CONTENTS OF MANUAL WERE ADJUSTED TO COINCIDE WITH PRESIDENTIAL TERMS INSTEAD OF A FULL CALENDAR YEAR.
MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
JANUARY 10, 2012

1. **Call to Order:** President Dan Warner called the meeting to order at 2:38 p.m. and welcomed and recognized guests.

2. **Approval of Minutes:** Deferred until February Faculty Senate Meeting.

3. **“Free Speech”:** None

4. **Committee Reports:**

   1) **Senate Standing Committees**
      - a. **Finance Committee:** No report.
      - b. **Welfare Committee:** No report.
      - c. **Scholastic Policies Committee:** No report.
      - d. **Research Committee:** No report.
      - e. **Policy Committee:** Chair Sean Brittain noted the Committee has not met since the last meeting. Interim University Legal Counsel, Erin Swann, will meet with the Committee to discuss the law regarding the sale of textbooks. Debbie Jackson will also meet with the Committee to discuss proposed changes to the University Assessment Committee.

   2) **Ad hoc Faculty Senate Committees**
      - a. **Budget Accountability Committee** – Chair Antonis Katsiyannis stated that this Committee will meet soon and that he would like to invite the Chief Financial Officer to talk about the salary report which should be out in February.
      - b. **Academic Calendar Committee** – No report.
      - c. **Lecturers Committee** – Senator John Leininger reported on the video that was sent to lecturers in some colleges. Feedback provided from those lecturers to be included in the survey that will soon go out to all lecturers.
d. **Teaching Effectiveness** – Chair Jane Lindle stated that there is no report but that the next meeting will be on January 24th at 9 a.m. in 402 Tillman Hall.

5. **President’s Report:** President Warner stated:
   a. that the Academic Technology Committee established a focus group of people to provide them with input and that the first meeting was held in December 2011 (after the last Faculty Senate meeting);

   b. complimented the reporting by Anna Mitchell of the *Anderson Independent* regarding the discussion during the last Senate meeting regarding the discussion on the salary disparity between raises given in athletics versus those given in academics;

   c. noted that the Joint City/University Committee continues its plan to sponsor a rowing event in the fall to foster and enhance relationships between the town and University communities;

   d. that work continues on the Faculty Senate/Staff Senate Habitat House and that a financial drive will soon be underway; and

   e. that Faculty Senate meeting discussions are always welcomed and encouraged as they are beneficial and good, both for the Senate and for the University.

6. **Old Business:** None

7. **New Business:**
   a. **Election to Grievance Board** – The following faculty were elected or re-elected by secret ballot to serve on the University Grievance Board: Claudio Cantalupo (BBS), Bob Horton (HEHD), Jane Lindle (HEHD); John Meriwether (E&G), Rachel Moore (AAH), Julie Northcutt (AFLS), Lydia Schleifer (BBS), Kelly Smith (AAH); David Tonkyn (AFLS)

8. **Announcements:**
   a. Richard S. Figliola is the 2011 recipient of the Class of ’39 Award for Excellence.

   b. Next Executive/Advisory Committee meeting will be on January 31, 2012.

   c. Next Faculty Senate meeting will be on February 14, 2012.
9. **Adjournment:** 3:38 p.m.

Scott Dutkiewicz, Secretary

Cathy Toth Sturkie, Program Coordinator

1. **Call to Order:** President Dan Warner called the meeting to order at 2:37 p.m. and welcomed and recognized guests.

2. **Approval of Minutes:** Both the December, 2011 and the January, 2012 Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes were approved as distributed.

3. **“Free Speech”:** Alumni Distinguish Professor of Chemistry Melanie Cooper “challenged the Faculty Senate to be more pro-active on behalf of the faculty.” She stated that her colleagues are concerned about how decisions are being made about the future of Clemson, but as an individual faculty member feel that they have no real voice that is actually heard. She believes that productive discourse including debate and criticism are crucial to productive and innovation decision making and is lacking at Clemson University.

4. **Special Orders of the Day:** the annual presentation on the Athletic Program.

   Janie Hodge, Faculty Athletic Representative, spoke about the academic metric and issues related to academics.

   Bill D’Andrea, Executive Senior Associate Athletic Director/External Affairs, spoke about IPTAY’s annual fund and how it supports student athlete scholarships, operational costs and the financial support of Vickery Hall. A reorganization of IPTAY will make it a fund raising enterprise to include planned giving and major gifts.

   Katie Hill, Senior Associate Athletic Director of Internal Affairs, encouraged the Senate to be aware of the sources of revenue and expenditures of Clemson athletics – the philosophy is that revenue is earned through ticket sales, contributions, etc. There are two exchanges between Clemson University and Athletics: a percent of out-of-state tuition and a 6% fee that is based on all earned revenue.

   Terry Don Phillips, Athletic Director, noted that compensation of coaches is a by-product of television revenues and is subject to the Board of Trustees Compensation Committee. It is approached from a competitive stance in order to climb to the Top 20. He stated that he does recognize the dichotomy between Athletics and academics but promised financial transparency.
5. **Slate of Officers:** The Slate of Officers was presented by the Executive/Advisory Committee:

Vice President/President-Elect: Antonis Katsiyannis (HEHD)  
Kelly Smith (AAH)

Secretary: Denise Anderson (HEHD)  
Jane Lindle (HEHD)

There were no nominations from the floor.

