics presented on the individual conference pages that follow, do not signal victory for the NCAA. The Association has a television commercial in which it claims that Black male student-athletes at Division I institutions graduate at rates higher than do Black men in the general student body. This is true across the entire division, but not for the six conferences whose member institutions routinely win football and basketball championships, play in multimillion-dollar bowl games and the annual basketball championship tournament, and produce the largest share of Heisman trophy winners. Across these 76 colleges and universities, Black male student-athletes graduate at 3 percentage points lower than their same-race male peers who are not on intercollegiate sports teams. That an average of 49.8% of Black male student-athletes on these campuses do not graduate within six years is a major loss.

### 10 Universities with Lowest Black Male Student-Athlete Graduation Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>Graduation Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Iowa State University</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>University of South Florida</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>University of Arizona</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>University of Arkansas</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Florida State University</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>University of Florida</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Indiana University</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Arizona State University</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Mississippi State University</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>University of Minnesota</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These two universities do not have NCAA Division I intercollegiate football teams.

Across these 76 colleges and universities, Black male student-athletes graduate at 3 percentage points lower than their same-race male peers who are not on intercollegiate sports teams. That an average of 49.8% of Black male student-athletes on these campuses do not graduate within six years is a major loss.

### Graduation Rates

#### Across Four Cohorts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Graduation Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Minnesota</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi State University</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona State University</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Arizona</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Arkansas</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida State University</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Florida</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana University</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona State University</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of South Florida</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona State University</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oregon</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Minnesota</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa State University</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### At Universities with Lowest Black Male Student-Athlete Graduation Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>Graduation Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Iowa State University</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>University of South Florida</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>University of Arizona</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>University of Arkansas</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Florida State University</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>University of Florida</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Indiana University</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Arizona State University</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Mississippi State University</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>University of Minnesota</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These two universities do not have NCAA Division I intercollegiate football teams.

These statistics are not meant to imply that Black male student-athletes at these universities are not academically qualified. The disparities in graduation rates are due to systemic issues that affect all student-athletes, regardless of race. The NCAA's television commercial misrepresents the academic achievements of Black male student-athletes by comparing them to the average student body, rather than to their non-athlete peers on the same campuses. This is a disservice to the student-athletes and a misrepresentation of their academic success.
Black men comprised over one quarter (26%) of scholar-ship student-athletes on cross country/track and field teams at member institutions in the six NCAA Division I champion ship conference member institutions during the 2011-12 school year.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Black Male Student-Athletes</th>
<th>Black Male Student-Athletes %</th>
<th>Undergraduate %</th>
<th>% Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wake Forest University</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>49.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Polytechnic Institute 8</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>70.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Commonwealth Institute 6</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>53.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Virginia</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>62.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina State University</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Carolina</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>69.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Kentucky</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Georgia</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>61.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston College</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>49.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Institute of Technology</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>69.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida State University</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>68.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Maryland</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>72.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Virginia</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>68.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Polytechnic Institute 6</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>67.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State University</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>68.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wake Forest University</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>66.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Polytechnic Institute 8</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>66.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina State University</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Carolina</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>58.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Kentucky</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>61.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Georgia</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>61.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida State University</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>61.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Maryland</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>72.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Virginia</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>68.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Polytechnic Institute 6</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>67.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State University</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>68.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wake Forest University</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>66.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Polytechnic Institute 8</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>66.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina State University</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Carolina</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>58.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Kentucky</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>61.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Georgia</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>61.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida State University</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>61.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Maryland</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>72.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Virginia</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>68.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Polytechnic Institute 6</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>67.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State University</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>68.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wake Forest University</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>66.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Polytechnic Institute 8</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>66.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina State University</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Carolina</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>58.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Kentucky</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>61.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Georgia</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>61.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida State University</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>61.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Maryland</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>72.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Virginia</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>68.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Polytechnic Institute 6</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>67.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State University</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>68.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wake Forest University</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>66.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Polytechnic Institute 8</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>66.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina State University</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Carolina</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>58.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Kentucky</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>61.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Georgia</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>61.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida State University</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>61.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Maryland</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>72.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Virginia</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>68.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Polytechnic Institute 6</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>67.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State University</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>68.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wake Forest University</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>66.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Polytechnic Institute 8</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>66.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina State University</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Carolina</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>58.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Kentucky</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>61.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Georgia</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>61.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida State University</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>61.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Maryland</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>72.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Virginia</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>68.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Polytechnic Institute 6</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>67.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State University</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>68.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wake Forest University</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>66.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Polytechnic Institute 8</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>66.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina State University</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Carolina</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>58.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Kentucky</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>61.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Georgia</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>61.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>% All Black Undergraduates</td>
<td>% Black Male Student-Athletes</td>
<td>% Difference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Cincinnati</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>-13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DePaul University</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>-36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgetown University</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marquette University</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>-35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Notre Dame</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Pittsburgh</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence College</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>-38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seton Hall University</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. John's University (New York)</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syracuse University</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temple University</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>-26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of South Florida</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>-18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villanova University</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graduation Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>% Undergraduate Athletics</th>
<th>% All Undergraduates</th>
<th>% Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Cincinnati</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DePaul University</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgetown University</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marquette University</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Notre Dame</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Pittsburgh</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence College</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seton Hall University</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. John's University (New York)</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syracuse University</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temple University</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of South Florida</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villanova University</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Representation

Big East Conference
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Black Male Student-Athletes</th>
<th>Black Male Undergraduates</th>
<th>% Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Illinois</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>-14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana University</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>-27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Iowa</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>-18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Michigan</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>-22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State University</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>-23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Minnesota</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>-29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Nebraska</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>-9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern University</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>-26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Ohio State University</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Nebraska</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>-10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Illinois</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana University</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Iowa</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>-7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wisconsin</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>-11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania State University</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>-10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purdue University</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>-24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State University</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>-31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Minnesota</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>-30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Nebraska</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>-19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern University</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>-36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Michigan</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>-35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Ohio State University</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>-35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Iowa</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wisconsin</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania State University</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purdue University</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>-24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State University</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>-31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Minnesota</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>-30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Nebraska</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>-19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern University</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>-36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Michigan</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>-35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Ohio State University</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>-35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Iowa</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wisconsin</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania State University</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Black Male Student-Athletes vs. All Student-Athletes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Black Male Student-Athletes</th>
<th>All Student-Athletes</th>
<th>% Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baylor University</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>-60.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa State University</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Kansas</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas State University</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma State University</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Christian University</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Texas</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Tech University</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Black Men on Revenue-Generating Sports Teams vs. Black Men in Undergraduate Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Black Male Student-Athletes</th>
<th>Undergraduate Men</th>
<th>% Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baylor University</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa State University</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Kansas</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas State University</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma State University</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Christian University</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Texas</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>-36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Tech University</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Texas</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>-36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Big 12 Conference**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Black Male Student-Athletes</th>
<th>All Undergraduates</th>
<th>% Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Arizona</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Arizona</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>-52.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona State University</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona State University</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>-52.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California, Berkeley</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>-32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California, Los Angeles</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>-49.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Colorado</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Colorado</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>-47.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Colorado</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>-43.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oregon</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oregon</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>-53.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon State University</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon State University</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>-40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford University</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford University</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>-30.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Southern California</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Southern California</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>56.2</td>
<td>-54.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Utah</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Utah</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td>-54.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Washington</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Washington</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>-43.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>-30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>-30.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Colorado</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>-37.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>-43.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>-43.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oregon</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oregon</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>-53.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington State University</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington State University</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>-52.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Washington</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Utah</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td>-54.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>-31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>-43.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>-43.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oregon</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oregon</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>-43.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Washington</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Washington</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>-52.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oregon</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oregon</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>-43.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Southeastern Conference
### Graduation Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>% Black Male Student-Athletes</th>
<th>% Undergraduates</th>
<th>% Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Alabama</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Arkansas</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn University</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Florida</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Georgia</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Kentucky</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana State University</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Mississippi</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi State University</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Missouri</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of South Carolina</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Tennessee</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas A&amp;M University</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanderbilt University</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Tech University</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Tennessee</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Kentucky</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Virginia</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Alabama</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Missouri</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of South Carolina</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Tennessee</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas A&amp;M University</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanderbilt University</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Undergraduate Student Body

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>% Black Male Student-Athletes</th>
<th>% Undergraduates</th>
<th>% Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Kentucky</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Missouri</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Tennessee</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas A&amp;M University</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanderbilt University</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Tech University</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Kentucky</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Missouri</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of South Carolina</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Tennessee</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas A&amp;M University</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanderbilt University</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Note:** The table above represents the graduation rates of Black male student-athletes compared to all Black undergraduate men across institutions in the Southeastern Conference. The data includes institutions such as University of Alabama, University of Arkansas, Auburn University, University of Florida, University of Georgia, University of Kentucky, Louisiana State University, University of Mississippi, Mississippi State University, University of Missouri, University of South Carolina, University of Tennessee, Texas A&M University, and Vanderbilt University.
In 2010, Black men comprised just 6.6% of head coaches in NCAA Division I. Only 7.4% of athletics directors at Division I colleges and universities were Black. Each of the six championship conferences highlighted throughout this report has a White male commissioner, as Lapchick, Hoff, and Kaiser (2010) note.

Recommendations for Improving Racial Equity in College Sports

The underrepresentation of black male undergraduates is an issue that many campus leaders (especially admission officers) view as difficult to address. The relative size of their black male enrollment is often less than 5%, which is significantly lower than the proportion of black men in the undergraduate student population. Yet, the NCAA does not measure graduation rates by race, gender, or division. In the 2019-20 academic year, the overall 4-year graduation rate for the NCAA was 30%, but this rate varied widely by race and gender. For example, black men had a 27% 4-year graduation rate, while white men had a 42% rate. This disparity highlights the need for more equitable policies to improve graduation rates for black male students.

In this section, we provide recommendations for five groups: Black male student-athletes and their families, athletic directors and coaches, university presidents and chancellors, college and university leaders, and the NCAA and its member conferences.

The NCAA and its member conferences should take the lead in addressing the underrepresentation of black male students in college sports. They should establish a commission on racial equity that routinely calls for and responds to disaggregated data reports, raises awareness of the persistence and pervasiveness of racial inequities, and partners with athletic conferences and institutions to develop policies and programs that help narrow racial gaps.

College and university leaders should demand disaggregated data reports from their athletics departments and offices of institutional research. These reports should include analyses of racial composition on individual sports teams in comparison to racial demographics within the undergraduate student body, as well as data on graduation rates, recruitment, and academic performance. Campus leaders should pay more careful attention to racial differences in student-athlete academic performance, including grade-point averages, enrollments in courses and majors, participation in enriching educational experiences, and post-college pathways.

The NCAA, conferences, and institutions should also commit a portion of proceeds earned from championships and other revenue sources back to member institutions for programming and other interventions that aim to improve racial equity within and beyond sports. For example, admissions offices typically do not have enough staff to implement the practices we recommend in the next section. Money from athletic conferences would help. These funds could also be used to support the work of the commissions on racial equity that we have proposed.

The Commission on Racial Equity (CRE) at Harvard University, led by senior associate athletic director and deputy director of athletics for academics, provides an example of a successful model. The CRE focuses on increasing the academic success of student-athletes, particularly minority students, and reducing the academic achievement gap between student-athletes and non-athletes. The CRE has implemented various initiatives, such as academic coaching and mentoring, peer tutoring, and summer academic enrichment programs, to help student-athletes succeed in the classroom.

The CRE model could be replicated at other institutions, with customized interventions based on the specific needs and resources of each institution. The NCAA and its member conferences should encourage and fund similar programs to support the academic success of student-athletes, particularly minority students. In addition, the NCAA should require member institutions to report disaggregated data on graduation rates by race, gender, and division, and to provide annual reports on the progress of their diversity and inclusion efforts.

In conclusion, the underrepresentation of black male students in college sports is a complex issue that requires a multifaceted solution. The NCAA and its member conferences, college and university leaders, and institutions must work together to address this issue and promote equity and inclusion in college sports.
Perceivably, there are too few young Black men who meet admissions standards and are sufficiently prepared for the rigors of college-level academic work. Despite these arguments, colleges and universities somehow manage to find academically qualified Black male student-athletes to play on revenue-generating sports teams. Perhaps admissions officers can learn from some practices that coaches employ. For instance, a coach does not wait for high school students to express interest in playing for the university - he and his staff scout talent, establish collaborative partnerships with high school coaches, spend time cultivating one-on-one relationships with recruits, visit homes to talk with parents and families, host special visit days for student-athletes whom they wish to recruit, and search far and wide for the most talented prospects (as opposed to recruiting from a small number of high schools). We are convinced that if admissions officers expended as much effort as coaches, they would successfully recruit more Black male students who are not athletes. Some would likely argue that affirmative action policies might not permit such targeted recruitment of one specific racial group. Somehow, there is considerably less institutional anxiety about potential affirmative action backlash when coaches do all that is necessary to recruit Black men for participation on revenue-generating sports teams.

Black undergraduate men elsewhere on campus could benefit from the centralized resources and institutionalized support offered to student-athletes. If targeted academic advising, tutoring, clubs and activities, life skills development resources, structured study spaces, alumni networks, and committed institutional agents were made available to Black men who are not student-athletes, their academic success and college completion rates would improve. Likewise, Black undergraduate men who receive scholarships comparable to those awarded to student-athletes are far more likely to persist through baccalaureate degree attainment than are those who encounter financial stressors or work more than 20 hours each week to support themselves. Post-secondary administrators should commit more financial and human resources to replicating the best features of athletics departments for populations that graduate at the lowest rates. This would surely include Black undergraduate men.

Racism and routine encounters with racial stereotypes are among many factors that undermine Black students' persistence rates and sense of belonging on predominantly white campuses. Several scholars (e.g., Edwards, 1984; Hodge et al., 2008; Hughes, Satterfield, & Giles, 2007; Oseguera, 2010) have noted that Black male student-athletes are often stereotyped as dumb jocks. "One could easily summarize their status as Niggers with balls who enroll to advance their sports careers and generate considerable revenue for the institution without learning much or seriously endeavoring to earn their college degrees" (Harper, 2009b, p. 701). Any effort to improve rates of completion must include some emphasis on their confrontations with low expectations and stereotypes, both in classrooms and off-campus. Provocative, persistent, and purposeful campus-wide efforts to improve the academic success and academic success rates of black student-athletes and non-athletes should网 meal equity in collegiate sports.

A Call for Greater Transparency in the Conferences of Champions

Increasingly, there are few young Black men who meet admissions standards who play on revenue-generating sports teams. This would suggest more black undergraduates are receiving financial aid and athletic scholarships. The reports of the Institute for Diversity and Ethics in Sport (TIDES) at the University of Central Florida on race, academic progress, and academic progress among teams selected for post-season play highlight racial differences in academic progress among teams selected for post-season play. These reports are available on the TIDES website: www.tidesport.org. The Institute also publishes timely reports that illuminate demographic trends in college coaching and administration. More published analyses, such as these, that make race real and visible are needed across all NCAA divisions.

Specifying Equity in the Conferences of Champions

...
Coaches and Athletics Departments

In preparation for athletic competitions, coaches develop strategies for defeating the opposing teams. This usually entails watching their opponents’ films, making necessary adjustments to the playbook, strategizing with the coaching staff, and a range of other preparatory activities. This same degree of strategy and intentionality is necessary for tackling racial inequities in intercollegiate athletics. The director of athletics must collaborate with coaches and other staff in the department to devise a strategy for narrowing racial gaps in graduation rates, academic success indicators (e.g., GPAs and timely progress toward degree completion), and other student-athlete outcomes. In the absence of a comprehensive and actionable strategy document, inequities are likely to persist or worsen over time. The plan must be constructed in response to data that are disaggregated by race, sex, and sport.

Racial equity goals, efforts that will enable the department to actualize those goals, key persons who will be chiefly responsible for particular dimensions of the strategy, and methods of assessment should be included in the plan. The implementation of any strategy is unlikely to be successful without compliance from coaches. Hence, they must be involved in all phases of the process and view themselves as departmental agents who are rewarded for winning games and achieving equity in student-athlete success.

Similar to our first recommendation for the NCAA and the six athletic conferences, we also recommend that athletics departments create internal committees or task forces that focus on racial equity. This group should be comprised of stakeholders within and beyond the athletics department, including administrators from academic and student affairs, current and former Black male student-athletes, and professors who study and write about race and/or sports. Committee members could engage colleagues from their respective areas of the institution in the athletics department’s strategic efforts to improve racial equity. For instance, professors could help their colleagues understand how they are complicit in conveying low expectations and racial stereotypes to Black male student-athletes who take their courses. Moreover, these particular faculty members could assume leadership for crafting an institutional strategy to disrupt classroom practices that sustain racial inequities for student-athletes and other students of color.

Martin, Harrison, and Bukstein (2010) studied Black male student-athletes who had good grades, records of athletic accomplishment, and impressive resumes that included leadership roles within and beyond athletics. More student-athletes like these can be found at colleges and universities across the country. Athletics departments that wish to improve Black male student-athletes’ academic success can learn much from Black male student-athletes who are academically successful. There are examples from the NAIA division I where the community, athletic department, and students work together to improve academic success. Key persons within the department who will accompany the student-athlete to academic success goals include coaches, administrators, and academic advisors. When高校 athletes succeed, they are celebrated and recognized for their achievements.