6. **Committee Reports:**

1) **Senate Standing Committees**
   
a. **Finance Committee:** Senator Susan Chapman reported that the Committee met on February 17th. The annual salary report should be available February 15. A proposed resolution on faculty compensation was discussed. The Committee will ask Karen Burg, Interim Graduate School Dean, to meet with the Committee to discuss the School's goals.

b. **Welfare Committee:** Chair Anderson submitted and explained the Report dated January 19, 2012.

c. **Scholastic Policies Committee:** Chair Horton submitted and explained the Committee Report dated January 17, 2012. Two issues regarding final exams and posthumous degrees were brought to the Senate for endorsement and both passed unanimously.

d. **Research Committee:** Chair Perhia stated that Committee will meet on February 1st; will meet with the Vice President for Research tomorrow and the Committee discussed the continuing list of issues.

e. **Policy Committee:** Chair Sean Brittain noted the form for faculty authored textbooks has been added to the *Faculty Manual* as Appendix K. The wording of PTR “separate and independent letters” will remain as currently appears in the *Faculty Manual*. There will be two items under New Business for consideration by the Senate.

2) **Ad hoc Faculty Senate Committees**
   
a. **Budget Accountability Committee** – Chair Antonis Katsiyannis stated that this Committee will meet on February 28th and will discuss athletic funds, compensation, and infrastructure needs.

b. **Academic Calendar Committee** – No report.
c. Lecturers Committee – Chair King reported that the video regarding lecturers will be made available to all faculty.

d. Teaching Effectiveness – Chair Jane Lindle stated that the next meeting will be on February 21.

3) University Commissions/Committees

7. President’s Report: President Warner stated:

a. At the Board of Trustee’s Meeting on February 14, the Board approved the Concept Study of the Douthit Hills residence complex. Highlights of his report to the Board was information regarding the work of the ad hoc Teaching Effectiveness Committee and the Lecturers Committee, and a copy of this report had been sent to all senators.

b. The Second Anniversary of Clemson at the Falls was held on February 9. This successful extension of the Business school reflects the hard work of many people, including Dean Lilly and Associate Dean Pickett.

c. The Clemson University Foundation met on February 9 and 10. It has reached $575 million under the “Will to Lead” Campaign. The IRS 990 form, an impressively long document, was reviewed by the audit committee.

d. The Watt Family contributed $5.5 million dollars to Clemson University. $5.2 million is targeted for the new Student Engagement and Innovation Center.

e. The Academic Success Center should be completed by the end of March, and the Life Sciences Building should be available by Fall.

f. Committee chairs to finish all committee business, reports and recommendations by the March meeting.

8. Old Business: None

9. New Business:
   a. Policy Chair Sean Brittain submitted and explained a proposed Faculty Manual change Part IV. G., Tenure Policy. There was no discussion. Vote was taken and proposed change passed unanimously.

10. Announcements:
   a. Next Executive/Advisory Committee meeting will be on February 28, 2012 in the Nancy Thurmond Room of the Strom Thurmond Institute.
b. Next Faculty Senate meeting will be on March 13, 2012.

c. Annual Spring Reception – April 10, 2010 – Connector at the Madren Center (invitations forthcoming)

11. **Adjournment:** 4:56 p.m.

Scott Dutkiewicz, Secretary

Cathy Toth Sturkie, Program Coordinator

Absent: T. Dobbins, L. Temesvari (B. Surver for), A. Winters, C. Cantalupo, X. Hu
Thank you for allowing me to address the faculty senate:

Let me introduce myself – my name is Melanie Cooper, I am an Alumni Distinguished Professor of chemistry and have been a faculty member here for over 25 years. Over that time I have taught thousands of students and brought in millions of dollars from funding agencies, published papers and books. Last year I was named the Outstanding Undergraduate Science Teacher in the US and I am a fellow of several professional societies.

I am proud to be associated with Clemson - last year I was inducted into the class of '39 – a very distinguished group indeed! That was me on the podium representing the faculty at the kick of the “Will to Lead” campaign, and giving the convocation speech to the new students last Fall.

I mention all this for a reason. Not because I am a raving egomaniac, but to emphasize the strength and depth of the Clemson faculty. Clemson is replete with accomplished faculty. We have build up nationally recognized research and teaching programs here. We have a large stake in the success of Clemson University, and we have expertise that has defined what Clemson is today.

The reason I am here is to challenge the Faculty Senate to be more pro-active on behalf of the faculty. As I talk with my colleagues I hear growing concerns about how decisions are being made about the future of Clemson, but as an individual faculty member I feel that I have no real voice (that is actually heard).

I want to emphasize that I am not questioning the university leadership. I believe that our leadership moved us forward to increased national stature – and led us through what could have been a devastating economic downturn. Now it's time to turn to the future. I understand that we “divested to invest” but my concerns are about how that investment will be made.

For example here are some concerns that I believe are of great importance to the faculty:

1. How were the priorities in the 2020 plan decided upon? (Many of us who participated in the visits of the VPs prior to that plan don’t see much of our input)
2. Why does the 2020 plan not mention education, or research, or student learning?
3. When resources are tight how are decisions made about initiatives that are not central to Clemson’s core mission?
4. Why are new administrative positions being created?
5. When departments are closed, or hiring decisions made – what is guiding these decisions?

Research findings suggest that debate, and yes, criticism are crucial to productive and innovative decision making, and it is this kind of productive discourse that I
believe is presently lacking at Clemson University. I challenge the faculty senate to make sure that the faculty voice is heard as we move forward.
## Academic Dashboard for Clemson Athletics
### Four-Year Data - UPDATED JUNE 2011

**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>ACC Median</th>
<th>NCAA Division I Mean</th>
<th>Top 10 Public Universities*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MEN:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>67**</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WOMEN:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowing</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**(B) NCAA ACADEMIC PROGRESS RATE (APR)**

2006-07, 2007-08, 2008-09, 2009-10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ACC Median</th>
<th>NCAA Division I Mean</th>
<th>Top 10 Public Universities*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MEN:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball</td>
<td>977</td>
<td>959</td>
<td>981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>964</td>
<td>945</td>
<td>970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track</td>
<td>953</td>
<td>962</td>
<td>974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td>977</td>
<td>948**</td>
<td>952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf</td>
<td>989</td>
<td>971</td>
<td>974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer</td>
<td>986</td>
<td>987</td>
<td>981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming</td>
<td>987</td>
<td>985</td>
<td>986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>978</td>
<td>976</td>
<td>972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WOMEN:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>978</td>
<td>968</td>
<td>972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>972</td>
<td>984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowing</td>
<td>977</td>
<td>985</td>
<td>988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer</td>
<td>987</td>
<td>978</td>
<td>990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming</td>
<td>971</td>
<td>983</td>
<td>988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>969</td>
<td>979</td>
<td>990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball</td>
<td>995</td>
<td>978</td>
<td>990</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**(C) FEDERAL GRADUATION RATE (FGR)**


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ACC Median</th>
<th>NCAA Division I Mean</th>
<th>Top 10 Public Universities*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MEN:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>55**</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WOMEN:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowing</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**(D) DIFFERENCE BETWEEN ATHLETE GRADUATION RATES AND INSTITUTIONAL GRADUATION RATES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ACC Median</th>
<th>NCAA Division I Mean</th>
<th>Top 10 Public Universities*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MEN:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>-45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>-39</td>
<td>-44</td>
<td>-44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track</td>
<td>-30</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td>-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td>-23</td>
<td>-27</td>
<td>-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf</td>
<td>-25</td>
<td>-17</td>
<td>-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming</td>
<td>-27</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WOMEN:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</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)

** Football Bowl Subdivision (FBS) only (N=120).

*** 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).

Notes: Clemson's Institutional Federal Graduation Rate is 77% for the entering classes of 2000, 2001, 2002, and 2003. All GSR, APR, and FGR data for this report were compiled from public information available at www.ncaa.org.
Clemson University Student Athletes:
Academic Update

• What are the most popular majors selected by Clemson student-athletes?

• How do Clemson student-athletes fare on academic performance metrics that must be reported to the federal government and NCAA?

What are the most popular majors?

• Data presented from 463 student-athletes enrolled in Fall Semester 2011

• The 463 SAs were enrolled in 52 different academic majors

Most Popular Majors - Overall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Percent of the student-athlete population</th>
<th>Cumulative percent of the student-athlete population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRTM</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Business</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Science</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47 Other Majors</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How do we fare on the required academic performance metrics?

• Federal Graduation Rate (FGR)

• NCAA Graduation Success Rate (GSR)

• NCAA Academic Progress Rate (APR)

• Academic Dashboard for Clemson Athletics

• Handout

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sport</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Semester GPR</th>
<th>Cumulative GPR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseball</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>2.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>2.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>2.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track/Cross Country</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowling</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>2.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track/Cross Country</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SLATE OF OFFICERS

VICE PRESIDENT/PRESIDENT-ELECT
ANTONIS KATSIYANNIS
KELLY SMITH

SECRETARY
DENISE ANDERSON
JANE LINDLE
2011-12 Faculty Senate Finance Committee

Report

Meeting: January 17, 2012, 3:30 – 4:25 PM in Room 215 Fluor Daniel Building

Present: Senators Figliola, Chapman, Starkey, Morris

The following items were brought to the floor and discussed:

1. Compensation report: Senator Chapman reported that she expects to get details from Wickes Westcott soon to prepare the Annual Faculty/Staff Compensation report. Senator Figliola provided some early statistics gathered at the Budget Accountability Meeting in December.

2. The proposed resolution on faculty compensation was discussed at length followed by discussions of what should the resolution seek to address. Some notes:
   - The Athletic Department has articulated their achievement goals and put into place a compensation strategy to meet those goals and has aggressively rewarded performance. They have a development process in place to support their plan.
   - The “right pocket/left pocket” approach at Clemson has developed a clear conflict in stated priorities for the University and methods to achieve its goals. Top 20 requires a healthy and happy faculty with quality facilities and resources.
   - The current stated faculty hiring plan and compensation strategy is vague at best, a failure at least, and an untenable model for future success.
   - Administration must develop immediately a clear goal for faculty compensation with an implementation plan (with timetable and discussion of resources).
   - University Development needs to become a verb, rather than a noun.
   - Divest to invest appears to focus on Administrative program growth with little attention to faculty or program quality.