Women athletes should also be recognized in the strategic planning process. Similar to our first recommendation for the NCAA and the six athletic conferences, we recommend that athletics departments create internal committees or task forces that focus on racial equity. This group should be comprised of stakeholders within and beyond the athletics department, including administrators from academic and student affairs, current and former Black female student-athletes, and professors who study and write about race and/or sports. Committee members could engage colleagues from their respective areas of the institution in the athletics department’s strategic efforts to improve racial equity. For instance, professors could help their colleagues understand how they are complicit in conveying low expectations and racial stereotypes to Black female student-athletes who take their courses. Moreover, these particular faculty members could assume leadership for crafting an institutional strategy to disrupt classroom practices that sustain racial inequities for student-athletes and other students of color.

Black Women Bailers

Women’s Sports

Black female student-athletes often have experiences of their same-race female peers. During the 2011-12 school year, Black women comprised enrollments across the 76 colleges and universities in the six NCAA Division I championship conferences. Although their over-representation, good news in the Southeastern Conference, their average six-year graduation rate (across four cohorts) was 74.6%, compared to 72.9% for White female student-athletes and 68.5% for all undergraduate students attending the 14 SEC member institutions. Coaches of men’s athletics teams can learn much from their colleagues who coach women’s sports. While statistics may suggest that Black women are doing better—they attend college in higher numbers, earn higher GPAs, are more engaged, and graduate at higher rates than do their same-race male counterparts—they too are confronted with stereotypes, academic and personal challenges, and institutionalized threats to their well-being and sense of belonging on predominantly white campuses. In comparison to Black men, much less has been written and is known about the experiences of Black female participants in intercollegiate athletics. College administrators, the American...
Similarly, athletics departments can learn from other NCAA Division I institutions or higher than student-athletes overall, undergraduate students overall, and institutions at which Black male student-athletes graduate at rates comparable to fans who buy tickets and make donations to the university. These pressures from the UW Career Services Office, tenured faculty, and a vice provost.

While an athletics department may genuinely care about academic success for student-athletes, which we think is praiseworthy. However, we agree with Getty et al. that coaches and staff in athletics departments should encourage student-engagement with faculty outside the classroom, a diverse cadre of peers, leadership skills can be enhanced through campus clubs beyond athletics; and essential knowledge that is necessary for admission to graduate school or professors or an internship related to one's field of study can be gained through doing research with other scholars (e.g., Comeaux et al., 2011; Gayles & Hu, 2009; Martin, 2009). We believe it important for journalists to highlight other aspects of Black male student-athletes and their families to resist the seductive lure of choosing a university because it appears to be a promising gateway to careers in professional sports. It can be for a very small number of players. An ESPN film or some other documentary on former Black male student-athletes who are not members of sports teams, and professionals in other offices on campus (the counseling center, career services office, etc.) Moreover, student-leaders can tell their stories through media that are not members of sports teams or professional in other offices on campus leaders within and beyond athletics, graduated in 4-6 years, and took court, similar to participants in Martin, Harrison, and Bukstein's (2010) study. On those who simultaneously perform well in classrooms and on the field or court, similar to participants in Martin, Harrison, and Bukstein's (2010) study.

Black Male Student-Athletes and Their Families

While we understand students’ desire to compete for NCAA Division I athletics, we appreciate that being a student-athlete is not the only path to success in one’s future career can be gained through doing research with other scholars (e.g., Comeaux et al., 2011; Gayles & Hu, 2009; Martin, 2009). Put differently, student-leaders can tell their stories through media that are not members of sports teams or professional in other offices on campus leaders within and beyond athletics, graduated in 4-6 years, and took court, similar to participants in Martin, Harrison, and Bukstein's (2010) study. On those who simultaneously perform well in classrooms and on the field or court, similar to participants in Martin, Harrison, and Bukstein's (2010) study.

Professional Sports to Careers in Governance and Administration 

It appears to be a promising gateway to careers in professional sports. It can be for a very small number of players. An ESPN film or some other documentary on former Black male student-athletes who are not members of sports teams, and professionals in other offices on campus (the counseling center, career services office, etc.) Moreover, student-leaders can tell their stories through media that are not members of sports teams or professional in other offices on campus leaders within and beyond athletics, graduated in 4-6 years, and took court, similar to participants in Martin, Harrison, and Bukstein's (2010) study. On those who simultaneously perform well in classrooms and on the field or court, similar to participants in Martin, Harrison, and Bukstein's (2010) study.

Journalists and Sports Media
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Clemson University Staff Development Program 2013-2014

Clemson's Staff Development Program (SDP) will begin accepting applications March 15. **The qualifications for the program have been modified to allow more staff to apply** – staff members with at least five years of service can now apply for the program.

The SDP allows for up to 25 staff members to complete 150 hours of professional development, personal development and university involvement/service activities; upon successful completion, participants will receive a permanent base salary increase.

Participants work with their supervisors and a mentoring committee to develop a concrete list of goals and a plan on how they will achieve those goals that benefit both themselves and the university. Participants will have approximately 10 months to complete their 150 hours of documented activities. Salary increases for successfully completing the program will take effect in July 2014.

For those individuals seeking assistance in the SDP application process, two general help workshops have been scheduled during the application period. As space will be limited, admission to these workshops will be on a first-come, first-served basis. As electronic completion of the application form is preferred, workshop leaders will not be able to assist with completion of individual applications. Instead, the sessions will focus on elements that make a strong application to the SDP. However, there is additional assistance available for application completion.

**Anticipated Schedule Dates**
- March 15, 2013 – Announce application process to the University
- March - April 16, 2013 – Conduct workshops for applicants
- April 16, 2013 – Completed applications due from applicants
- April 25, 2013 – Completed supervisor approval forms due from supervisors
- June 3, 2013 – 2013-2014 participants will be announced
- June 2013 – Conduct orientation session for participants and supervisors
- July 1, 2013 – Proposed date for new participants to begin program

**Here are a few key questions to consider:**


> What is the Staff Development Program?
Clemson University’s Staff Development Program is an employee-driven, performance-based, peer-reviewed initiative designed to **enhance staff productivity and engagement.** This is accomplished through employee-driven professional development, university-related service, and personal development activities that are peer-reviewed and financially rewarded if accomplished. This initiative is funded centrally by the university, and not by specific departments.
Why is the SDP important?
Employees who choose to (1) enhance their professional development, (2) volunteer for university-related service, and (3) engage in meaningful personal development, are the kind of employees best suited to assist Clemson in the accomplishment of its objectives. The university becomes a better place when staff members are committed to its core mission and purpose. Professional development activities are expected to enhance the skills of staff members in their work, thus increasing their value to Clemson.

How does the SDP work?
With supervisor support, qualified staff members may apply to the SDP during the spring by completing an application and preparing a proposed plan outlining their professional and personal development. Applications undergo blind review by a representative panel of peers. Accepted applicants then complete their proposed plans by identifying specific activities and strategies for accomplishing specified goals. Staff Development Program Plans are implemented for approximately one year, from early summer through the following spring.

More information about the Staff Development Program is available at http://www.clemson.edu/sdp.
Definition of Critical Thinking:
"Critical thinking is the intellectually disciplined process of actively and skillfully conceptualizing, applying, analyzing, synthesizing, and/or evaluating information gathered from, or generated by, observation, experience, reflection, reasoning, or communication, as a guide to belief and action. In its exemplary form, it is based on universal intellectual values that transcend subject matter divisions: clarity, accuracy, precision, consistency, relevance, sound evidence, good reasons, depth, breadth, and fairness (Scriven and Paul, 1987)."

Student Learning Outcomes
1. Explore complex challenges
2. Analyze multi-dimensional problems
3. Extrapolate from one conceptual context to others
4. Synthesize alternative solutions to multi-dimensional challenges
5. Communicate effectively complex ideas

Creative Inquiry Fellows Program
(To be developed with similar criteria, based on the CTI Faculty Scholars model)
- Faculty Development
- Active Participation
- Assessment Strategies
- Student Learning Outcomes

CTI Faculty Scholars
- Faculty Development required to be a CTI Scholar
- 4-day program developed for summer institute
- Active Participation in Annual Programs
- Pre/Post Assessment of Courses
- Evaluation

Duke University Incentive Model of "Scholars" recognized by the University, provided $5000 supplement as long as remain a CTI Scholar (think Alumni Professor)

Incentive - $5000 to support faculty and student expenses

Duke University Incentive Model of "Scholars" recognized by the University, provided $5000 supplement as long as remain a CTI Scholar (think Alumni Professor)

Research Focus—Linking Critical Thinking, Creative Inquiry, and Engagement

THE COURSE

- Second Year Course
- Class size under 20
- Critical Thinking
- Taught by CTI Scholars
- Interdisciplinary and Disciplined Based on open to all students
- Communication Intensive
- Enhance academic and engagement experiences
- Assessment Strategies
  - Pre/Post Test in the course
  - Summative Assessment
  - ePortfolio Artifacts
  - ETS Proficiency Profile
  - Tracking system of students in CTI courses

Operationalization of the Course(s)
Steering Committee develops interdisciplinary courses that meet the CTI requirement and a general education requirement for submission to Undergraduate Curriculum Committee.

CU 21X (CTI) Natural Science and Mathematics
CU 22X (CTI) Science, Technology and Society
CU 23X (CTI) Social Science
CU 24X (CTI) Cross Cultural Awareness
CU 25X (CTI) Humanities and Literature
CU 26X (CTI) Humanities and Non-Literature

Steering Committee develops a system to approve Critical Thinking designation for current discipline based courses. (Similar to the Honor College model).

Explore opportunities for engagement activities to incorporate Critical Thinking through faculty development/participation as CTI Scholars

Pilot Study
To better inform future direction, the Steering Committee is proposing a formal pilot phase; with results informing and changing the direction of implementation

- Writing Intensive versus non-writing intensive
- Under and Over 20
- Interdisciplinary versus discipline based
- Links to engagement—using pre and post assessment strategies

Engage the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee in course approvals.

Volunteer to work with UCC to improve the Critical Thinking Component of the ePortfolio.
FACULTY SENATE SCHOLASTIC POLICIES
Final Report for meeting held Thursday, February 21, 2013
3:30 am – 5:00 pm
Room 301 of the Academic Success Center

SCHOLASTIC POLICIES COMMITTEE 2012-2013
Wayne Goddard (goddard) (E&S)
Alan Grubb (agrub) (AAH)
John Leininger (ljohn) (BBS)
Domnita Marinescu (dcm) (E&S)
Graciela Tissera (gtisser) (AAH)
David Tonkyn (tdavid) (AFLS)

Invited guests: Suzanne Price (Academic Success Center), Maddy Thompson (Undergraduate Student Government)

Old business
General Education changes  Previously, Perry Austin had presented to us the Student Senate’s proposal for reforming General Education. We forwarded this proposal without comment to the Executive/Advisory Committee on Jan. 29, and asked that the students be allowed to present it to the Senate. The E/A Committee agreed, but at the April meeting when the new Senate convenes. Therefore, we will not consider it further this year.

Evaluation of Instruction Form: On February 12, the Senate endorsed the Chairs’ survey on the use of student teaching evaluations with some minor suggestions. Those have been incorporated into the online questionnaire and it is going out. We thanked Graciela Tissera for leading this initiative and Linda Nilson, Debra Jackson and David Knox for assisting.

Bridge Program: Alan Grubb submitted a preliminary report on the Bridge Program. He is still collecting information.

Faculty Advisory Board on Online Education: John Leininger reported that the Board met on Feb. 6, and set a schedule for meetings into the summer, with potential meetings to listen to vendor presentations. They discussed the following issues: Course and Program Inventories, Credit Hour Definition of an online course, Faculty Certification (working on policy statement for SACS, as they have promised SACS that faculty teaching online would have to be certified for that), Course Approval, Delivery Definitions, and Minimum Use of Learning Management Systems (LMS). The University has hired two new support people (Steven Lind and David Dumonde) and is looking to hire two more over the coming months.

Council on Undergraduate Studies: David Tonkyn reported that the Council met on Feb. 8, and heard reports from a number of committees, including academic advising, grievance, integrity, etc. Over 2500 undergraduate students and 800 graduate students have applied for May graduation. This is about 150 more than in May last year. About 1700 of the undergraduates have completed their eportfolios.
Undergraduate Admissions Committee  This committee did not meet.

FAS Advisory Committee  David Tonkyn reported that this committee met on January 24. Every member had interviewed one faculty member at each rank plus a Department Chair for their thoughts on how FAS is used and how they would like to see it changed. At the meeting, we compiled these results and settled on the main areas for improvement. For example, many faculty would like to see FAS be more user friendly (fewer clicks, more transparent structure) and be used for more than just annual evaluations, such as to link to documents and websites, encourage collaborations, export CVs, etc.

Articulation Agreements  David Tonkyn has tried three times to contact University counsel with specific questions on the implications of accepting 3xx credit from two-year institutions, but they have not responded.

New business

Probationary student initiative  Suzanne Price presented the Probationary Student Initiative which was developed jointly by Student Affairs and Academic Affairs and has been presented to a variety of organizations on campus. Freshman probation rates from 2009-2011 were 9.3%, 7.7% and 9.0%, and being on probation is a negative predictor of graduation. This new initiative uses existing resources and partnerships to try to bring more students off probation. This presentation was for information purposes only, and seems excellent.

Expanded survey of use of teaching evaluations?  At the last faculty Senate meeting, there was discussion of extending the Department Chairs' survey on the use of student teaching evaluations to Chairs of TPR committees as well. We discussed this and decided to wait for the results of the first survey of Department Chairs, in case it needs modification, before revising it for this new audience.

Informing students of alternate sources for required materials  We had been asked to consider a situation in which a faculty member used Blackboard to notify students that required course materials could be obtained more cheaply outside of the University Bookstore. This could lead to a significant reduction in sales to Barnes and Noble, with whom we have an exclusive contract for on-campus sales, but provide savings to the students. We cannot address the legal aspects, but thought that this problem could be avoided in the future if faculty simply use discretion. Also, most students already know how to search online for cheaper books, etc.

Racial inequalities in Div. I Championship conferences report  Jeremy King sent out a report last December from the Penn Center for the Study of Race and Equity in Education which clearly documents lower graduation rates for male black athletes in Division I schools than for other black or white students. There is no directive on which, if any, Faculty Senate committees might explore this issue. We thought that a useful first step would be to ask the Athletic Department whether they are familiar with this report and, if so, what their thoughts are on it.
Financial exigency/closure Jeremy King has asked a number of Faculty Senate committees to look at the new AAUP financial exigency/program closure guidelines. We examined the AAUP guidelines and proposed that Faculty Senate request that Clemson University Counsel propose a revision to the Faculty Manual, which we can then discuss. It was suggested that a previous President, Dan Warner, may have worked on this issue with Clay Steadman when he was University Counsel.

Reversal of substitution decision Jeremy King has asked that we consider a case in which Dean of Undergraduate Studies Jan Murdoch apparently overturned a departmental decision to deny a course substitution. The student had appealed unsuccessfully to his academic Dean before asking Dean Murdoch. We believe that the Dean overreached her authority and should be reminded by Faculty Senate that the curriculum belongs to the faculty, including decisions on course substitutions.

Updated Student Bill of Rights We did not have time to discuss the proposed changes to the Student Bill of Rights, and will try to do so at the next meeting.
Faculty Senate Research Committee Minutes
Report on meeting held Tuesday, March 5, 2013
3:00pm-4:00pm
419 Brackett Hall

Research Committee Membership 2012-2013:
Chair- Jim McCubbin- CBBS
Peter van den Hurk- CAFLS
Robert Hewett- AAH
Megan Mowrey-CBBS
Mike Ellison/Dvora Perahia- CES
Sarah Griffin—HEHD
Julie Northcutt-CAFLS
Julia Frugoli- Non Senate Member

Old business: Drafting and discussion of the Faculty Senate Research Committee Report: Clemson University Faculty Perceptions of Institutional Support for Research (see Appendix). The committee has decided to forward the final committee report, without the original, unedited comments, to the Interim VP for Research and to copy the Dean of the Graduate School.

New business: Discussion of future agenda items impacting faculty research success on campus, and discussion of the need for continuity of Research Committee work from year to year.

Committee went into executive session for discussion of a personnel matter.
The Faculty Senate Research Committee is has been soliciting faculty input to identify the most pressing campus-wide issues that impact faculty research and scholarly success here at Clemson. We wanted to know Clemson's research infrastructure needs and other challenges to faculty research productivity. We used faculty input to develop an agenda of high priority research concerns that merit attention. We hope this data collection will inform university faculty and administration, and facilitate efforts to maximize the research infrastructure, culture and climate at Clemson University.

Data Collection: Senators were asked to poll their constituents for input. These data were consolidated into a multi-page list of challenges, barriers, and suggestions for improvement of faculty research success. Detailed items were discussed at the meeting and, using a nominal group process, were organized and prioritized into a set of commonly held targets for improvement. Faculty research productivity and success is intimately intertwined with broader issues such as teaching load and graduate policies, so our list is contextualized with this in mind.