3. The Committee has extended a request to Acting Dean of Graduate School Karen Burg to meet and discuss budget and goals of the Graduate School. We seek some data points prior to the anticipated future changes in the Graduate School.

4. Senator Hewitt asked to be excused from the Committee given his other responsibilities. The Committee thanks him for his past efforts.

Old Business: Senator Figliola has again requested feedback from Provost Helms on her position and policy regarding transparency of budgets at the College and Department levels and how best to implement it. The Committee will be making a recommendation soon.

Finance Committee Membership for 2011-12:

Senators Figliola (Chair), Chapman, Hewitt, Starkey, Morris
Faculty Senate

Welfare Committee Meeting

January 19, 2012, 9:30 a.m. – 10:30 a.m.

In Attendance: Denise Anderson (chair), Susanna Ashton, John Leininger, Catalina Marinescu, Tom Dobbins, Joshua Morgan (guest), Will Stockton (guest), Sina Safayi (guest)

Discussion of issue of benefits for domestic partners. On advice of Erin Swann, the committee invited Joshua Morgan and Will Stockton to discuss work currently being done by A Better Clemson which is examining such issues as domestic partner benefits for students, faculty and staff. At this time their group is focusing on student benefits as it seems to be an “easier” hurdle to start with; there is more flexibility with regard to student benefits as compared to faculty and staff benefits. Joshua and Morgan indicated that at this time they do not see the need for the committee to take any specific actions but that they were appreciative of the support that the committee indicated it would provide.

Discussion of issues related to post-docs and leave time. Post-doc Sina Safayi had requested to bring the issue of a lack of paid vacation time for Clemson University 12 month post-doc employees to the welfare committee for discussion. Following a lengthy discussion concerning policies at other Top 20 universities, policies across the board at Clemson, and approaches post doc supervisors take to leave time, a general consensus was reached that perhaps the biggest issue is lack of transparency with regard to the policy. It appears that many post-docs are unaware that they will not receive official paid vacation time as part of their contract. The committee will try to bring the administrator (with may or may not be someone in HR) who oversees the University post-doc program to clarify questions related to post-docs and benefits to see if there is any other action to be taken on this item beyond encouraging increased transparency with regard to policies related to benefits.

Abuse of leave pool (questions related to how the pool is overseen, how is it is enforced for the original purpose). There was a brief discussion centered on uncertainty about what exactly we were being asked to examine. Tom indicated that the leave pool is owned and administered by the State, not Clemson. We agreed that there is, however, likely abuse of paid sick time that occurs locally. The committee is going to look into the issue further to get a better idea of how the leave pool works and suggested perhaps that a reminder to administrators and employees of the purpose and procedures tied to sick leave might be necessary.

Custodial services on campus. There was discussion regarding contracting out custodial services for the University and displeasure with how that has been impacting facilities, classrooms, etc. with regard to cleanliness. Of highest concern was the state of classrooms because garbage cans have been removed from many locations and students are simply leaving behind a mess and faculty are either not doing anything about it or spending too much time cleaning up creating what one committee member indicated was “the most expensive custodial staff” in the state. The committee would like the faculty senate to approve sending a short survey to faculty and staff concerning this issue and the perception of how well this initiative is working.

The next scheduled meeting is Thursday, February 16th at 9:30 a.m.
FACULTY SENATE SCHOLASTIC POLICIES
Minutes from January 17, 2012

SCHOLASTIC POLICIES COMMITTEE 2011-2012
Bob Horton (bhorton) (HEHD)
Xiaobo Hu (xhu) (BBS)
Julie Northcutt (jknorth) (AFLS)
Kelly Smith (kcs) (AAH)
Graciela Tissera (gtisser) (AAH)
David Tonkyn (tdavid) (AFLS)
Narendra Vyavahare (narenv) (E&S)

2011-2012 Meetings: 8/23, 9/20, 10/25 (1:00 – 2:00), 11/15, 12/6, 1/17, 2/21, 3/13 (1:00 – 2:00), 4/17
All meetings are 2:30 – 4:30 except as otherwise noted.

Attending: Xiaobo Hu, David Tonkyn, Kelly Smith, Narendra Vyavahare, Graciela Tissera, Nick Baulch,
Logan Roof, Jeff Appling, Bob Horton.

Evaluation of Instruction Form – Leads: Xiaobo and Naren
Xiaobo and Naren have gathered information for us as we begin to tackle the form used to
evaluate instruction. They have talked with Linda Nilson and Wickes Westcott and will
invite Linda to our February meeting. We are considering revising the questions or perhaps
even recommending that we use an external company (e.g., Idea Center) to do this for us. We
are also asking Debbie Jackson if she has suggestions that might help us with SACS
accreditation; she and Wickes Westcott plan to attend our February meeting.

Self-Plagiarism and Academic Integrity
After considerable discussion, we thought that the default should be that submitting the same
paper for more than one course without the explicit permission of the instructor should be
considered a violation of Academic Integrity. Kelly Smith will draft a statement that we will
discuss. Once we’re in agreement, we’ll present the statement to the Executive Advisory
Committee to get their input.

Attendance Policy
Tonkyn and Horton are representing SP, working with Amanda Macaluso from Student
Government, to determine if Redfern might excuse absences. We have met with Dr. George
Clay once and plan to have another meeting. This meeting is not yet scheduled. Student
Government will invite a member from Clemson’s General Council to attend to help
emphasize the importance of this issue.