Limitations: A qualitative methodology was used to identify perceptions of Clemson University faculty members based on their experience in development and maintenance of high quality research and scholarly productivity. This method identifies issues reported in the survey. It is not a scientific quantitative survey and there are specific limitations in proper interpretation of these data. For example, this methodology does not scientifically address the breadth of opinions and perceptions, the issues specific to certain disciplines and academic units, and how deeply these perceptions may be held by individuals. Instead, these data are best used to identify areas of concern that may provide opportunities for overall improvement in institutional support for the research mission of Clemson University.

The nominal group process resulted in several important themes emerging for development of targeted action items. The prioritized list is included below:
I. Research Infrastructure

A. Institutional support for faculty proposal development: There is a perception that Clemson University institutional support for proposal development and management is inefficient and often ineffective. The structure of institutional support for proposal development at Clemson is fragmented into separate university preaward (Office of Sponsored Projects), postaward (Office of Sponsored Projects Administration), and college/department level support. We are aware of recent efforts to better coordinate pre- and postaward administration. However, much of the individualized support for preaward proposal development is largely outsourced to the colleges. As a result, each college must invest resources to offer these services, and as a result, some colleges have marginal proposal support services. There is a concern about the duplication of services between colleges. Subsequently, there is a perception that overall proposal support services do little to facilitate faculty proposal development institution wide.

There is a concern that funding for institutional support of the research mission may not efficiently contribute to mission success. The committee discussed these issues in light of the use and return of indirect costs. The current distribution of indirect costs to the office of research, colleges, departments and investigators is highly valued by faculty. The notion of recentralizing these funds seems to have limited faculty support, but may also be part of the perceived limitations in institution-wide support. Questions were raised about how some top tier research universities (e.g. UGA, Texas A&M) finance highly effective institutional support for faculty research and proposal development. Concerns were also expressed about whether recentralization of indirect funds would actually produce a highly efficient and effective institutional support program. If these concerns actually came to pass, faculty would lose twice, with continued absence of strong campus wide support in the face of loss of the previously returned indirects.

No one seems to be requesting institutional support for discipline-specific scientific aspects of research proposals. Instead Clemson might better provide general expertise for NSF, DoD, NIH and foundation application procedures, and more efficiently facilitate the proofing and mechanical aspects, including budget calculations, formatting, etc.

B. There is a perception that the availability of seed money and bridge money for research is insufficient to support the overall research mission.

C. There is concern that lack of comprehensive insurance and maintenance for equipment often results in critical loss of functionality, without funding mechanisms to bring equipment back into service. This results in poor performance on some NSF-funded research projects and loss of significant university resources.

D. There is concern that some of the university intellectual property policies unnecessarily restrict partnerships with industry.
E. There is a concern about the transparency of the limited submission application and review process. Requests for proposals often are announced with insufficient advance notice to allow all interested parties an adequate opportunity to submit. There is also concern about the adequacy of the review process to provide an equitable assessment of all proposals.

II. University teaching load policies

A. Teaching load policies significantly affect faculty research success. There is a perception that college teaching load policies may negatively impact faculty research productivity, university wide. There is a perception that increases in student enrollment and loss of faculty positions have produced teaching loads inconsistent with Top 20 aspirations.

B. Additional adjunct, lecturer and instructor hires are insufficient to offset heavy teaching loads.

III. Graduate student quality

A. Graduate student policies significantly affect faculty research success. There is a perception that graduate student quality is significantly compromised by stipend levels that are noncompetitive in the current market. Like faculty salaries, graduate stipend levels need periodic market-based assessments and adjustments to regain lost competitiveness.

B. There is concern that university graduate tuition policies result in significantly higher budgetary costs for GRAs, relative to the cost of non-graduate research assistants.

IV. Additional needs- Several other issues have been raised, and relate to limited submission review, space constraints, conflict of interest policies.

V. Next steps- Further review and discussion of these issues will enable a set of action items to be developed and recommendations made. It is the committee’s hope that the long term issues will be passed on to the research committee in subsequent years to maintain continuity and follow-up, and to increase the chances for change implementation and improvement of university support for faculty research.

End of Committee Report
Faculty Senate Welfare Committee Minutes
February 19, 2013

Attending were Tina Robbins, Susanna Ashton, Dale Layfield, Jay Ochterbeck, and Diane Perpich.

We met with Vice Provost Nadim Aziz to discuss the results of the COACHE survey. Our discussion was open and broad-ranging as to ways to improve faculty welfare. VP Aziz is investigating several issues for us, including:

- whether the report can be made public to all faculty
- whether there is more data (e.g., the questions asked, etc.) for various areas in which Faculty reported dissatisfaction (especially questions about recognition/awards and Department/Unit level leadership)
- Regarding awards: VP Aziz is drawing up a "best practices" memo, with special attention to nominating and promoting Clemson faculty for national level recognition. Ultimately we would like this to circulate to all departments.
- A similar document regarding best practices for mentoring of junior and mid-level faculty.

The committee is likewise developing proposals around several items, with VP Aziz's support. These include proposals relating to:

- Retirement recognition
- A Research Fellowship program
- An internship program for faculty looking to explore paths to administrative positions or gain a better understanding of specific university offices
- Parental leave policy
New Business

1) Discussion with Janie Lindle and Camille Cooper regarding possible revisions to FM Part V, Grievance Procedures, resulted in decision for Policy Committee to strengthen the wording providing the Grievance Board with discretionary power to control the number of witnesses called and evidence submitted for Category II cases. This will hopefully decrease the time needed to hear these cases. University Counsel has expressed some concern that the less serious Category II cases take up more time than the more serious Category I cases.

2) We are exploring the idea of merging Alumni Distinguished Professorships with the proposed University Professorships to form a titled professorship that would recognize excellence in teaching, service/citizenship, and/or research. If this idea is not suitable to the Alumni Association, we will submit a proposal to include the University Professorship in the Faculty Manual (see attachment).

3) A proposed FM change in Part II, Section D (Alleged Violations of the Manual) to more clearly state that the decision on whether a violation to the Faculty Manual has occurred rests solely with the Senate, while giving the Provost the final authority on resolutions to violations (see attachment).

Old Business

1) The proposed revision of the Goals/Performance/Evaluation section of the manual to bring it into agreement and fully implemented with FAS which was approved by the EAC and FS at the last meetings was found to have some sections that were incongruent with what was voted on. These have been corrected and will be submitted to EAC for approval to be passed onto the Senate.
Deferred maintenance Update—Clemson University has developed a 2020 Capital Plan

Capital Asset Stewardship involves evaluation, planning, maintenance, and funding: Presently, 39% of academic infrastructure is over 50 years old; 27% between 25 and 50 years with an average renovation age of 41 years. Auxiliary infrastructure (housing, dining…) is 35 years old on the average (60% over 25 years)

There is regular Assessment and Evaluation of facilities (semi-annual for roofs; annual for mechanical, HVAC, plumbing…

There is a space utilization study underway—should be completed by summer.

There is a need for swing space (possibly Sirrine once a new building for the school of business is built)

SC spent $200 million for infrastructure (last bond bill was issued in 1999); NC spent $3 billion; and GA $1.5 billion. Clemson used a state institution bond for renovation/addition to Lee Hall.

Projected Cost—$329 million for planned and deferred maintenance by 2020. For example, $105 million for critical utility and infrastructure; $103 million for major repairs (Sirrine, Poole); and $72 million for annual maintenance. Also, $116 million for new construction (Watt Innovation Center, CURI—these projects have received private funds).
Grievance Board Chair Annual Report on 2012 Activities to Faculty Senate

Clemson Faculty Grievance Board 2012 Activities

- Petitions and Hearings Report
- 5-year Grievance Policy Review
  - Benchmark Review
  - Analysis of Findings of Facts HP Reports
  - Survey of Grievance Policy Participants
- Handbook Development
Petition Outcomes

- Complaints Supported by HP Rept
- Complaints not Supported by HP Rept
- Complaints not Supported by Provost
- HP Recommendations Supported by Provost
- Grievance Appealed to President
- Presidential Decisions Supporting Appeal
- Grievance Appealed to Board of Trustees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Complaints Supported by HP Rept</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Complaints not Supported by HP Rept</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Complaints not Supported by Provost</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total HP Recommendations Supported by Provost</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Grievance Appealed to President</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Presidential Decisions Supporting Appeal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Grievance Appealed to Board of Trustees</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Petitioners' Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- male
- female
Benchmarks Review

Sources of Petitions

- Hearing processes are the same regardless of the type of complaint
- Hearings are recorded
- The university will not penalize and with positive recognition
- All participants (including advisors/advocates) are providing service to
- All parties are present for the hearings
- Less review time
- Petitions go to faculty, not administrative office

Notable policies differences at other institutions:
- Michigan State, Mississippi State, Penn State, Purdue, TAMU, UFL
- Albion, Boston College, Colorado State, Cornell, Kansas State
- Analyzed at 11 institutions' faculty grievance policies
Clemson University

Benchmarks Review
Recommendations to PC

- Lessen the Provost's review time from 20 to 15 days
- Move to a single day hearing for all types of grievances (not just Category 1)
- Audio record Category 2 Hearings
- Recognize service of both Counselors and Board members in workload.
- Ensure that staff are excused from duties to participate in Hearings

12 March 2013
Lindie GBrept2: FS

Clemson University

Analysis of 5 years of Findings of Fact
HP Reports to Provost

- Findings section of Hearing Panel reports to Provost between 2007 and 2012
- 13 Cases (including both G1 and G2)
- Two coders
- Inter-rater reliability of .82
- Report includes only agreed upon codes of 199 findings

12 March 2013
Lindie GBrept2: FS
5 years of HP Findings of Fact:

- Definitions of Faculty Manual Terms used in Findings
  - Pro
  - Policy
  - Collegiality
  - Anonymity/Confidentiality

- Code Development
  - 90% of the 199 Findings of Fact
Subtopics among 90% of Findings

Implications

- Annual process for departments and committees to review written policies as well as clarify procedures
- Training for administrators and faculty on documentation steps
- Attention to dysfunctional working relationships through training for both faculty and administrators
In what role did you serve in your most recent Grievance Process experience for which you wish to provide feedback to the Grievance Board? [Choose only one response.]

- Hearing Counselor: 13%
- Hearing Members: 26%
- Petitioner: 24%
- Respondent: 29%
- Witness: 8%

Participants in Attempts to Resolve F2F
Other Efforts Pre-Grievance

Faculty Senate Office 8
Grievance Counselor 8
Ombud Office 6
Access & Equity 1

Helpfulness of Different Process Resources

Grievance Counselor 6
Faculty Senate Office 5
Faculty Manual 4
Ombud Office 3
Access & Equity 0
Degree to Which Counselor was an Advocate

I chose to go to a Grievance Counselor who

- 25% recommended my college
- 63% did not know my college
- 0% was talking knowledge and insight about the situation
- 0% was taking the people I would have

To what degree do you feel that the Grievance Counselor served as your advocate in the process?

- To a Great Degree: 50%
- To a Small Degree: 38%
- No Degree: 12%
- Not Applicable: 0%

Reasons for Choosing a GC
Throughout the Hearing Process, I was updated on the process...

- Petitioner
- Respondent
- Witness
- HP Member

12 March 2013

Petitioner: 3
Respondent: 3
Witness: 1
HP Member: 1

Petitioner: 2
Respondent: 2
Witness: 2
HP Member: 1

Petitioner: 5
Respondent: 5
Witness: 2
HP Member: 1

Throughout the Hearing Process, I was listened to by the Hearing Panel in a timely manner.

Throughout the Hearing Process, it was moved in a timely manner.
I was well informed on the Hearing Panel's final report to the Provost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Agree Somewhat</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Petitioner
- Respondent
- Witness

12 March 2013 Lindle GBreport FS

Handbook Development

- Principles:
  - Emphasis on clarity for consistency of experience
  - Working document for common practices

- Content
  - Define terms
  - Clarify Roles
  - Potential to "pull out" role-based sections
Proposed Faculty Manual Revisions, Part IV, Section E

Rationale

The proposed major revision of this section is to transform the Goals, Performance Record, and Evaluation process from hard copy (Forms 1, 2 and 3) over to the FASElectronic system.

Current Policy - Part IV Section E: Annual Performance Evaluation

The annual performance evaluation by the chair or director and evaluation by the faculty peer review committee shall be conducted on an academic year basis. These reviews must incorporate attention to “Best Practices for a Performance Review System for Faculty,” Appendix E. For teaching faculty, student evaluations must be used as indicated in Section IX.D.11.

1. Establishment of Goals using Form 1 (Appendix F):

On a date stipulated by the Provost, and published in the “Calendar of Dates and Deadlines” the faculty member enters his/her goals for the year in the Faculty Activity System (FAS). The faculty member’s goals and assigned duties for that year are established by the chair or director in consultation with the faculty member; the percentage of emphasis given to each goal area is determined at the same time. “Professional Goals and Duties” (in Appendix F and printed from FAS) is used as a written record of these matters. Where there is a disagreement, the chair or director has the final responsibility to determine duties and goals and to set the percentage of emphasis distributed among goals; a faculty member who disagrees may file a disclaimer and indicate his or her disagreement on Form 1. A signed, printed copy of Form 1 will be placed in each faculty member’s personnel file. These goals are frozen for the university. If a revision of goals is required because of a significant change in workload or in response to input from the dean or chair, revised goals may be entered. Revised goals must be agreed to by the department chair or director. If goals are revised, a signed, printed copy of the new Form 1 will be added to the faculty member’s personnel file.

2. Statement of Accomplishments using FAS and Form 2 (Appendix F):

On a date stipulated by the Provost, and published in the “Calendar of Dates and Deadlines” faculty member completes Evaluation Form 2, “Annual Report of Professional Accomplishments” and submits it to the chair or director. (Form 2 is found in Appendix F and printed from FAS.) While this report will, in most cases, correspond to goals laid out in Form 1, faculty need to record the fullest account of yearly activity, especially concerning matters that might not otherwise come to the attention of the chair or director. Accomplishments not listed as objectives on Form 1 should be clearly identified as such. This annual report is restricted to activities related to the faculty member’s professional responsibilities and/or professional development.

3. Annual Faculty Evaluation using Form 3 (Appendix F):

Form 3 records the department chair’s summary evaluation of the faculty member. On the basis of material in Forms 1 and 2, personal observations, and a second interview, the chair or director completes Evaluation Form 3, “Evaluation of Academic Personnel” and forwards it to the dean no later than a date stipulated by the Provost... and published in the “Calendar of Dates and Deadlines.” In the case of tenure-track faculty, the chair may attach the faculty member’s most recent reappointment recommendation to the annual performance review (Form 3) and then complete the balance of the form, including evaluation of any accomplishments after the reappointment evaluation.

The narrative evaluation has three parts: (a) a description of the individual’s effectiveness with emphasis upon demonstrated strengths, (b) an indication of the area(s) where improvement is needed, and (c) suggestions of ways by which the faculty member can reach a higher stage of professional development.
In addition to a narrative evaluation, Form 3 calls for a “Total Performance Rating,” a six-step scale ranging from “excellent” to “unsatisfactory.” The department chair will check one category. After completing and signing Form 3, a copy goes to the faculty member who signs it and returns it to the chair or director. Signing this form does not imply agreement with the evaluation and the faculty member has the right to file a disclaimer to the chair’s or director’s evaluation within ten calendar days of its receipt. The chair will respond to any disclaimers and revise the evaluation if appropriate.

After ten calendar days, the department chair or director forwards Forms 1, 2, and 3, including any attachments and disclaimers, to the Dean. The chair is expressly prohibited from forwarding to the dean any material that was not seen by the faculty member during the evaluation process. After receiving the evaluation package, the dean has three weeks in which to read, sign, comment on the faculty member’s performance and the chair’s evaluation, and return the package. The dean will respond to any disclaimers and revise the evaluation if appropriate. Finally, a copy of Form 3 must go to the faculty member who will read, sign, and return the form to the chair. The faculty member’s signature does not imply agreement and a disclaimer to the dean’s evaluation can be filed within ten calendar days of receipt. Any annual evaluation to which a disclaimer has been filed (including copies of Forms 1, 2, and 3, all disclaimers, all responses, and any other supporting documents) must be forwarded to the Provost for information before being returned to the dean’s office, to the chair’s office, and, finally to the faculty member. Filing a disclaimer does not preclude or delay filing a grievance under Grievance Procedure II. The time period for the grievance process begins after the faculty member acknowledges by signature that he/she has received the dean’s response to the evaluation.

Form 3, including all supporting documents (Forms 1 and 2, all disclaimers, all responses, and any other supporting documents), is an official document useful in faculty development and providing important information for decisions concerning reappointment, promotion, tenure, and salary. It becomes a part of the faculty member’s permanent, confidential file retained by each college dean. The faculty member has the right of full disclosure of his/her confidential file.

In departments with four or more faculty, excluding the chair, a faculty member may request and receive in a timely fashion a report on how the six categories of the “total performance rating” were distributed among his/her colleagues, i.e., how many rated “excellent,” “very good,” etc. Where there are sufficient numbers of faculty so that confidentiality can be maintained, a more precise distribution appropriate to the rank and tenure status of the inquiring faculty member will be reported.

Suggested Revisions with additions tracked - Part IV Section E. Annual Performance Evaluation

The annual performance evaluation by the Department Chair or School Director (hereafter generically referred to as “Chair”) and evaluation by the faculty peer review committee shall be conducted on an academic year basis. The FAS performance period extends from the beginning of the summer semester to the end of the following spring semester. These reviews must incorporate attention to “Best Practices for a Performance Review System for Faculty,” Appendix E. For teaching faculty, student evaluations must be used as indicated in Section IX.D.11.

The FAS has three separate sections - Goals, Performance Record, and Evaluation. These are to be completed during the performance period as required by the Provost. The Goals section for each performance period shall be completed within three weeks of the first day of Fall semester classes and after interactions between Chair and Faculty member have been completed. The Record section would be maintained and updated by the faculty member throughout the summer and following academic year. The Chair and the Faculty member must complete the Evaluation section by the end of the summer term following the performance period.
1. Establishment of Goals using Form 1 the Faculty Activity System Goals Section (FAS - Appendix F):
On a date stipulated by the Provost, and published in the "Calendar of Dates and Deadlines" during the period extending from three weeks prior to the last day of Spring semester classes and three weeks after the first day of Fall semester classes the faculty member enters his/her goals for the next year in the Goals section of Faculty Activity System (FAS). The Faculty member's goals and assigned duties for that year are established by the chair or director in consultation with the faculty member; agreed upon as established by the Faculty member in consultation with the Chair. The percentage of emphasis given to each goal area is determined at the same time, as part of the negotiations. "Professional Goals and Duties" (in Appendix F and printed from FAS) is used as a written record of these matters. These goals and assigned duties are to be described within the FAS Goals section. Where there is a disagreement, the Dean, after consultation with the faculty member, has the final responsibility to determine duties and goals and to set the percentage of emphasis distributed among goals. Upon completion of this section, both the Chair and the Faculty member will sign it electronically (by check box). Signing this FAS section does not imply agreement with the goals and distribution of effort assigned by the Chair. A faculty member who disagrees may file a disclaimer within the Goals section and indicating his or her disagreement on Form 1. A signed, printed copy of Form 1 will be placed in each faculty member's personnel file. These goals are frozen for the university. The Chair then freezes the Goals section for the remainder of the performance period. Closure of the Goals section must take place no later than three weeks after the first day of Fall semester classes.

If a revision of goals is required after they are frozen, because of a significant change in workload or in response to input from the dean or chair, any revisions must be entered into a revised form of the Goals section, and must be agreed upon by both the Chair and the Faculty member. Revised goals must be agreed to by the department chair or director. If the Goals section is not revised, an electronically signed, printed copy of the new version of the Goals section Form 1 will be added to the faculty member's personnel file.

2. Statement of Accomplishments using the FAS Performance Record Section and Form 2 (Appendix F):
On a date stipulated by the Provost, and published in the "Calendar of Dates and Deadlines" within ten days of the conclusion of the Spring semester the Faculty member completes the entries into the FAS Performance Record section regarding teaching, service, and research accomplishments attained during the past performance period. Evaluation Form 2, "Annual Report of Professional Accomplishments," and submits it to the chair or director. (Form 2 is found in Appendix F and printed from FAS.) While this report will, in most cases, correspond to goals laid out in Form 1 the Goals section, faculty need to record the fullest account of yearly activity, especially concerning matters that might not otherwise come to the attention of the Chair or director. Accomplishments not listed as objectives on Form 1 should be clearly identified as such. This annual report is restricted to activities related to the faculty member's professional responsibilities and/or professional development.

3. Annual Faculty FAS Evaluation Section using Form 3 (Appendix F):
Form 3 records the department. The FAS Evaluation section records the Chair's summary evaluation of the faculty member's performance. On the basis of material in Forms 1 and 2 Goals and Performance Record sections, and other evaluation criteria such as personal observations, and a second interview, the Chair or director together with the Faculty member completes the Evaluation section Form 3, "Evaluation of Academic Personnel," and forwards it to the dean no later than thirty days after the conclusion of the Spring semester. a date stipulated by the Provost and published in the "Calendar of Dates and Deadlines." In the case of tenure track faculty, the chair may attach the faculty member's most recent reappointment recommendation to the annual performance review (Form 3) and then complete the balance of the form, including evaluation of any accomplishments after the reappointment evaluation.

The Chair is to present a narrative in the Evaluation section within FAS with have three parts: (a) a description of the individual's effectiveness with emphasis upon demonstrated strengths regarding teaching, service, and scholarship, (b) an indication of the area(s) where improvement is needed, and (c) suggestions of ways by which the faculty member can reach a higher stage of professional development.
In addition to a narrative evaluation, Form 3 calls for the FAS Evaluation section should include a "Total Performance Rating," chosen from a six-step scale ranging from "excellent" to "unsatisfactory." The department Chair will indicate this ranking by checking one category a box in FAS. After completing and signing Form 3, a copy goes to the faculty member who signs it and returns it to the chair or director. After the Chair completes this section, the Faculty member will read it, sign it (by check box) and return it to the Chair. Signing this form FAS section does not imply agreement with the evaluation, and the Faculty member has the right to file a disclaimer to the chair's or director's evaluation within ten calendar days of its receipt. The Chair will respond to any disclaimers and revise the evaluation if appropriate.

After ten calendar days, the department chair or director forwards Forms 1, 2, and 3, including any attachments and disclaimers, to the Dean. The chair is expressly prohibited from forwarding to the dean any material that was not seen by the faculty member during the evaluation process. After receiving the evaluation package, the dean has three weeks in which to read, sign, comment on the faculty member's performance and the chair's evaluation, and return the package. Upon receipt of the FAS from the Faculty member recording his/her signature (as well as any disclaimer) the Chair forwards the FAS including any attachments and disclaimers to the Dean for the Dean's entry of his/her evaluation into the FAS Evaluation section. The Dean then has the remaining time before the beginning of the Fall semester in which to read, comment, and sign the faculty member's performance section and the Chair's evaluation using the Evaluation section for these entries. The Dean will respond to any disclaimers and revise the evaluation if appropriate. Finally, a copy of Form 3 must go to the the FAS must be released to the Faculty member who will read, and sign (by check box) and return the form to the chair the annotated Evaluation section. The faculty member's signature does not imply agreement and a disclaimer to the Dean's evaluation can be filed within ten calendar days of receipt. Any annual evaluation to which a disclaimer has been filed (including copies of Forms 1, 2, and 3, all disclaimers, all responses, and any other supporting documents) must be forwarded electronically to the Provost for information before being returned to the Dean's office, to the Chair's office, and, finally to the Faculty member. Filing a disclaimer does not preclude or delay filing a grievance under Grievance Procedure II. The time period for the grievance process begins after the faculty member acknowledges by electronic signature (check box) that he/she has received the Dean's response to the evaluation.

Form 3, including all supporting documents (Forms 1 and 2, all disclaimers, all responses, and any other supporting documents), The FAS with these three sections of Goals, Performance Record, and Evaluation, including all supporting documents, all disclaimers, all responses, and any other supporting documents, is an official document to be used in faculty development and providing important information for decisions concerning reappointment, promotion, tenure, and salary. It becomes a part of the faculty member's permanent, confidential file retained by each college Dean and the HR record. The Faculty member has the right of full disclosure of his/her confidential file.

In departments with four or more faculty, excluding the chair, a Faculty member may request and receive in a timely fashion a report on how the six categories of the "total performance rating" were distributed among his/her colleagues, i.e., how many rated "excellent," "very good," etc. Where there are sufficient numbers of faculty so that confidentiality can be maintained, a more precise distribution appropriate to the rank and tenure status of the inquiring faculty member will be reported.

Final Proposed Policy - Part IV Section E: Annual Performance Evaluation

The annual performance evaluation by the Department Chair or School Director (hereafter generically referred to as "Chair") shall be conducted on a performance year basis using the Faculty Activity System (FAS). The FAS performance period extends from the beginning of the summer semester to the end of the following spring semester. These reviews must incorporate attention to "Best Practices for a Performance Review System for Faculty," Appendix E. For teaching faculty, student evaluations must be used as indicated in Section IX.D.11.
The FAS has three separate sections - Goals, Performance Record, and Evaluation. These are to be completed during the performance period as required by the Provost. The Goals section for each performance period shall be completed within three weeks of the first day of Fall semester classes and after interactions between Chair and Faculty member have been completed. The Record section would be maintained and updated by the faculty member throughout the summer and following academic year. The Chair and the Faculty member must complete the Evaluation section by the end of the summer term following the performance period.

1. Establishment of Goals using the Faculty Activity System Goal Section (FAS -Appendix F):

During the period extending from three weeks prior to the last day of Spring semester classes and three weeks after the first day of Fall semester classes the faculty member enters his/her goals for the next year in the Goals section of FAS. The Faculty member’s goals and assigned duties for that year are agreed upon as established by the Faculty member in consultation with the Chair. The percentage of emphasis given to each goal area is determined at the same time, as part of the negotiations. These goals and assigned duties are to be described within the FAS Goals section. Where there is a disagreement, the Dean, after consultation with the faculty member, has the final responsibility to determine duties and goals and to set the percentage of emphasis distributed among goals. Upon completion of this section, both the Chair and the Faculty member will sign it electronically (by check box). Signing this FAS section does not imply agreement with the goals and distribution of effort assigned by the Chair. A Faculty member who disagrees may file a disclaimer within the Goals section indicating his or her disagreement. The Chair then freezes the Goals section for the remainder of the performance period. Closure of the Goals section must take place no later than three weeks after the beginning of the Fall semester.

If a revision of goals is required after they are frozen, because of a significant change in workload or in response to input from the dean, any revisions must be entered into a revised form of the Goals section. All revisions should be completed within ten days after the start of renegotiation of the Goals section, and must be agreed upon by both the Chair and the Faculty member. If the Goals section is revised, an electronically signed copy of the new version of the Goals section will be added to the Faculty member’s personnel file.

2. Statement of Accomplishments using FAS Performance Record Section (Appendix F):

Within ten days of the conclusion of the Spring semester the Faculty member completes the entries into the FAS Performance Record section regarding teaching, service and research accomplishments attained during the past performance period. While this report will, in most cases, correspond to goals laid out in the Goals section, faculty need to record the fullest account of yearly activity, especially concerning matters that might not otherwise come to the attention of the Chair. This annual report is restricted to activities related to the Faculty member’s professional responsibilities and/or professional development.

3. Annual FAS Evaluation Section (Appendix F):

The FAS Evaluation section records the Chair’s summary evaluation of the faculty member performance. On the basis of material in the Goals and Performance Record sections, and other evaluation criteria such as personal observations, an interview, etc., the Chair together with the Faculty member completes the Evaluation section and forwards it to the Dean no later than thirty days after the conclusion of the spring semester.

The Chair is to present a narrative in the Evaluation section within FAS with three parts: (a) a description of the individual’s effectiveness with emphasis upon demonstrated strengths regarding teaching, service, and scholarship, (b) an indication of the area(s) where improvement is needed, and (c) suggestions of ways by which the Faculty member can reach a higher stage of professional development.
In addition to a narrative evaluation, the FAS Evaluation section should include a “Total Performance Rating,” chosen from a six-step scale ranging from “excellent” to “unsatisfactory.” The Chair will indicate this ranking by checking a box in FAS. After the Chair completes this section, the Faculty member will read it, sign it (by check box) and return it to the Chair. Signing this FAS section does not imply agreement with the evaluation. The Faculty member has the right to file a disclaimer to the evaluation within ten calendar days of its receipt. The Chair will respond to any disclaimers and revise the evaluation if appropriate.

Upon receipt of the FAS from the Faculty member recording his/her signature (as well as any disclaimer) the Chair forwards the FAS including any attachments and disclaimers to the Dean for the Dean’s entry of his/her evaluation into the FAS Evaluation section. The Dean then has the remaining time before the beginning of the Fall semester in which to read, comment, and sign the faculty member’s performance section and the Chair’s evaluation using the Evaluation section for these entries. The Dean will respond to any disclaimers and revise the evaluation if appropriate. Finally, the FAS must be released to the Faculty member who will read and sign (by check box) the annotated Evaluation section. The Faculty member’s signature does not imply agreement and a disclaimer to the Dean’s evaluation can be filed within ten calendar days of receipt. Any annual evaluation to which a disclaimer has been filed (including all disclaimers, all responses, and any other supporting documents) must be forwarded electronically to the Provost for information before being returned to the Dean’s office, to the Chair’s office, and, finally to the Faculty member. Filing a disclaimer does not preclude or delay filing a grievance under Grievance Procedure II. The time period for the grievance process begins after the Faculty member acknowledges by electronic signature (check box) that he/she has received the Dean’s response to the evaluation.

The FAS with these three sections of Goals, Performance Record, and Evaluation, including all supporting documents, all disclaimers, all responses, and any other supporting documents, is an official document to be used in faculty development and to provide important information for decisions concerning reappointment, promotion, tenure, and salary. It becomes a part of the Faculty member’s permanent, confidential file retained by each college Dean and the HR record. The Faculty member has the right of full disclosure of his/her confidential file.

In departments with four or more faculty, excluding the chair, a Faculty member may request and receive in a timely fashion a report on how the six categories of the “total performance rating” were distributed among his/her colleagues, i.e., how many rated “excellent,” “very good,” etc. Where there are sufficient numbers of faculty so that confidentiality can be maintained, a more precise distribution appropriate to the rank and tenure status of the inquiring faculty member will be reported.
Proposed Faculty Manual Change
Part II, Section D (Alleged Violations of the Manual), #1

Current Wording:

1. Resolving the issue. The President of the Faculty Senate, or one of the standing committees that s/he may designate to address the matter in his/her stead, may seek additional information. If the Senate President, or the designated committee, decides that a Faculty Manual violation has not occurred, that decision shall be communicated to the individual making the allegation and the matter will be considered closed. If the Senate President, or the designated committee, decides that a Faculty Manual violation has occurred, s/he or the committee will notify the person charged with the violation that the issue is being considered and recommend a resolution to address the violation. The Senate President will communicate the proposed resolution to the complainant, the alleged violator(s) and any other named parties, and the Provost in writing. All of these persons shall be asked to respond in writing within seven weekdays of receiving the decision. If any of these parties do not accept the resolution, the Senate President shall forward the proposed resolution, as well as any relevant materials, to the Provost. The Provost shall render a decision in writing and communicate it to the Senate President and all involved parties.

Proposed Change:

1. Resolving the issue. The President of the Faculty Senate, or one of the standing committees that s/he may designate to address the matter in his/her stead, may seek additional information. If the Senate President, or the designated committee, decides that a Faculty Manual violation has not occurred, that decision shall be communicated to the individual making the allegation and the matter will be considered closed. If the Senate President, or the designated committee, decides that a Faculty Manual violation has occurred, s/he or the committee will notify the person charged with the violation that the issue is being considered communicate in writing (a) the finding of a violation and its nature, and (b) a proposed resolution to the complainant, the violator(s) and any other named parties, and the Provost, and recommend a resolution to address the violation. The Senate President will communicate the proposed resolution to the complainant, the alleged violator(s) and any other named parties, and the Provost in writing. All of these persons shall be asked to respond in writing to the proposed resolution within seven weekdays of receiving it the decision. While the finding of a violation may not be appealed or overturned, if any of these parties do not accept the proposed resolution, the Senate President shall forward the proposed resolution, notify the Provost and
provide him/her with any additional relevant materials, as well as any relevant materials, to the Provost. The Provost shall render a decision written final resolution to the violation, in writing and communicate it to the Senate President and all involved parties.

Final Wording:
1. Resolving the issue. The President of the Faculty Senate, or one of the standing committees that s/he may designate to address the matter in his/her stead, may seek additional information. If the Senate President, or the designated committee, decides that a Faculty Manual violation has not occurred, that decision shall be communicated to the individual making the allegation and the matter will be considered closed. If the Senate President, or the designated committee, decides that a Faculty Manual violation has occurred, s/he will communicate in writing (a) the finding of a violation and its nature, and (b) a proposed resolution to the complainant, the violator(s) and any other named parties, and the Provost. All of these persons shall be asked to respond in writing to the proposed resolution within seven weekdays of receiving it. While the finding of a violation may not be appealed or overturned, if any of these parties do not accept the proposed resolution, the Senate President shall notify the Provost and provide him/her with any additional relevant materials. The Provost shall render a written final resolution to the violation, and communicate it to the Senate President and all involved parties.

Rationale:
Questions have recently arisen as to the interpretation of the Manual regarding the Provost’s role in Faculty Manual violations: does the Provost simply make a final resolution to a finding of a violation by the Senate President and/or Senate committee? Or can the Provost’s final “decision” concern itself with whether a violation occurred or not? The belief of the Senate has been that any final “decision” by the Provost concerns itself only with the resolution/consequences of a finding of a violation by a duly authorized Senate entity. The proposed change clarifies this belief, giving the Senate sole authority in determining whether violations have occurred, but giving the Provost the final authority on resolutions to violations.
1. Call to Order: The Faculty Senate Meeting was called to order at 2:34 p.m. by President Jeremy King.

2. Approval of Minutes: The Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes dated March 12, 2013 were approved as written and distributed.