Final Exam Schedule
We have been asked to consider the exam schedule. Two professors said they believed that
those who taught 8:00 classes should not be scheduled for the last exam on Friday night.
Though we do not consider this a matter of policy, we have contacted Stan Smith who will
raise the issue at their Records and Registration Staff meeting on January 26.
Ad Hoc Committee on Teaching Effectiveness

Clemson Faculty Senate

Meeting 24 January 2012

Present: Coggeshall (BBS), Cooper (CES), Espey (formerly CAFLS, now BBS), Lindle (HEHD), Nilson (OTEI), Spede (AAH)

Agenda: Teaching Effectiveness Web Design

Discussion:

Committee members discussed their preferences for web presence on the topic of Evidence of Effective Teaching and Learning. The discussion included consideration of other institutions' web presence on the matter of evaluation of faculty teaching and student learning, teaching portfolio recommendations, and faculty development web sites for improving teaching and learning in higher education. Some examples of these sites were shared by Committee members:

http://www7.nationalacademies.org/bose/DBER_Homepage.html


One of the most cited traditional sources for peer review of teaching is a book by Chism. Spede shared the reference information as follows:

Committee members also discussed the difficulty in finding relevant TPR and other documents from the department to the college level on Clemson’s site. Although most units have web sites, faculty may not have access to helpful information in their own unit. Important guidelines may be distributed only once a year by email, and then can’t be retrieved from the department web site. The discussion led to the following recommendations:

Recommendation #1: Using the Clemson Syllabus Repository as a rough model, a TPR Guidelines Repository should be created that all faculty can access. This access would help units in updating guidelines and in investigating campus practices.

Recommendation #2: For specific information about resources to meet Faculty Manual policy on the evaluation of teaching, the link for this information should connect off of the front page of the Faculty Senate’s web page. The menu title should be:
Evidence of Effective Teaching and Learning

Recommendation #3: The menu on the Evidence of Effective Teaching and Learning page should have the following two choices:

Faculty and Lecturers
Peer Review Committees and Administrators

Recommendation #4: Sub menus for both choices in #2 should be the 7 specifications of teaching/learning evidence provided in the Faculty Manual policy, as follows:

Faculty and Lecturers

Evidence -based measures of student learning
Course materials, learning objectives, and examinations
In-class visitation by peers and/or administrators
Statement of methods and/or teaching philosophy
Exit interviews with current grads/alumni
Student course evaluations
Additional evidence

Peer Review Committees and Administrators
Evidence -based measures of student learning
Course materials, learning objectives, and examinations
In-class visitation by peers and/or administrators
Statement of methods and/or teaching philosophy
Exit interviews with current grads/alumni
Student course evaluations
Additional criteria

Recommendation #5: The content for each section should consist of links to other sites, media streams and media casts, and .pdfs. The preferred .pdfs should be peer-reviewed articles.

Recommendation #6: Some definition, description and explanation about each link may be necessary. For example, some of the links will be duplicated in both sections of this site, but in the Faculty portion a note or explanation may state that the linked info is perhaps more descriptive of evaluation and interpretation of evidence, than of producing evidence. The same link in the Peer Review/Administrator portion might explain that the information will help with analyzing the Faculty member’s performance, but might not include guidance on how to change the faculty member’s practices.

Recommendation #7: Under the Additional Criteria/Evidence sub-menus of both sections, a wiki or other collaborative site, where people can post what they find should be created. This portion should be divided by colleges and discipline.

The next meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, February 21, 2012 at 9 AM in Room 420 Tillman Hall. The following chart lists the tasks for each committee member for the various sub menus recommended for the web site. Committee member should bring to the next meeting up to 10 strong links in their section along with 4 or 5 others for the committee to review.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence of Learning and Teaching</th>
<th>Committee Member/s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. evidence-based measurements of student learning (such as pre and post testing)</td>
<td>Cooper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. evaluation (by peers and/or administrators) of course materials, learning objectives, and examinations</td>
<td>Espey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. in-class visitation by peers and/or administrators</td>
<td>Spede</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. a statement by the faculty member describing his/her methods and/or a teaching philosophy</td>
<td>Coggeshall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. exit interview/surveys with current graduates/alumni</td>
<td>Lindle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. additional criteria as appropriate for the discipline and degree level of the students</td>
<td>Espey &amp; Nilson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. student ratings of courses, particularly the analysis of comments</td>
<td>Lindle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respectfully submitted
Jane Clark Lindle, Chair & Recoding Secretary
CLEMSON UNIVERSITY GRIEVANCE BOARD
GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE ACTIVITY
CATEGORY II PETITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Grievances to Submitted to Grievance Board</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grievances Found Non-Grievable by Grievance Board</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grievances Found to be Grievable by Grievance Board</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Yet Determined Grievable Or Non-Grievable</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grievances In Process</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspended Grievances</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawn Grievances</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petitions Supported by Hearing Panel</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petitions Not Supported By Hearing Panel</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing Panel Grievance Recommendations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supported by Provost</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provost Recused</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grievances Decided by Provost</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grievances Appealed to President</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presidential Decisions</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Petitioner</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grievances Appealed to Board of Trustees</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Petitioner(s)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Petitioner(s)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GRIEVANCE ACTIVITY BY COLLEGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>AAH</th>
<th>AFLS</th>
<th>BBS</th>
<th>E&amp;S</th>
<th>HEHD</th>
<th>LIBRARY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Original Text: The tenure probationary period for a full-time regular faculty member shall not exceed seven years. If advance written agreement is reached by a faculty member, the chair or director, the dean, and the Provost, periods of leave without pay may be excluded from this seven-year period. Included within the tenure probationary period may be the faculty member's full-time tenured or tenure-track service at other institutions of higher learning, subject to advance written agreement. Time spent as lecturer or postdoctoral research fellow, as visiting, part-time, or adjunct faculty, or in other non-tenure-track positions (both academic and non-academic), whether at the University or elsewhere, shall not count as tenure probationary service unless approved by the department tenure-promotion-reappointment committee, department chair (see section D, paragraph 2), dean, and Provost and subject to advance written agreement. Candidates must be notified of their options during the contract negotiation process. Agreements for immediate tenure or for a probationary period of two years or less shall be reviewed in accordance with a department's regular tenure peer evaluation process. Leave time taken which benefits the institution as well as the individual faculty member may count as probationary period service. Probationary faculty who give birth, father, or adopt a child during their probationary period may, at their request, receive a one-year extension of the tenure decision. The request for an extension must come within two months of the birth or adoption. The extension will automatically be granted unless the chair or dean can document sufficient reason for denial. Normally, a maximum of two such extensions may be granted. Extension of the probationary period of a faculty member for serious illness, family tragedy or other special circumstances may be granted with the approval of the department chair, dean and Provost.