3. “Free Speech”: None

4. University Commissions and Committees: President King moved University Committee reports before Special Orders because Senator Bob Horton’s teaching commitment. Dr. Horton, Student Code of Conduct Review committee member distributed and explained a draft External Non-Disclosure Policy for Senate endorsement. Dr. Horton emphasized that a student’s disciplinary record of minor offenses is not expunged, but rather not disclosed outside of the University. A student must file a petition meeting required criteria with any decision regarding non-disclosure made at the discretion of the Director of the Office of Community and Ethical Standards or his/her designee. Senators expressed concern that the existing appeals process should serve the function of this policy’s desired outcome. After debate, two-thirds of the Senators present approved the motion to endorse the policy. Three Senators did not endorse the proposal (A. Grubb, P. van den Hurk, W. Goddard, with one abstention (D. Perhia).

5. Special Order of the Day: Holly McKissick, CUSG Senate President Pro Tempore submitted and outlined changes, proposed by a CUSG task force, to General Education. A major change includes implementing a three tier process where students progress from fundamentals (Humanities/Fine Arts, Social/Behavioral Sciences, Natural Sciences, Mathematics) to connections (Communication, Science and Technology in Society), to application (Cross-Cultural Awareness). The task force proposed changes to two competencies by requesting additional upper-level Cross-Cultural options and removal of the Ethical Judgment requirement. During discussion, some members of Senate expressed concern regarding details, such as the burden of a second lab science and increased credit hour requirements from 28 to 32, which detract from in-major requirements. Others expressed broader concerns, some feeling that proposed changes should better integrate general education rather than another revision of course requirements. Senator and Scholastic Policies Chair, Dave Tonkyn applauded CUSG for their initiative on this proposal and their participation at every 2012-13 Senate Scholastic Policies committee meeting. CUSG will consider Senate feedback.

Brett Dalton, Vice President for Finance and Operations provided a facilities update, which was requested by the Senate ad-hoc Budget Accountability Committee, titled Capital Asset Stewardship: Evaluation, Planning, Maintenance, Capital Investment and Funding. VP Dalton reported that key drivers in facilities decisions include preventative maintenance needs, programmatic and competitive priorities, and long range strategic planning per the University’s 2020 Roadmap. He noted that the University is systematically updating the electric/utility structure as well as wastewater/sewer treatment system. The 2020 capital plan is reviewed quarterly and there will be some amendments, for instance, increased focus on research facilities. VP Dalton asks faculty to work with their department chairs and deans regarding issues and needs. Faculty are encouraged to contact VP Dalton’s office (dbrett@clemson.edu) or Phil
Landreth, Director of Instructional and Research Support, Assistant to the Provost (lralth@clemson.edu) with academic facility questions, concerns and suggestions.

John Mueller, HR Director of Customer Services discussed the HR Service Center (http://www.clemson.edu/employment/hrsc/). This new one-stop experience was implemented to consistently and effectively deliver excellent customer service with three components: (1) Frequently Asked Questions which are categorized by audience type then topic with applicable forms and websites; (2) an Ask-HR portal where one can submit an HR-related question or request for information for same-day or 24-hour response; and, (3) HR Tookits where policy and form requirements, based on topic, are in one place.

6. Committee Reports:
   a. Senate Committees: All final 2012-13 committee reports are available online: http://www.clemson.edu/faculty-staff/faculty-senate/reports.html

   Scholastic Policies – Chair David Tonkyn submitted and the final 2012-13 Scholastic Policies Committee Report.

   Finance – Chair Antonis Katsiyannis submitted the final 2012-13 Finance Committee Report.

   Research – Chair Jim McCubbin submitted the final 2012-13 Research Committee Report. The April 3, 2013 Report was also submitted and explained. Chair McCubbin announced that the final Clemson University Faculty Perceptions of Institutional Support for Research Senate Research Committee Report was sent to Larry Dooley, Interim VP for Research with a copy to Karen Burg, Interim Dean of the Graduate School. Upon the request of Tracy Arwood, Assistant VP for Research Compliance, the committee will review a draft of Clemson University Authorship Guidelines.

   Welfare – Chair Diane Perpich submitted the final 2012-13 Welfare Committee Report.

   Policy – Chair Bill Pennington submitted the final 2012-13 Policy Committee Report. Chair Pennington asked for motion to vote on a report item to add the President’s Commission on Sustainability to the Faculty Manual. Two-thirds of the Senate voted in the affirmative to include this addition.

   b. ad hoc Faculty Senate Committees

   Budget Accountability Committee – Chair Antonis Katsiyannis submitted the final 2012-13 Budget Accountability Committee Report.

7. Old Business:
   a. The following items, that were carried from March 12, 2013 New Business to April 9, 2013 Old Business, were not discussed and will be considered in the new Senate year. These include, as listed in the 4-12-2013 minutes: (a) Survey of Chairs on use of student teaching evaluations (SP Feb 21 Report); (b) Report on Bridge Program (SP Feb 21 Report); (c) Articulation Agreements (SP Feb 21 Report); (d. iii) Part IV. Section H. Post Tenure Review; and, (d. iv) Part III. Section F. Endowed Chairs and Titled Professorships.
b. The Centennial Professorship Selection Committee ballot was provided to outgoing Senators so they could elect one Administrator, one Endowed/Title Chair and two Faculty who were nominated by Faculty Senate President and Executive/Advisory Committees at their March 26, 2013 meeting. Associate Provost for Faculty Development and Support, Nadim Aziz; Lesly Temesvari, Alumni Distinguished Professor of Biological Sciences; Bob Horton, Professor of Teacher Education; and, Maria Mayorga, Professor of Industrial Engineering were elected to serve on the selection committee, which President King chaired. The selection committee ballot did not include faculty from the two eligible Colleges of Architecture, Art and Humanities and Business and Behavioral Science.

c. Dan Warner, Selection Committee Chair and Immediate Past President announced Michelle Piekutowski, Interim Chief Human Resources Officer, as the 2012-13 recipient of the Alan Schaffer Faculty Senate Service Award. Dr. Warner presented Ms. Piekutowski with a plaque and copy of the book, *Life Death & Bialys*. This award is given to faculty, staff or administrator who demonstrate leadership, innovation, and commitment in service to the Faculty Senate. The award was created to honor the late and former Senate President Alan Schaffer, who was a Professor of History at the University. The recipient also receives a $500 stipend with $1,000 donated in the recipient’s name to Clemson Libraries. Dr. Warner described Ms. Piekutowski’s work as an “aggressive pursuit of excellent collaboration with faculty senate.”

d. President King thanked retiring Faculty Senators for their three years of service and provided them with certificates.

e. President King introduced Kelly Smith, as the 2013-14 Faculty Senate President and Alan Grubb as the 2013-14 Secretary.

8. Outgoing President’s Report: President King shared that it was a great honor serving the Senate and faculty. President King also expressed confidence in faculty governance and welcomed lecturer Delegates, a new group to the Senate this year. He reported that he recently met with the Athletic Director who is excited to return to Senate to share athletic finances and explore ways academic and athletics can better connect. King recommended that faculty stay abreast of the 35-18 state legislation regarding accountability based funding and that the *Faculty Manual* be updated to reflect new AAUP financial exigency guidelines. King requested that the Senate continue to consider improved models of faculty, in particular research professors and that there be investment and continued reinvestment in existing faculty.

Denise Anderson, Secretary

Monica A. Patterson, Program Coordinator
Also present: Nadim Aziz (Vice Provost for Faculty Development), Dave Blakesley (Faculty Representative to the Board of Trustees), Gordon Halfacre (Ombudsman for Faculty and Students), Dori Helms (Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs), Debra Jackson (Vice Provost of Assessment), Fran McGuire (Editorial Consultant of the Faculty Manual), John Mueller (HR Director of Customer Service), Monica Patterson (Faculty Senate Program Coordinator), Michelle Piekutowski (Chief Human Resources Officer), Cathy Sturkie (Honorary Faculty Senator), Jackie Todd (Director of Internal Communications), Dan Warner (Immediate Past President)

Absent: S. Ashton, S. Chapman, R. Hewitt, A. Katsiyannis (R. Horton for), D. Layfield, C. Marinescu, M. Mowrey, J. Northcutt, M. Ellison, P. Srimani, G. Tissera, N. Vyavahare,

9. **New Business:** President Smith thanked President King for his service. President Smith made a motion to continue the ad hoc Budget Accountability Committee, which was passed by the requisite two-thirds vote of the new Senate. Smith asked the new Senate to answer the Senate Committee preference survey, and select lead Senators and the second Advisory Board member. He reminded new Senators, Alternates and Delegates of the Tuesday, May 14, 2013 Orientation to be held in the Madren Center’s Executive Board Room from noon – 2:00pm.

10. **Announcements:**
   a. Next Faculty Senate meeting – May 14, 2013 in a new location, University Union Senate Chambers.
   b. Next Executive/Advisory Committees meeting – April 30, 2013 (5th Tuesday)

11. **Adjournment:** President Smith adjourned the meeting at 4:21 p.m. Immediately following, the annual Spring Reception honoring retired Senators and welcoming the new Senate was held.

   ---

   Alan Grubb, Secretary

   Monica A. Patterson, Program Coordinator
In the three semesters before a student’s graduation or any time thereafter, a student may request that his/her discipline record not be externally disclosed. If a student’s request is approved, the disciplinary record will no longer be disclosed outside of the University but will still be maintained in accordance with the South Carolina State Records Act and/or the Clery Act. Any decision regarding non-disclosure will be made at the discretion of the Director of the Office of Community and Ethical Standards or his/her designee.

Factors required for such petitions to be considered:

- At least six months must have elapsed since the adjudication of the violation;
- The petition must be regarding a violation sanctioned with one semester of Disciplinary Probation or less;
- The violation must be the only disciplinary infraction on the student’s record;
- The student must have completed all educational sanctions regarding his/her violation in a timely manner.

Additional factors that may be considered in review of such petitions:

- The student’s reason(s) for the non-disclosure petition;
- The present demeanor of the student;
- The nature of the violation, the violation’s impact or potential impact on the University community, and the severity of any damage, injury, or harm resulting from the violation;
- Any other factor which is reasonable and relevant

Petition Requirements

In order to be considered for record non-disclosure, students must submit a detailed petition form to the Office of Community and Ethical Standards.

This petition should minimally include:

1. A description of the behavioral changes the student has made since the incident and completion of the sanction(s);
2. The student’s anticipated graduation date and the future plans he/she has following graduation.

Once the original petition is received, the Director or his/her designee and the student may meet to discuss the student’s petition. Decisions are final and may not be appealed. Any previous decision granting external non-disclosure will be revoked should another violation occur.
What is General Education?

The task force believes that general education is a collection of appropriate curricula that represents knowledge that every student should acquire throughout his or her undergraduate career at Clemson University. We also feel that the general education curriculum should represent a logical flow of ideas and prepare students to be effective world citizens.

What is the purpose of the task force?

In light of recent developments with the Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) and the reaffirmation of accreditation by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS), Clemson Undergraduate Student Government felt that our current general education curriculum needed to be revisited. The Academic Affairs Chair tasked the Academic Advisory Committee with the project of proposing reforms to the general education curriculum. The Academic Advisory Committee housed within Student Senate consists of the two senators from each college who received the most votes in the student body election, creating a board that is truly representative of students across campus.

What is not being accomplished by the current curriculum?

Members of the task force expressed concerns that the offerings of the current curriculum lack a general structure in that courses can be taken at any point during the undergraduate career. We believe that the current structure of the general education program and the execution and makeup of existing courses provide little value added to the undergraduate educational experience. We also felt that the relationship between competencies and courses is unclear in that what is required as part of the curriculum should be explicitly stated via the competencies.

Our proposal: A general education core within an academic core.

In order to incorporate continuity within the general education curriculum, the task force felt that a general education program core would mitigate the problem of a curriculum that is representative of the silo effect—"towers" of courses that are unrelated and disjointed in nature. We also felt that the current listing of competencies could logically follow a three-step process: fundamentals, connections, and applications. A general education core would represent an appropriate shift in students' perception of general education. We also recognize that the proposed general education core would be only part of a larger academic core. The below structure outlines our proposal:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fundamentals</th>
<th>Connections</th>
<th>Applications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Humanities/Fine Arts</td>
<td>Social/Behavioral Sciences</td>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Natural Sciences</td>
<td>Science and Technology in Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>Cross-Cultural Awareness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
General Education Revision Task Force - Final Report

Competencies
Our proposal represents a philosophical shift in that competencies directly match requirements. As a result, distributed competencies will no longer exist. The general education core would allow all competencies to logically flow and match existing or proposed courses or series of courses.

Fundamentals
These competencies represent the fundamentals of the academic experience. The task force is not proposing changes to these requirements, as they are required by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS), and no further revision was necessary.

- Humanities/Fine Arts (3)
- Social/Behavioral Sciences (6)
- Natural Sciences (8)
- Mathematics (3)

Connections
At this stage in the academic career, students will be able to draw conclusions based on the skills they will acquire in the fundamentals component of the general education core. The "Communication" competency will consist of both freshman composition and an additional communication course.

- Communication (6)
- Science and Technology in Society (3)

Applications
At the final stage of the academic career, students will be able to connect the theoretical skills that they have acquired and apply them to practical circumstances. Students will also apply the aforementioned skills to gain further knowledge about the world as a whole, effectively preparing them to be well versed in both a practical and theoretical sense.

- Cross-Cultural Awareness (3)

The proposed general education core curriculum will:
- Satisfy the SACS requirement of 30 hours and should not propose a challenge in terms of staffing or funding.
- Propose significant changes to the "Cross-Cultural Awareness" competency. Courses involving emerging world cultures and markets would be beneficial to the educational experience. Because many students have trouble satisfying this competency, we feel that the upper-level humanities courses that explore these topics should be open to all students.
- Remove "Ethical Judgment" from the list of competencies. We felt that it is immensely important for all students to be ethical thinkers, but it is not necessary for students to prove as an educational outcome.

The larger academic core curriculum will include:
- The "Critical Thinking" competency, as this competency will be satisfied upon the university's installation of the QEP.
- A "Leadership Development" competency that will prepare students to be civic and intellectual leaders within their chosen field.
- An "Engagement" competency that will incorporate significant co-curricular experiences such as study abroad, internships, cooperative education, undergraduate research, Creative Inquiry, and other related endeavors that draw conclusions in practice based on theoretical knowledge. Students will also be able to take a series of two related courses of interest in one department outside of their college to satisfy the competency. For example, a student majoring in engineering could take two related business courses.
- The "Academic and Professional Development" requirement as it currently exists.
Clemson University: Capital Asset Inventory

- Inventory includes Education and General (E&G), Auxiliaries, & Athletics Facilities
- ~7M Gross Square Feet
- 318 Buildings
- ~20,000 contiguous acres
Clemson University: Capital Asset Inventory

- Core Education and General (E&G) Facilities
  - Support instruction, research, and service missions
  - Examples include: classrooms, labs, Academic Success Center, administrative space, utilities, roads, etc.
  - ~4.2M Gross Square Feet
  - 127 buildings
  - Average Renovation Age: ~41 years
    - 39% of facilities are over 50 years
    - 27% of facilities are between 25 – 50 years

Clemson University: Capital Asset Inventory

- Auxiliary Enterprise Facilities
  - Self-supporting entities that provide goods or services to support students, faculty, & staff
  - Examples include: housing, dining, bookstore, & parking
  - ~2.2M Gross Square Feet
  - 166 Buildings
  - Average Renovation Age: ~35 years
    - Over 60% of space is over 25 years
Clemson University: Capital Asset Inventory

- Athletic Facilities
  - Self-supporting facilities for athletic activities
  - Examples include: football stadium, baseball stadium, soccer field, tennis facility, etc.