Revised Text: The tenure probationary period for a full-time regular faculty member shall not exceed seven years. If advance written agreement is reached by a faculty member, the chair or director, the dean, and the Provost, periods of leave without pay may be excluded from this seven-year period. Included within the tenure probationary period may be the faculty member's full-time tenured or tenure-track service at other institutions of higher learning, subject to advance written agreement. Time spent as lecturer or postdoctoral research fellow, as visiting, part-time, or adjunct faculty, or in other non-tenure-track positions (both academic and non-academic), whether at the University or elsewhere, shall not count as tenure probationary service unless approved by the department tenure-promotion-reappointment committee, department chair (see section D, paragraph 2), dean, and Provost and subject to advance written agreement. Candidates must be notified of their options during the contract negotiation process. Agreements for immediate tenure or for a probationary period of two years or less shall be reviewed in accordance with a department's regular tenure peer evaluation process. Leave time taken which benefits the institution as well as the individual faculty member may count as probationary period service.

Extension of the probationary period for any reason can only come at the request of the faculty member as long as the faculty member is capable of making the request. Probationary faculty who give birth, father, or adopt a child during their probationary period may, at their request, receive a one-year extension of the tenure decision. The request for an extension must come within two months of the birth or adoption. The
extension will automatically be granted unless the chair or dean can document sufficient reason for denial. Normally, a maximum of two such extensions may be granted.

Request for an extension of the probationary period at the request of a faculty member for serious illness, family tragedy or other special circumstances may be granted with the approval of the Tenure, Promotion, and Reappointment Committee, Department Chair, Dean and Provost. We recognize that truly exceptional circumstances can arise that make it impossible for a faculty member to request an extension of the probationary period prior to his/her penultimate year. In only such extreme cases, the Provost may choose to extend the probationary period without consulting the incapacitated faculty member with the approval of the Dean, Department Chair, and Tenure, Promotion, and Reappointment Committee.

Rationale: The cap of seven years on the probationary period was established by the American Association of University Professors in 1940. The probationary period is a stressful part of a faculty member’s career and should not be lengthened unless requested by the faculty member. As James Andrews points out on the AAUP newsletter AcademeOnline,

Extension of the already substantial seven-year maximum probationary period would prolong the period in which faculty receive lower pay, exert less influence, and have less job security. It could also encourage the sort of isolated and dysfunctional faculty behavior that is likely eventually to erode effective peer-review processes, shared governance practices, and tenured appointments themselves.

Extensions can be granted under special circumstances such as the birth of a child, but all such requests must originate from the faculty member. We recognize that truly exceptional circumstances can arise that make it impossible for a faculty member to request an extension of the probationary period prior to his/her penultimate year. In only such extreme cases, should the probationary period be extended without consulting the incapacitated faculty member.

The Policy committee also concluded that the PTAR committee should also be involved in the decision to extend the probationary period of a faculty member for special circumstances.

We have also struck the restriction that faculty who birth, father, or adopt a child only be granted two extensions. Faculty members who have more than two children should not be penalized.
MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
MARCH 13, 2012

1. **Call to Order**: President Dan Warner called the meeting to order at 2:34 p.m. and welcomed and recognized guests.

2. **Approval of Minutes**: The February 14, 2012 Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes were approved as distributed.

3. **“Free Speech”**: None.

4. **Special Orders of the Day**: Doug Hallenbeck, Executive Director of Housing, presented information on the Twenty Year Housing Master Plan that includes three main projects (Douthit Hills, Core Campus, Fraternity/Sorority Village). The first is approved by the Board of Trustees; the last two are conceptual. He described a schedule of actions to repair, renovate, or demolish campus housing.

   Dan Hoffman, Director of Parking and Transportation Services, provided a synopsis of plans to improve parking by linking parking services to sustainability. His immediate proposals include multi-purpose meters and paid parking for visitors. He stated that better management for parking spaces, rather than, for instance, building a parking structure, is the key. He emphasized changing behavior to improve options for parking. Improved efficiency by the use of scanning technology by enforcement and alternative transportation initiatives (Catbus, Tiger Transit, carpooling, WeCar, ZimRide, park-and-ride, and shuttle service) will reduce demand for parking space and make the campus more accessible.

5. **Election of Officers**: Candidates for Vice President/President-Elect and Secretary presented their statements of interest for these two Faculty Senate Offices:

   - **Vice President/President-Elect**: Antonis Katsiyannis (HEHD)
     Kelly Smith (AAH)
   - **Secretary**: Denise Anderson (HEHD)
     Jane Lindle (HEHD)

   There were no nominations from the floor.
Elections were held by secret ballot. Kelly Smith was elected Vice President/President-Elect and Denise Anderson was elected Secretary.

6. Committee Reports:

1) Senate Standing Committees
   b. Welfare Committee: Chair Denise Anderson submitted and explained the Report dated February 16, 2012 and stated that a resolution will be presented under New Business.
   c. Scholastic Policies Committee: Chair Bob Horton submitted and explained the Committee Report dated February 21, 2012. He asked for and received a Senate endorsement to a proposed change to the Academic Integrity policy.
   d. Research Committee: Chair Dvora Perahia submitted and explained the Committee Report dated January-February, 2012. She also stated that a meeting with Vice President for Research Gerald Sonnenfeld was very productive. The committee also wants to meet with Debra Jackson about SACS reaccreditation.

   Senate Alternate Bill Surver congratulated Senator Perahia on her being named a Fellow of the American Physical Society for her "contributions to the understanding of complex fluids formed by assemblies of strongly interacting polymers."

   e. Policy Committee: Chair Sean Brittain submitted and explained the Committee Report dated February 21, 2012.

2) Ad hoc Faculty Senate Committees
   a. Budget Accountability Committee – Chair Antonis Katsiyannis submitted and explained the Committee Report dated February 28, 2012 (attached). He also stated that he hoped that the Chief Financial Officer would visit with the Faculty Senate in the near future.
   b. Academic Calendar Committee – No report.
   c. Teaching Effectiveness – Chair Jane Lindle stated that the Committee is in the process of completing the its final report and that in this meeting a vote will be taken on a Faculty Manual change about student evaluation of teaching. At this time, Chair Lindle submitted for acceptance the report, "Research on Recommended Practices for Student Ratings of Courses/Instruction" (attached). There was no discussion. Vote to accept the Report was taken and passed unanimously.
   d. Lecturers Committee – Chair Jeremy King submitted for acceptance the “Report of the Clemson University Faculty Senate Ad Hoc Committee on the Status of Lecturers” (attached). There was no discussion. Vote to accept Report was taken and passed.
9. New Business:
   a. Policy Chair Sean Brittain submitted and explained a proposed Faculty Manual change Part IX. D. 11, Teaching Practices. An amendment was offered, accepted and seconded. Vote to accept the proposed amendment was taken and passed unanimously. Vote to approve the proposed Manual change was taken and passed unanimously (attached).

   b. Welfare Chair Denise Anderson submitted and explained the “Resolution to Establish a Clemson University Childcare Center” for endorsement (attached). There was much discussion. Vote to endorse the Resolution was taken and passed.

10. Announcements:
    a. Next Executive/Advisory Committee meeting will be held on March 27, 2012.
    b. Next Faculty Senate meeting will be held on April 10, 2012.
    c. Annual Spring Reception to be held on April 10, 2010 in the Connector at the Madren Center.

11. Adjournment: 4:56 p.m.

Scott Dutkiewicz, Secretary

Cathy Toth Sturkie, Program Coordinator

University Housing Master Plan

- A 20 year Master Plan that includes new construction, renovations, and facility improvements.
- Maintain a goal of between 6,900 and 7,600 beds at the end of the plan, including 300-400 graduate housing beds, estimating limited enrollment growth.
- Achieve a goal of 50% of undergraduate students living on campus.
- Retain 75% of the sophomore class to live on campus.
- Maintain a goal of between 6,900 and 7,600 beds at the end of the plan, including 300-400 graduate housing beds, estimating limited enrollment growth.
University Housing Master Plan

- Address critical deferred maintenance issues to upgrade current housing inventory.
- Many halls are nearing end of useful life as over 50% of assignable beds are in buildings that are 30 years old or older.
- Students are demanding more privacy in their room and bathroom environments.
- Provide more independent living options through a larger percentage of single-occupancy rooms.
- Address critical deferred maintenance issues to upgrade current housing inventory.
There is a gap between perceived value of on- and off-campus options. Survey results indicated that students desired to live on campus, but moved off because the perceived "value of the facilities was not worth the cost. Affordability was less of an issue than the perceived value.
Strategic Objectives

Support 2020 Road Map by:

• Improving Housing inventory on-campus
• Increasing our ability to recruit and retain the best and brightest students to Clemson
• Creating an environment that put Bridge students in the best position to be successful
• Improving Housing’s ability to retain Juniors and Seniors

Increasing Housing's ability to provide an environment that all Clemson Students can take part in and be proud of.
Douthit Hills

Five critical elements:

- 733 Beds for upperclassman-students
- 752 Beds for Bridge to Clemson students
- Mixed-use retail development - new retail establishments
- Relocation of bookstore
- 400 seat new dining hall

Parking

752 Beds for Bridge to Clemson students
733 Beds for upperclassman-students

Five critical elements:
Douthit Hills Redevelopment:

Why It's Right for Clemson

2020 Road Map

• Directly impacts our 2020 Goal: To fulfill Clemson's responsibility to students and the state of South Carolina

• Specifically, by providing facilities that will enhance our ability to provide talent for the new economy by recruiting and retaining outstanding students and faculty and providing an exceptional educational experience grounded in engagement.