- 25 Buildings

Clemson University Facility Assessment & Evaluation

- Data-driven: Evaluate critical systems, infrastructure, & facility utilization
  - Semi-annual building envelope inspections (roof, windows, etc.)
  - Annual building inspections
    - Electrical systems
    - HVAC systems
    - Plumbing systems
    - Fume Hoods
  - Annual boiler inspections
  - Annual fire code inspections, elevator inspections, asbestos surveys, and OSHA building hazard assessments
  - Building condition assessment program (3-year cycle)
Clemson University
Facility Assessment & Evaluation

- Quarterly containment inspections
  - (i.e., aboveground storage tanks, storm water outfalls, etc.)
- Space planning and utilization assessments
- Utility master plan and precinct plans
- Regulatory testing and inspections of the Central Energy Facility and Wastewater Treatment Plant
- Systems assessment to forecast major system renewals/upgrade and respond to pending regulatory changes
- Consultant studies of major building systems and utility infrastructure
- Stakeholder feedback:
  - University Facilities Advisory Committee (UFAC)
  - Customer Surveys

Clemson University
Facility Planning

- Establishes investments in asset maintenance & capital construction
- Based on data & metrics
- Accounts for proper maintenance of new construction
- Key Drivers:
  - Preventative maintenance needs
  - Programmatic and competitive priorities
  - Long-range strategic planning
    - Infrastructure requirements – utilities (water, sewer, power, etc.)
  - Cost / Benefit analyses: renovate, repurpose, maintain at existing level, or demolish and build new?
Planning for Maintenance & Capital Renewal

• **Maintenance & capital renewal is NOT...**
  
  • A simplistic mathematical formula
  
  • A depreciation schedule
  
  • An easy calculation
  
  • Something that can be done from afar...from an office

Planning for Maintenance & Capital Renewal

• Strategically planned major repairs, renovations, & replacements of facilities & infrastructure

• Maintenance & capital renewal at Clemson results from conscious, data-driven decisions, as part of a rational capital plan and resource allocation strategy which considers:
  
  • Is the cost to renovate near to or in excess of costs to replace?
  • Does the current facility allow for efficient space utilization?
  • What is the historic significance of the facility?
  • Can the facility be repurposed?
  • Does repurposing reduce or increase maintenance and capital renewal needs?
  • Is the facility approaching the end of its life cycle, making further investment unwise?
Funding Asset Stewardship & Capital Investments

- Core E&G Facilities
  - Sources:
    - Bond Bill (1999 – Last Bond Bill)
    - State Capital Reserve Funding
      - FY 12 and FY 13 - Maintenance of electrical utility infrastructure ($10.7M)
    - Annual Maintenance, Renovations, and Repairs (MR&R) Fund
    - University Maintenance & Stewardship Fund
    - State Institution Bonds
    - Private donations
    - Grants

Funding Asset Stewardship & Capital Investments

- Auxiliary Operations (dining, housing, bookstore, parking, etc.):
  - By state statute, MUST be self-supporting – including debt, operations, & facilities
  - Sources:
    - Revenues generated through normal operations
  - Considerations:
    - NO LEGAL obligation of the State to support operations or to support any debt issuances
Funding Asset Stewardship & Capital Investments

- Athletic Operations:
  - By state statute, MUST be self-supporting – including debt, operations, & facilities
  - Sources:
    - IPTAY donations
    - Private fundraising
    - Operating revenues (ticket sales, bowl games, television contracts, etc.)
- Considerations:
  - NO LEGAL obligation of the State to support operations or to support any debt issuances

CU 2020 Capital Plan

- Considers factors such as:
  - Facilities needed to support Clemson University 2020 Plan
  - Financial health and stability
- 2020 Capital Plan reviewed quarterly
- Housing and Athletics fully funded by self-generated revenue.
  - Authorization to proceed.
- E&G Facilities
  - Authorization to proceed
  - Funding when feasible (Bond Bill)
CU 2020 Capital Plan Summary
FY 13 – FY 20

- **$329M for Total Planned Maintenance**
  - $105M - Maintenance of Critical Utility and Infrastructure Systems (electrical infrastructure maintenance, combined heat plant, etc.)
  - $49M - Critical HVAC & Air Quality Repairs (Daniel Hall, Barre Hall)
  - $103M - Major Repair Projects (College of Business Building, Poole, etc.)
  - $72M - Annual Maintenance and Repair Projects

- **$116M for New Construction**
  - Watt Innovation Center, Charleston Architecture Center, Clemson University Restoration Institute Graduate Education Center, etc.

Bio Sciences/Life Sciences Building Replacement

- Replaces Long Hall (Life Sciences building built in 1937)
- Status: Complete FY 13
- Budget: $50M
Lee Hall III Upgrade

- Renovation of 124K GSF, with addition of 50K GSF
- Nationally ranked academic programs
- Multiple fund sources
- Status: Complete FY 12
- Budget: $31.6M

Wind Turbine Drivetrain Test Facility

- Highly accelerated testing of drivetrains for wind turbines and electrical testing of multi-megawatt electrical equipment including wind turbines
- DOE grant funding
- Status: In Construction
- Budget: $84.9M
Watt Family Innovation Center

- Facility to support freshman engineering students
- Major gift
- Status: Design
- Budget: $29.0M

Greenville Project One

- Consolidates professional business programs in downtown Greenville
- Major gift from donor
- Status: Design
- Budget: $6.7M
Wastewater Treatment Facility Critical Repairs

- Addresses critical infrastructure maintenance
- Status: In Construction
- Phase 1 Budget: $4.8M
- Future Phases Budget: ~$5.2M

Electrical Infrastructure Critical Upgrade

- Replaces and upgrades portions of the antiquated 12,470-volt and 4,160-volt distribution systems to ensure enhanced safety and reliability
- Status: In Construction
- Phase 1 Budget: $10.7M (State Capital Reserve Funding of $10.7M)
- Future Phases Budget: ~$43M
Indoor Football Practice Facility

- Full-size synthetic turf football field, with coaches' platform, training room, sound and lighting systems.
- Status: Complete FY 13
- Budget: $10M

Douthit Hills

- High quality residential area for approximately 1,650 students with a 400-seat dining facility.
- Status: Design
- Budget: $212.7M
Johnstone Hall Replacement

- Replacement for Johnstone Hall temporary housing (built in 1953)
- Status: Concept Design
- Project Budget: $60.9M

Capital Asset Stewardship: Responsible Evaluation, Planning, Maintenance, Capital Investment & Funding

- Through objective, thorough, regular, and data driven evaluation, assessment, & planning – Clemson University is:
  - Responsibly maintaining its physical assets
  - Serving its students through responsible stewardship
  - Ensuring that the University and the State’s assets are stewarded properly
  - Balancing new construction with maintenance & capital renewal
Project Background:

The Human Resources Service Center (HRSC) http://www.clemson.edu/employment/hrsc/ offers a one-stop experience for customers to find the information they need when they need it. The HRSC is comprised of three components: Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs), Ask-HR and HR Toolkits. Using self-service and interactive components, this online resource offers accurate, reliable and comprehensive information in one area.

HRSC Operation:

1. Ask-HR provides an interactive experience where employees can submit questions online. The questions are fielded by trained HR representatives who are segmented into teams that deal with specific areas such as benefits, recruitment, payroll and many others. Once a question is submitted, it is assigned a “ticket” and forwarded electronically to an HR team member who will then follow up with the customer directly.

2. FAQs are a self-service tool. They are sorted into audience types, such as faculty, staff and supervisors. These documents are constantly updated with questions that come into the Ask-HR system. Within each audience type, there are categories and subcategories, which makes navigating and searching for a question quick and easy.

3. HR toolkits offer consolidated information on a variety of HR topics and functions. Presented with the same look and feel, each toolkit includes a step-by-step process and features links to relevant HR forms, policies, related documents and a glossary. HR toolkits are continuously being developed for all audience types, similar to those established for FAQs.

Outcomes:

Data/Metrics: Regularly analyze trends and patterns from data collected in order to proactively address customers’ concerns and produce FAQs and toolkits accordingly. Additionally, customer survey data and metrics will be utilized in an effort to consistently improve HR service delivery.

Improved overall efficiency of HR service delivery is anticipated with the implementation of the HRSC because HR customers will not have to spend valuable time and resources searching multiple Web pages or calling HR staff to get answers to their questions. This HR effort is in support of Clemson University's 2020 Road Map, specifically the following strategic objectives: "Build to compete – facilities, infrastructure and technology”, and “Attract, retain and reward top people.”
The Human Resources Service Center (HRSC) is a one-stop experience for addressing all HR questions and providing information and assistance with the following services:

Benefits / Recruitment / Compensation / Onboarding
International Employment / Records Management
Payroll / Employee Relations / Training

On our HRSC website you will find Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs), Toolkits, and an Ask-HR web portal!

clemson.edu/employment/HRSC

We look forward to serving you!
The research committee has finalized the *Faculty Senate Research Committee Report: Clemson University Faculty Perceptions of Institutional Support for Research*. This final report has been sent to Larry Dooley, Interim VP for Research with a copy to Karen Burg, Interim Dean of the Graduate School. A copy of the final report is attached.

Tracy Arwood, Assistant VP for Research Compliance, has asked the Senate Research Committee to look at a draft of Clemson University Authorship Guidelines (see attached). This document could possibly be of great help in training of students and prevention of authorship disputes. The research committee has been asked to review this draft and provide comments and feedback for development of university level guidelines.
Faculty Senate Research Committee Report:
Clemson University Faculty Perceptions of Institutional Support for Research
Spring, 2013

Research Committee Membership 2012-2013:
Chair - Jim McCubbin - CBBS
Peter van den Hurk - CAFLS
Robert Hewett - AAH
Megan Mowrey-CBBS
Mike Ellison/Dvora Perahia - CES
Sarah Griffin - HEHD
Julie Northcutt - CAFLS
Julia Frugoli - Non Senate Member

In the fall of 2012 the Clemson University Faculty Senate Research Committee solicited faculty input to identify the most pressing campus-wide issues that impact faculty research and scholarly success here at Clemson. The committee wanted to know Clemson's research infrastructure needs and other challenges to faculty research productivity. We used faculty input to develop an agenda of high priority research concerns that merit further attention. We hope this data collection and analysis will inform university faculty and administration, and facilitate efforts to maximize the research infrastructure, culture and climate at Clemson University.

Data Collection: Senators were asked to poll their constituents for input. These data were consolidated into a multi-page list of challenges, barriers, and suggestions for improvement of faculty research success. Detailed items were discussed at the meeting and, using a nominal group process, were organized and prioritized into a set of targets for improvement. Faculty research productivity and success is intimately intertwined with broader issues such as teaching load and graduate policies, so our list is contextualized with this in mind.

Limitations: A qualitative methodology was used to identify perceptions of Clemson University faculty members based on their experience in development and maintenance of high quality research and scholarly productivity. This method identifies issues reported in the survey. It is not a scientific quantitative survey and there are specific limitations in proper interpretation of these data. For example, this methodology does not scientifically address: 1) the breadth of opinions and perceptions, 2) the issues specific to certain disciplines and academic units, and 3) how deeply these perceptions may be held by individuals. Instead, these data are best used to identify areas of focus that may provide opportunities for overall improvement in institutional support for the research mission of Clemson University.

The nominal group process resulted in several important themes emerging for development of targeted action items. The prioritized list is included below:
I. Research Infrastructure

A. Institutional support for faculty proposal development: There is a perception that Clemson University institutional support for proposal development and management is inefficient and often ineffective. The structure of institutional support for proposal development at Clemson is fragmented into separate university preaward (Office of Sponsored Projects), postaward (Office of Sponsored Projects Administration), and college/department level support. We are aware of recent efforts to better coordinate pre- and postaward administration. However, much of the individualized support for preaward proposal development is largely outsourced to the colleges. As a result, each college must invest resources to offer these services, and as a result, some colleges have marginal proposal support services. There is a concern about the duplication of services between colleges. Subsequently, there is a perception that overall proposal support services do little to facilitate faculty proposal development institution wide.

There is a concern that funding for institutional support of the research mission may not efficiently contribute to mission success. The committee discussed these issues in light of the use and return of indirect costs. The current distribution of indirect costs to the office of research, colleges, departments and investigators is highly valued by faculty. The notion of centralizing these funds seems to have limited faculty support, but may also be part of the perceived limitations in institution-wide support. Questions were raised about how some top tier research universities (e.g. University of Georgia, Texas A&M) finance highly effective institutional support for faculty research and proposal development. Concerns were also expressed about whether centralization of indirect funds would significantly improve institutional support program. If indirect funds were centralized without a significant improvement in institutional support, faculty would lose twice, once with continued absence of strong campus wide support, and again with loss of the previously returned indircets.

No one seems to be requesting institutional support for discipline-specific scientific aspects of research proposals. Instead Clemson might better provide general expertise for NSF, DoD, NIH and foundation application procedures, and more efficiently facilitate the proofing and mechanical aspects, including budget calculations, formatting, etc.

B. There is a perception that the availability of seed money and bridge money for research is insufficient to support the overall research mission.

C. There is concern that lack of comprehensive insurance and maintenance for equipment often results in critical loss of functionality, without funding mechanisms to bring equipment back into service. This results in poor performance on some NSF-funded research projects and loss of significant university resources.

D. There is concern that some of the university intellectual property policies unnecessarily restrict partnerships with industry.
E. There is a concern about the transparency of the limited submission application and review process. Requests for proposals often are announced with insufficient advance notice to allow all interested parties an adequate opportunity to submit. There is also concern about the adequacy of the review process to provide an equitable assessment of all proposals.

II. University teaching load policies

A. Teaching load policies significantly affect faculty research success. There is a perception that college teaching load policies may negatively impact faculty research productivity, university wide. There is a perception that increases in student enrollment and loss of faculty positions have produced teaching loads inconsistent with Top 20 aspirations.

B. Additional adjunct, lecturer and instructor hires are insufficient to offset heavy teaching loads.

III. Graduate student quality

A. Graduate student policies significantly affect faculty research success. There is a perception that graduate student quality is significantly compromised by stipend levels that are noncompetitive in the current market. Like faculty salaries, graduate stipend levels need periodic market-based assessments and adjustments to regain lost competitiveness.

B. There is concern that university graduate tuition policies result in significantly higher budgetary costs for GRAs, relative to the cost of non-graduate research assistants.

IV. Additional needs- Several other issues have been raised, and relate to limited submission review, space constraints, conflict of interest policies.

V. Next steps- Survey findings will be communicated the interim VP for Research and interim Dean of the Graduate School. Further review and discussion of these issues will enable a set of action items to be developed and recommendations made. It is the committee's hope that continuity and follow-up will be maintained in subsequent years to increase the chances for change implementation and improvement of university support for faculty research.

End of Committee Report
CLEMSON UNIVERSITY

Authorship Guidelines - Draft

I. General Principles and Responsible Conduct

The mission of Clemson University is to fulfill the covenant between its founder and the people of South Carolina to establish a "high seminary of learning" through its historical land-grant responsibilities of teaching, research and extended public service. Coupled with this mission is the responsibility to communicate truthfully new knowledge gained from research to the rest of the scientific community. When publishing results of research, authors should adhere to certain standards that will assure the quality and integrity of the publication. Specially, authors should:

i. If possible, report results and their verification in a peer-reviewed forum

ii. Report all relevant data including conflicting data if pertinent to the hypothesis in question

iii. Acknowledge the work of others that is relevant to the context of the study and its interpretation

iv. Refrain from redundant primary publications of the same data

v. Take ultimate responsibility for the scholarly character, accuracy, and conduct of the research performed under their supervision

vi. Present research in appropriate scientific forums before reports are released to the press

vii. Alert editors and readers of potential conflicts of interest that may affect how the article will be interpreted

Fabricating data, falsifying data, and/or knowingly representing the work of others as one's own are serious violations of our mission and the public trust and constitute scientific misconduct.

II. Criteria for Authorship

Authorship refers to the listing of names of participants in all written communications of data and their interpretation to the scientific community. Authorship is the fulfillment of the responsibility to communicate scientific research to society and is the primary means for assigning credit for a scientist's contributions to the advancement of scientific knowledge.

Authorship should be given generously, but only to those who have contributed significantly to the research, are prepared to stand behind their findings, and have reviewed the entire manuscript. All authors of a scholarly publication should meet the following four criteria:

i. Participate substantially in conception, design, and execution of the study, or in the analysis and interpretation of data
ii. Participate substantially in the drafting of the manuscript or in the substantive editing of the manuscript

iii. Give final approval of the version of the manuscript to be published

iv. Be able to explain and defend in public or scholarly settings that portion of the study for which he or she was directly responsible, including potential conflicts of interest

A claim of authorship by, or assignment of authorship to, persons who may have been associated in some way with a study but do not meet the four criteria above is considered highly inappropriate. The referral of patients included in a clinical study does not in and of itself warrant co-authorship status. Individuals who have made lesser contributions such as providing advice, occasional analyses, subject/patient material, space, or who may have supported the research in other ways, should be acknowledged. The practice of permitting honorary authorship is unacceptable and should be actively discouraged.

III. Responsible Author
One author, designated as the Responsible Author must assume overall responsibility for each publication (e.g., primary research report, abstract, review article, book chapter) submitted from Clemson University. The Responsible Author is typically the faculty member who leads the study and who assumes the responsibility for coordinating and completing the work, drafting of the manuscript, satisfying pertinent rules for submitting the manuscript and any required revisions, and coordinating responses of the group to inquiries or challenges. The Responsible Author should exercise due diligence in assuring the validity of the entire manuscript.

The selection of the Responsible Author, inclusion of collaborator(s) as co-author(s), and the order of authorship should ideally be determined by the research team as a whole. Decisions regarding authorship and its order should, when possible, be determined before the study begins and any disputes resolved at that time. A written memo attesting to this determination is valuable documentation if a dispute subsequently arises. Changes in authorship, which take place as a study proceeds, should similarly be documented in writing. The Responsible Author should assure that all collaborators are appropriately recognized and that study collaborators listed as co-authors meet the criteria for authorship described herein. The Responsible Author does not necessarily have to be the first author.

The Responsible Author should assure that all co-authors have had the opportunity to approve the final version of a manuscript or abstract, that each co-author has reviewed the portions of the manuscript or abstract representing his or her contribution, and each is willing to support that material.

Each co-author must consent to authorship prior to submission of any manuscript bearing his or her name. In addition, each co-author should practice due diligence to assure the validity of the manuscript.

IV. Students, Fellows, and Research Associates
All persons designated as authors should qualify for authorship as defined herein. Faculty should
be aware of their responsibility to ensure that students, postdoctoral fellows, and other research associates participate in the preparation of manuscripts and are recognized as authors in publications covering the results of research in which they were active participants.

V. Multi-Authorship/Multi-Center Manuscripts
These criteria are considered important because there has been a gradual diffusion of responsibility for multi-authored or collaborative studies that has led to the publication of papers for which no single author was prepared to take full responsibility.

Multi-authorship, including authorship on papers from multi-center studies, raises special issues, such as the ability of an author to evaluate all aspects of a study and the sequence of listing of authors. Authors should discuss these issues openly before initiating a multi-authored project and repeatedly during the course of such work. To promote this process in multi-center studies, specially charged Publication Committees are often invaluable (see section on Disputes over Authorship).

All authors should approve the final version of a manuscript and should be prepared to take public responsibility for the work. It is recognized, however, that medical studies often involve investigators from several specialties, and it may not always be possible for a single investigator to confirm each piece of data used in the written report. It is therefore the responsibility of each participating investigator to be actively involved in verifying the sections of a manuscript that discuss his or her specialty area, and to assure all co-authors that the sections are accurate and valid.

VI. Disputes over Authorship
In general, authorship issues and related matters should be freely discussed and decided upon early during the research process and prior to writing of the manuscript. However, agreements relating to authorship may need to be changed during the collection of data and preparation of the manuscript. Possible disagreements include interpretation of the criteria for authorship, order of listing of authors, editorial control of content and focus of the manuscript, selection of journal or other publication media, and choice of Responsible Author.

i. A procedure for resolution of disputes over authorship is outlined along with a timetable for each step. It is recognized that extensions in the time to resolve a dispute may be necessary. When this occurs, the reason(s) for the delay in completion should be documented in the final report. All matters related to dissolution of authorship disputes should be held in a confidential manner as much as possible.

Disagreements between or among authors should be resolved in a collegial manner by the Responsible Author in consultation with the other author(s), relevant research personnel, and any other individual who claims authorship. Generally, the Responsible Author has the primary responsibility for making decisions on authorship and other matters related to the publication of manuscripts.

When matters of authorship and related issues cannot be resolved in a satisfactory manner by the Responsible Author, other author(s), research personnel, and other individuals who claim
authorship, the Responsible Author and/or other author(s)/ research personnel should present their controversy in writing to the Department Chair. The manuscript in question should not be submitted for publication before these issues are resolved. The Departmental Chair should meet with the individuals involved in the dispute, collect and retain appropriate information, and make a recommendation in writing as to authorship within 60 days of receiving the complaint. When the authorship dispute involves the Chair, if the Chair has a major conflict of interest, or if the dispute involves more than one department, then a neutral mediator will be appointed by the Dean's designee. The mediator should hold the rank of tenured professor and make a recommendation to the Chair within 60 days. Normally, the Chair will notify the Dean of an impasse, but the individuals involved can also make this notification directly.

If resolution at the local level cannot be achieved, the matter can be referred to the Authorship Dispute Committee in one of two ways. If the matter is taken to the Authorship Dispute Committee with the mutual agreement of all parties, the decision of the Committee will be binding on all parties. If the matter is taken to the Authorship Dispute Committee without the mutual agreement of all parties, the decision of the Authorship Dispute Committee is not binding, but the Committee will make a written recommendation that will be provided to all parties of the dispute and can be made public by any of the parties involved.

The Authorship Dispute Committee will be comprised as follows: the Dean (or his or her designee) will appoint three senior faculty members (one of whom will serve as Committee Chair from departments other than the involved department(s)) to a committee to investigate the dispute. The review group will not include individuals with personal responsibility for the research, but should include faculty members with unique qualifications relative to the dispute in question (i.e., research expertise, training of graduate students, experience with clinical trials, active peer-reviewed research, etc.). In addition, a representative from the Office of Research will serve as Executive Secretary. Within 75 days, the committee will make a recommendation in writing.

ii. Disputes Over Authorship in Multi-Center Studies
Publication, presentation, and authorship policies should be determined and accepted by all participating investigators at the beginning of any multi-center study. Specifically, it is recommended that a Publication Subcommittee representing all Investigators should be established at the beginning of any multi-center study for the purposes of expediting, coordinating, and monitoring the paper-writing processes. Inherent in these charges is the responsibility to adjudicate disputes over authorship. As with single-center studies, difficulties for a particular paper can be avoided if the identification and sequence of authors is agreed upon by all participants in advance.

If a dispute between investigators from separate centers does arise, the solution to the dispute should arise from within the organizational structure of the multi-center study. If a dispute cannot be resolved, the principle of academic freedom generally indicates that an investigator has the right to present those data for which he/she is contract custodian. However, this right should be tempered by the concept of collegial collaboration. It is unacceptable for an investigator to publish or present studies finding before the total group of study investigators has had a reasonable opportunity to do so.
iii. It is important to note that the journal editor plays an important role in disputed authorship. See the Committee of Publication Ethics' website for more information: http://www.publicationethics.org/
Faculty Senate Research Committee
Final Report AY 2012-2013

Research Committee Membership 2012-2013:
Chair- Jim McCubbin- CBBS
Peter van den Hurk- CAFLS
Robert Hewett- AAH
Megan Mowrey-CBBS
Mike Ellison/Dvora Perahia- CES
Sarah Griffin—HEHD
Julie Northcutt-CAFLS
Julia Frugoli- Non Senate Member

Continuity of Committee Mission:

The current and past research committee chairs met to discuss continuity of agenda items for multi-year initiatives. We will continue to monitor follow-up items from Academic Year 2012-13 and will coordinate with the new research committee to assure continuity into Academic Year 2013-14. McCubbin has been asked by President-elect Kelly Smith to continue as chair of the research committee in AY 2013-14.

Faculty Survey of Institutional Support for Faculty Research:

The Committee solicited faculty input to identify the most pressing campus-wide issues that impact faculty research and scholarly success here at Clemson. We asked about perceptions of Clemson's research infrastructure needs and other challenges to faculty research productivity. Information was used to develop an agenda of high priority research concerns. The final report has been sent to Larry Dooley, Interim VP for Research with a copy to Karen Burg, Interim Dean of the Graduate School. Both have replied and support this ongoing effort and dialogue.

Nationwide Inefficiencies in Research Resulting from Administrative Burdens

A survey released in 2007 by the Federal Demonstration Partnership, an association of federal agencies, research universities, and research-policy groups estimated that 42 percent of American researchers' time is spent on administrative tasks, compared with 18 percent two decades earlier. The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) will open a 60-day comment period as soon as a draft proposal is finished. This offers an opportunity for the research community and anyone who recognizes the value of scientific progress to help ensure that American science thrives in an accountable, efficient, and
effective way. The Research Committee has been involved with the Office of the VP for Research in coordination of an institution-level response to U.S. OMB call for comments on administrative burdens and inefficiencies for U.S. researchers.

Clemson University Authorship Guidelines:

Tracy Arwood, Assistant VP for Research Compliance, has asked the Senate Research Committee to look at a draft of Clemson University Authorship Guidelines (see attached). This document could possibly be of great help in training of students and prevention of authorship disputes. The research committee has been asked to review this draft and provide comments and feedback for development of university level guidelines. Work on this document will likely continue into the next academic year.

Video Surveillance Policy:

The Research Committee read and provided feedback to CUDP Chief Jim Link on a draft Video Surveillance Policy. The committee recommended that this policy exempt video collected for research purposes in order to avoid conflict with federal guidelines on protection of human research subjects.

Assessment of Digital Commons Utility:

The Committee assessed the utility of Digital Commons http://digitalcommons.bepress.com/ as a hosted platform repository for institutional content of any type. Digital Commons offers a traditional institutional repository as well as professional publishing software, management tools and faculty pages to communicate, via multi-media capabilities, research and scholarly products. This can potentially collect, preserve and publish theses and dissertations, pre-prints, working papers, journal articles, conference proceedings and other content. This platform is currently being assessed as a potential singular portal for input and maintenance of data for the CU Faculty Activity System database. Specifically, we are assessing the use of Digital Commons for reporting faculty CVs, publications and other accomplishments.

University Policy on Conflict of Interest

The Research Committee Chair provided input to then-VPR Gerry Sonnenfeld and General Counsel Chip Hood on a draft university policy on conflict of interest. This policy was developed in response to the U.S. Public Health Service's new requirements for reporting financial conflicts of interest by anyone involved in PHS grants.
Academic Advising and Accreditation

The new Banner-based IROAR software did not originally provide for a requirement for academic advisors to clear students for registration only after receiving academic advising. The Research Committee Chair provided input to Senate President King on the importance of academic advising in accreditation guidelines. Accreditation guidelines provided an additional rational to compel implementation of a university-level provision for registration clearance. This clearance for registration provision has now been incorporated into the IROAR Fall '13 registration process.

Fringe Benefit Policies for Postdoctoral Fellows:

The Research Committee was represented in discussions with Kristina Kaylor of Human Resources on fringe benefit policies for postdoctoral fellows and personnel hired on research grants.

Senate Representation in Search for Director of the Office of Sponsored Programs

The Faculty Senate was represented by the Research Committee at open forums with candidates for Director of the Office of Sponsored Programs.

Personnel Issues:

The Research Committee convened in executive session to discuss and provide guidance to the President of the Faculty Senate on a personnel issue.
UNFINISHED

Survey of Chairs on their use of student teaching evaluation in evaluations:  Graciela Tissera took the lead in developing a survey of Chairs on their use of student teaching evaluations for performance reviews. The goals are to determine which information is used, how it is weighted (for example does a high score indicate excellent or too easy teaching?), whether all faculty are evaluated in the same way, what other information is also used, and whether all these criteria are clearly communicated to faculty. Linda Nilson and Debra Jackson provided valuable input and David Knox implemented the survey online. It was endorsed Senate on Feb. 12 and went out soon after, followed by a reminder to Chairs that their input is important and will be confidential. The results are not yet in. Based on the results of this survey, we may wish to discuss with Chairs the strengths and weaknesses of such student evaluations, and the requirement to consider alternative sources of information on teaching. We may also wish to survey Chairs of TPR Committees in the future.

Bridge Program:  Alan Grubb has been evaluating the admission and performance of students who enter Clemson University through the Bridge Program, compared with traditional students. He has been compiling information on admission standards, grades, graduation rates, etc., from Debra Jackson, Robert Barkley, Sue Horton and others, and has submitted a preliminary report.

New articulation agreements:  SP has been asked whether Clemson University can enter into articulation agreements with two-year colleges in which those colleges offer courses that will receive 3xx credit at Clemson University. Clemson does not currently allow this, nor do most other universities, based on an informal professional survey by Robert Barclay.  David Tonkyn has received arguments for and against this change and reviewed SACS documents, but was unable to schedule a meeting with University Counsel for review.

Student and Employee Policy for email Communication:  At the Provost’s request, Jan Murdoch forwarded this proposed new policy on emails on March 20, for FS vetting:

Email is considered an official method of communication at Clemson University. Official email communications are intended to meet the academic, research and public service needs of the user community including students, faculty, staff and administrators. The University has the right to expect that such communications will be received and read in a timely
manner. To enable this process, the University ensures that all members of the university community can be reached through a standardized, university issued email account throughout their tenure at Clemson University. If a user chooses to forward their email to an account other than those issued or supported in partnership by Clemson University, Clemson University cannot be held responsible for the timely delivery or reliability of the user’s access to the service.

**COMPLETED**

**Banner:** We were asked last May by outgoing Faculty Senate President Dan Warner to consider the perhaps unintended effects of implementing Banner, the new student records system, on Clemson’s redemption and withdrawal policies. Banner does not have an option to enforce current University policies limiting student withdrawal and redemption hours. We received input from Jeff Appling and met with the Banner Project Manager and the Registrar’s Office, and made two recommendations: to remove the cap on withdrawal hours, to avoid costly custom software development and bring Clemson in line with other schools; and to change the cap on grade redemptions from 10 credit hours to 3 courses. Both were approved unanimously at the May 8, 2012 Faculty Senate Meeting.

We also agreed to fast-track any other issues that arose from the implementation of Banner, and met again in July with the Banner Project Manager and Registrar’s Office, to discuss three more. First, Banner did not have a way to force students to meet with their advisors prior to registering for classes, and we were asked whether this requirement might be relaxed. We had a spirited discussion and, without taking a vote, made it clear that at least some faculty feel strongly that it should be continued. Students are now registering through Banner for the first time, and we observe that a way has been found to ensure that students meet with their advisors prior to registering for classes. We also discussed the changes that Banner would bring to purchasing and class room scheduling across campus.

**Retention Committee:** We endorsed a request from Vice-Provost Jan Murdoch to eliminate the Freshman-Sophomore Retention Committee that she chairs. This was approved at the September 11, 2012 Senate Meeting by a two-thirds majority.

**Latin Honors requirement:** We discussed whether the new Latin honors criteria were too high, and whether their implementation should be delayed a year. We voted not to reconsider the standards themselves, but to support the delay so that students who entered Clemson University in the fall of 2009 could graduate under the standards set in that year’s Undergraduate Announcements. In September, the Senate asked us to look into it further, and it was a major point of discussion at the Council on Undergraduate Studies meeting on Sept. 14. There we learned that the Undergraduate Announcements are explicitly NOT a contract with the students (page 8), that there had already been a 2-year extension to the criteria, and that the SDPR forms had shown the new standards for several years. Given this information, we did not support delaying implementation, and recognized that Provost Helms has the final decision.
Contextualization in grading: We were asked to explore whether faculty should provide rankings of students in addition to letter grades, as a possible response to grade inflation. At the Oct. 9 Senate meeting, we proposed to drop this issue unless and until someone actively raises it, and there were no objections.

Ad hoc Committee on Application of Graduate Credits to an Undergraduate Degree: Bob Horton was the SP representative to this committee, and had sent us the text below which was sent to the Council on Undergraduate Studies. We reported this to the full Faculty Senate at its Oct. 9th meeting and there were not comments.

Undergraduate Enrollment in Graduate Courses
Clemson University undergraduates may request to enroll in graduate courses at Clemson only if they have senior standing and have a cumulative grade-point ratio of 3.0 or higher. Enrollment of undergraduates in any graduate course is subject to approval by the department offering the course and by the Graduate School. The total course workload for the semester must not exceed 18 hours, and undergraduate students may not enroll in a total of more than 12 semester hours of graduate credit at Clemson University. The credits and quality points associated with senior enrollment in graduate courses will be part of the undergraduate record. Undergraduates seeking to enroll in graduate courses must complete form GS6, Request for Senior Enrollment, and GS6BS/MS, which is available at www.grad.clemson.edu/forms/GeneralForms.php.

Application of Graduate Credits to Undergraduate Degree
At the discretion of the degree-granting program, a degree-seeking undergraduate student may apply graduate level coursework—whether earned at Clemson or elsewhere—towards an undergraduate degree. Graduate courses taken at regionally accredited institutions other than Clemson University are eligible to be evaluated for transfer credit. Students may not receive credit for both the 400 and 600 levels of the same course.

Changes in International Student Travel: We met with the Vice Provost for International Affairs, Sharon Nagy, about proposed changes to allow study abroad programs in selected regions of countries that are otherwise considered unsafe by the US State Department, CDC or WHO. These changes had been proposed before she arrived, and she made modifications before sending them to CUGS and others. We expressed our concerns that the International Affairs Office, and not individual faculty members, should take primary responsibility in detecting any changes to such regions that would affect the safety of our students and faculty.

General Education changes: On several occasions, we discussed with Perry Austin and Student Senators their ideas on reforming the General Education requirements at Clemson. Perry forwarded to us the Final Report of the Student Senate General Education Revision Task Force, which we then sent to the Senate for information and guidance. It was decided to invite the Student Senate to present this report at the first meeting of the 2013-2014 Senate, so that curricular reform might be on the agenda at the outset.
Calhoun Honors College Committee: We approved changes to the Faculty Manual provision regarding the make-up of the Calhoun Honors Committee, which had been requested by Dr. Bill Lassiter, Director of the Calhoun Honors College. These were modest and intended to reflect changes in the Honors College personnel and programs. These were approved at the Nov. 18, 2012 Faculty Senate meeting.

Permanent fall break: We considered a request that the University institute a permanent Fall Break, separate from mandated election holidays, as a solution to the problems that arise when the only break is in early November, near the end of classes. This was not supported.

Informing students of alternate sources for required materials: We were asked to consider a case in which a faculty member had used Blackboard to notify students that required course materials could be obtained more cheaply outside of the University Bookstore. This could lead to a significant reduction in sales to Barnes and Noble, with whom the university has a contract for on-campus sales, but provide savings to the students. We cannot address the legal aspects, but thought that students were savvy in finding cheaper sources of books, etc., and that discretion rather than a new policy on faculty should suffice.

Financial exigency/closure: Jeremy King asked a number of Faculty Senate committees to look at the new AAUP financial exigency/program closure guidelines. We examined them and proposed that the Faculty Senate request that the University Counsel propose a specific revision to the Faculty Manual, which we could then discuss. It was suggested that Dan Warner may have worked on this with Clay Steadman when he was Counsel.

Reversal of substitution decision: Jeremy King asked that we consider a case in which Jan Murdoch apparently overturned a departmental decision to deny a course substitution. The student had appealed unsuccessfully to his academic Dean before asking Dean Murdoch. It appeared that she overreached her authority, but when we contacted her, she expressed surprise at this interpretation. She pointed out that her signature is the final one on the form, and she has understood this to mean she has final authority. In addition, she sometimes had information regarding the students that was not available to faculty. She suggested that Faculty Senate formally seek to change this policy if it wishes. We did not pursue this.

Scholarships and Awards Committee: Wayne Goddard has represented Scholastic Policies on this committee. No action items were transmitted to the committee.

Online Education Faculty Advisory Board: John Leininger has represented Scholastic Policies on this new committee, and kept us informed on its activities and plans.

Council of Undergraduate Studies, including Banner Subcommittee: David Tonkyn has represented Scholastic Policies on this committee and brought up several SP items for general discussion (e.g., Latin Honors, applying graduate credits to undergraduate degree, evaluation of Bridge Program and articulation agreements.)
Policy Committee Final Report

Members: Rob Baldwin, Megan Che, Scott Dutkiewicz, Mary Beth Kurz, Peter Laurence, Fran McGuire, John Meriwether, Monica Patterson, Bill Pennington (chair)

New Business

Faculty Manual Revision to include the President’s Commission on Sustainability.
To be inserted as VII.C.10 (page 55)

10. President’s Commission on Sustainability. The Commission will be the coordinating body for efforts to make the University a model of affordable, fiscally responsible, environmental sustainability for public institutions of higher education. Membership of the Commission consists of members of the faculty, members of the staff, students, and other nonvoting members. Three faculty representatives shall be appointed by the Faculty Senate from the Faculty at Large and shall have a three-year staggered term limit. Each member shall be from a different College (to include the Library). Appointees may include Emeriti faculty. Appointees shall have a demonstrated knowledge, interest, and ability in the subject of sustainability and shall not be sitting on the Senate at the time of nomination or appointment. Staff in operational areas, students and ex-officio members are appointed for one year terms by the individuals or organizations outlined in the Commission’s charter (http://www.clemson.edu/administration/commissions/sustainability/documents/charter.pdf). The chair of the Commission is appointed by the President for a one year renewable term.

Completed Business

The following changes were approved by the Executive Advisory Committee and the Faculty Senate, and have been submitted to the Provost:

- Part II, Section D - Alleged violations of the Manual – clarifies role of the Faculty Senate in determining whether a violoation has occurred, and the role of the provost in determining resolution of violations.
- Part IV, Section E - Annual Performance Evaluations – merges FAS and old Forms 1-3 methods of evaluation to provide a fully on-line evaluation system.
- Part III, Section E. # 9 – Post-Doctoral Research Fellows – Removes one-year limit and identifies criteria for renewal.
- Part III, Section F – Endowed Chairs and Titled Professors - Specifies Alumni Distinguished Professorship are based on teaching and dedication to Clemson University and its students.
- Part V. Section I. # 9 and 10 – Grievance Hearings – Clarifies deadlines for decisions by the Hearing Panel and the Provost.
- Part VII, Section B, e. (page 47) – Change in the composition of the Calhoun Honors College Committee
- Part III E (6) – Lecturer – Details the policy to follow when there is a discrepancy in recommendations for promotion to senior lecturer;
Part III E (8) - Senior Lecturers – Clarifies the administrative duties limit for senior lecturers as well as the characteristic of senior lecturers

Part IV, B (2) - Selection of Other Academic Administrators – Details the policy to follow when faculty-recommended interim chair candidates do not receive Dean approval.

Part IX. Professional Practices, Section D. Teaching Practices, #11 (Evaluation of Teaching by Students)

Part VII D (4) – The Freshman/Sophomore Committee – At the request of Dr. Jan Murdoch the Senate approved the deletion of this committee.

Part X C (new # 2) – Public Health Service Financial Conflict of Interest Policy – A link to this policy is provided.

The Policy Committee also discussed and ruled on an allegation of a Faculty Manual violation. The committee ruled that a violation had occurred, but felt that the manual was not completely clear with regard to the section being violated (see Pending Business 12).
Ongoing and Pending Business

1) Policy Committee discussed creation of a new named professorship, i.e. “University Professor”, and establishment of In-Rank promotion criteria to allow Full Professors to request an external review process with the intent of qualifying them for a raise. We also discussed President Barker’s establishment of a Presidential Endowed Chair (Juan Gilbert was the first recipient of this award). The discussion of the new named professorship is ongoing, and we have suggested that President King and Senator Pennington continue to work on this next year as an ‘ad hoc’ committee. The intent is to explore whether this position might be merged with the Alumni Distinguished Professorship. This will depend on the willingness of the Alumni Association and the Board of Trustees to share ownership of this position. We will also suggest creation of a student scholarship, endowed by the Board. Each recipient of this scholarship would be selected by one of the new Alumni Distinguished Professors.

The need for an In-Rank Promotion for Full Professors was diminished by the commitment of the University to accept Huron’s compensation plan which is based on elevation to and subsequent maintenance of market-based salaries for all faculty.

Continuing discussion of President Barker’s Presidential Endowed Chair is focused on the role of the Faculty in the selection process, and also on inclusion of this position in the faculty manual.

2) Discussion with Grievance Board representatives, Janie Lindle and Camille Cooper, regarding possible revisions to FM Part V, Grievance Procedures, resulted in decision for Policy Committee to strengthen the wording providing the Grievance Board with discretionary power to control the number of witnesses called and evidence submitted for Category II cases. This will hopefully decrease the time needed to hear these cases. University Counsel has expressed some concern that the less serious Category II cases take up more time than the more serious Category I cases. It was also decided that the submission of the grievance complaint should be made simultaneously to both the Provost and the Faculty Senate to avoid the appearance that the Provost is in control of the Grievance Process. The time-table for the Provost should also be reduced from the current 20 days to 10 days.

3) The LGBTQ Task Force has been approached about inclusion of their charter in the Faculty Manual. They were very open to the idea.

4) A great deal of discussion of the Post Tenure Review process took place with the intent of providing more immediate remediation activities for faculty receiving two or more unfavorable ratings (these are defined as “fair”, “marginal” or “poor”) on their Annual Performance Review. A proposal was submitted to the Executive Advisory Committee which would have established a “rolling” five year window. The occurrence of a second poor APR within any five consecutive years would trigger Phase II review, involving external review.
5) Discussion of the role and treatment of postdoctoral associates generated three main issues:
   a) Should post-docs be special faculty
   b) No matter what they are should they and/or other special faculty have grievance rights
   c) No matter what they are, what are the requirements/conditions for dismissal and/or
      termination beyond any grant-specific guidelines.

It has been suggested that these options be handled by the Policy, Welfare, and Research
committees, respectively. Alternatively, a select or ad hoc committee could be formed to address
these issues.

6) Hiring and Review of Academic Administrators: The policy committee concurs that this
section of the Faculty Manual is in desperate need of a thorough revision. The text is unclear and
sections are dated. This revision should be done in cooperation with General Counsel and the
BOT and should probably be done by an ad-hoc committee dedicated to this task. This is a
pressing issue given the large number of on going hires. Establishing clear guidelines for the
review of AA is also crucial given the demands for transparency as it pertains to raises.

7) Program Termination/RIF: While not as pressing as it was a few years ago, a clear policy
should be established when we are not in crisis mode. Work on this policy should be done in
cooperation with the General Counsel. (Pennington and Steadman made good progress on this in
the past).

8) IP policy: Two years ago the Policy Committee (Pennington) met with Johanna Floyd and
Becca Hanus regarding several issues with the current policy (or lack thereof). It was promised
that the IP committee would discuss our concerns and get back to us, but this never happened.
Crucial that senate remain engaged on this issue. Revision of the policy is ongoing.

9) Department Bylaws/TPR Guidelines: The Senate should offer itself as a resource to
departments who would like to ensure that department policies are consistent with the
requirements established in the Faculty Manual. This may reduce Faculty Manual violations and Grievances.

10) General Policy Concern: Many general policies on campus (computer use, IP, Mission Statement, etc…) that affect faculty are implemented with minimal faculty input. The Senate should work to ensure that faculty have the opportunity to comment on new university policy, and encourage faculty to take the time to offer thoughtful feedback.

11) Tenure Policy: There is ongoing concern about the meaning of “separate” as it pertains to chair and TPR committee recommendation to their dean. Some chairs seem to be relying on old versions of the Faculty Manual. It may be useful to send a memo to chairs summarizing the changes to the FM each fall.

12) It has been suggested that the description of the Provost’s handling of tenure and promotion decisions be modified to follow that for Deans (see below, especially the underlined passage), but this has not been acted upon.

Faculty Manual Part IV.D. (paragraph 6, page 21)

The dean reviews the complete file, makes a separate recommendation on the “Request for Personnel Action” form, and writes a report which includes a rationale for supporting or opposing the recommendations of the peer committee and department chair. The dean may establish committees within the college to provide assistance and advice in such reviews. The dean shall promptly inform the candidate in writing of his or her recommendation and its rationale, and the faculty member may elect to include a letter of response in the materials forwarded to the Provost. If the dean’s recommendation differs from those of the peer committee and/or the department chair, the differences shall be discussed with them prior to informing the candidate. Except in cases of penultimate year tenure review, the candidate is offered the opportunity to withdraw at this stage. In all other cases the complete file is forwarded to the Provost.
FACULTY SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE
ANNUAL COMMITTEE REPORT (2012-13)
ANTONIS KATSIYANNIS, CHAIR
Committee Members: Susan Chapman, Feng Chen, Calvin Sawyer, Pradip Srimani

September 18, 2012
Matthew Watkins (annual giving office)-2012 Data-Faculty/staff giving at 19.59%; faculty only-23.71%; Faculty/staff alumni-34.24%; faculty alumni-38.44%; Staff have a scholarship sponsored (10 students received about a $1,000); no such scholarship by faculty.

Huron Report- Top 20 plan for faculty compensation: To attract, recruit, retain, and reward top performers. Compensation will be market-based and performance driven (Huron Report concluded that faculty compensation was NOT competitive; 14% below average). Highlights –University professors (stipend); pay increases for promotion to be a % as opposed to a fix amount (10% for assistants; 12% for Associates; and 15% for professors); Development of a merit pay matrix.

President's memo- 2012 Market-Based Special Adjustment Increases-to be reflected in the October 26, 2012 paycheck.

2012 Salary Report-In light of the Special Adjustment Increases as the result of the Huron report, explanations required in the past for over 6% raises are suspended.

October 11, 2012
Video Surveillance Policy-Policy articulates the need to safeguard privacy and enforces uniformity across campus. The policy, however, may be counterproductive leading to removal of valuable surveillance due to the involvement of the police in administering the system. Concerns over the need for obtaining permission from Police versus a notification system (e.g., lab video surveillance); the broad nature of disciplinary consequences (need for procedures/tiered approaches); the oversight by the police rather than administrators, possibility of criminalizing those who install video surveillance technology.

Trends in 2012 salary adjustments-will work with CFO to examine pre and post compensation salary adjustments across the university, colleges, and departments.

Benefit Rates-Senator Chapman will work on clarifying and establishing policies regarding benefit rates applied/assessed to grants having foreign personnel on J1 visas Update by the November 20, 2012

J-1 visa holders- will be changed in their status to time-limited. Temporary grant will cease to exist as a possibility. Only time limited or temporary will be allowed for these itinerant hires, including J-1s. This effectively means that once this change is implemented that all J-1 visa holders will be limited to the 19% rate.

November 20, 2012
Deferred maintenance Update—2020 Capital Plan
Capital Asset Stewardship involves evaluation, planning, maintenance, and funding: Presently, 39% of academic infrastructure is over 50 years old; 27% between 25 and 50 years with an average renovation age of 41 years. Auxiliary infrastructure (housing, dining...) is 35 years old on the average (60% over 25 years).

There is regular Assessment and Evaluation of facilities (semi-annual for roofs; annual for mechanical, HVAC, plumbing...)

There is a space utilization study underway-should be completed by summer.

Projected Cost-$329 million for planned and deferred maintenance by 2020. For example, $105 million for critical utility and infrastructure; $103 million for major repairs (Sirrine, Poole); and $72 million for annual maintenance. Also, $116 million for new construction (Watt Innovation Center, CURI-these projects have received private funds)
Faculty Senate Welfare Committee
2012-13 Year-End Report

Chair: Diane Perpich
Committee: Alan Winters, Tina Robbins, Jay Ochterbech, Susanna Ashton, Dale Layfield, Narendra Vyavahare

Accomplishments:

- **Parking**: In September, the committee met with Dan Hofmann, the head of Parking Services, to convey faculty concerns about parking. Representatives from Staff Senate joined us. Concerns about the flexibility of parking passes (whether they should be tied to vehicles or individuals), about specialty parking spaces, and about customer service in the Parking Services Office during changes in protocol were addressed. As a result, Parking Services has consciously increased the various means by which they reach out to faculty, staff, and students to inform them of upcoming changes and new regulations. A regular meeting with PS, Faculty and Staff Senate representatives was put in place and will hopefully continue in future years. Alan Winters agreed to be the liaison from Faculty Senate.

- **Benefits Fair**: Tina Robbins and Alan Winters staffed the Faculty Senate table at the Benefits Fair. They were available to answer questions about the Senate or to listen to faculty concerns about benefits. Since very few faculty utilize the fair, we will not staff a table in future.

- **Clemson Cares**: The Welfare Committee was contacted by the Health Promotions Office at Redfern and sent a representative to participate in a meeting discussing the development of a “Faculty Care and Concern Resource Page” on Redfern’s website.

- **Payroll Changes**: We provided feedback to Human Resources on the change in payroll from every other week to twice a month.

- **Lecturers**:
  - **Benefits**: The head of the welfare committee met with members of the research committee, the President of Faculty Senate, and a representative from Human Resources to look at benefits for lecturers. The goal is to have standardized benefits for lecturers with the same status across the university. We have not yet had follow up from HR.
  - **Representation on Faculty Senate**: Early in the year, we voiced concerned about the lack of representation for lecturers in the Senate. We were delighted when the Senate President spearheaded a proposal to have 2 lecturers from each college serve on the senate as non-voting members.

- **COACHE Survey Results**: We reviewed the Provost’s Summary from the report in late fall. Faculty expressed dissatisfaction in areas related to benefits (e.g., leave policies), divisional and departmental leadership, and faculty recognition and opportunities for mentorship and advancement. These areas became the principal focus of our work this semester. After a productive spring meeting with Vice Provost Nadim Aziz, we will forward four proposals by fall of next year. These will relate to:
• Parental/maternity leave for teaching faculty
• Improved recognition of retiring faculty members
• Internal sabbatical program
• Internship programs for faculty looking to expand administrative or other experience
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Committee members-Doris Helms, Provost; Brett Dalton, CFO; Wickes Westcott, Director, Institutional Research; Antonis Katsiyannis, chair; Lusk, staff senate president; Chapman, Finance committee; Srimani, Finance Committee.

June 5, 2012
Salary Report Release-January 31, 2013 is the expected date for the salary report to be released. Last year’s delays were the result of verifying pay increases above 6%. There is a summer “try-out” to improve process and collect needed info in a timely fashion.
Lab Fees Update-Lab fees will go directly to the departments generating them (not the College)
Financial Aid at Clemson—Recent initiatives undertaken by the Student Financial Assistance Office has resulted in improved freshman class and overall satisfaction (e.g., yield on Palmetto fellows with 1350+ SATs went from 43% to 50%; Out-of-state scholarship students-1250 SAT/Top 10% went from 12% to 21% - from Fall 2011 to Fall 2012; Honor student applications up by 16%). Scholarships are now offered in tiers based on SAT/ACT and rank in class.
Initiatives-A simple tool regarding the FED requirement for Net Price Calculator is located at:
http://workgroups.clemson.edu/A_A_5690_OIR/cunpc/index.cgi. The NPC gives prospective students an estimate of the amount of aid students similar to them received in the past.

September 17, 2012
Huron Report Highlights-Top 20 plan for faculty compensation: To attract, recruit, retain, and reward top performers. Compensation will be market-based and performance driven (Huron Report concluded that faculty compensation was NOT competitive; 14% below average). Seven recommendations: Develop a market-based compensation philosophy; Develop a market-based compensation strategy; Develop a meaningful performance rating scale with planned distribution; Maintain all faculty performance data in HRIS; Develop a merit-based performance matrix; Establish “University” professorship; Establish faculty mentorship program.

University professors (stipend); pay increases for promotion to be a % of salary as opposed to a fix amount (10% for assistants; 12% for Associates; and 15% for professors); Development of a merit pay matrix.

December 10, 2012
Compensation 2012 trends-An overview was provided by Ms. Samuels with data addressing staff, faculty, administration as well as college and department trends. Info was also provided on both base salary increases as well as bonuses.

February 19, 2013
Deferred maintenance Update—2020 Capital Plan
Capital Asset Stewardship involves evaluation, planning, maintenance, and funding: Presently, 39% of academic infrastructure is over 50 years old; 27% between 25% and 50% with an average renovation age of 41 years. Auxiliary infrastructure (housing, dining...) is 35 years old on the average (60% over 25 years)
There is regular Assessment and Evaluation of facilities (semi-annual for roofs; annual for mechanical, HVAC, plumbing...)
There is a space utilization study underway-should be completed by summer.
Projected Cost—$329 million for planned and deferred maintenance by 2020. For example, $105 million for critical utility and infrastructure; $103 million for major repairs (Sirrine, Poole); and $72 million for annual maintenance. Also, $116 million for new construction (Watt Innovation Center, CURI-these projects have received private funds)