In engagement,
Core Campus

Housing: 700 Beds
Freshman and Sophomore Housing

Dining:
1000 Seat Dining Hall
Retail Dining
Convenience Store
Providing a dynamic on-campus, mixed-use neighborhood in the core campus to give Clemson a unique competitive advantage for years to come. This includes Housing, Dining, and Academic space.
Village
Fraternity and Sorority
Project Objectives

- Create an on-campus Fraternity & Sorority experience that is uniquely Greek, uniquely Clemson and responds to student demand.
- Provide an opportunity for all Fraternities & Sororities to be a part of the on-campus experience with a united organizational presence.
- Create a financially viable plan that is feasible today and flexible for the future.
- Provide an opportunity for all Fraternities & Sororities to be a part of the on-campus experience with a united organizational presence.
- Create an on-campus Fraternity & Sorority experience that is uniquely Greek, uniquely Clemson and responds to student demand.
Conceptual Sketch from Highway 93
Clemson University Fraternity Sorority Village
»•

Residence Hall

Manning Hall

New Core Campus
Douthit Hills (grad & upperclassmen)
Thornhill Village

On-line

Total Beds

Project Type

6303

Renovation

7727

Renovation

New Construction
New Construction
Demolition

Clemson House

Demolition

New Construction

Johnstone Hall

Renovation
7576

Greek Row

Calhoun Courts

Renovation

Demolition

7262

7657

8117

Lightsey Bridge I

New Construction

Demolition

7297

Phase I

Phase II

New Construction

Shoebox Replacement Geer Hall

Sanders Hall

Shoebox Replacement -

Lever Hall

Renovation

Renovation

Demolition

7503

7536

7329

7802

Demolition

Byrnes Hall

Renovation

7484

Benet Hall

Barnett Hall

Renovation

7610

Demolition

Mauldin Hall

Renovation

Young Hall
Cope Hall

Smith Hall


Special Order: Daniel Hoffman  
Director of Parking and Transportation Services  

Mr. Hoffman provided a synopsis of plans to improve parking by linking parking services to sustainability.  

No presentation was submitted.
2011-12 Faculty Senate Finance Committee

Report

Meeting: February 21, 2012, 3:30 – 4:20 PM in Room 215 Fluor Daniel Building

Present: Senators Figliola, Chapman, Morris

The following items were brought to the floor and discussed:

1. Compensation report: Senator Chapman reported that she was informed by the Institutional Research Office that Finance would not receive a version prior to its public publication in mid-March.

Senator Figliola received further clarification from Wickes Westcott, Director, Institutional Research, that there was a technical problem in reporting causing the delay but that the Committee would not receive any information in the Report prior to its public release.

• With the current compensation task group and the Budget Accountability Committee, the Finance Committee discussed who should in fact review the report. In the past, the Finance Committee had recommended format and the type of information given in the report and provided a synopsis. The Committee asks the Senate to provide direction for future Finance Committee members.

2. Acting Graduate School Dean Karen Burg notified the Committee that she would not be available to meet at the February meeting. No further dates have been established.

3. The Committee spent part of the meeting discussing impressions from the meeting with the athletic representatives.

Finance Committee Membership for 2011-12:

Senators Figliola (Chair), Chapman, Hewitt, Starkey, Morris
Faculty Senate

Welfare Committee Meeting Minutes

February 16, 2012

In Attendance: Denise Anderson (chair), Susanna Ashton, John Merriwether, John Leininger, Tom Jones (guest), Wanda Smith (guest)

Issue of Custodial Services contract

The meeting was spent in a very informative discussion with Tom Jones, Director of Custodial and Recycling Services, on the issue of custodial services on campus. After sharing feedback from faculty and staff regarding custodial services, Tom shared with the committee the current status of custodial services on campus with respect to the number of staff who are Clemson employees versus contractual employees. Interestingly, complaints have been coming from facilities across the board — those serviced by CU staff as well as those serviced by the contractual staff. Tom is aware that there are still problems with the level of service and he outlined the ways that they are trying to address those issues. The department is very open to feedback and suggestions and it was determined that a large part of the issue with respect to getting help as needed in “emergencies” or when one cannot find custodial help (e.g., after 1 p.m.) is the fact that most faculty are unaware of the procedures to follow. Therefore, Tom left with an understanding that the procedures needed to be more clearly communicate to the campus so that faculty, staff and students can have access to the help they may need. Additional topics of discussion included the removal of larger garbage cans from offices, the placement of trash receptacles on campus, recycling, and changes to cleaning schedules as the Department tries to be both efficient and effective with regard to custodial services. It is noteworthy to point out that the University has increased the amount of recycled materials from 15% to 26% in the last few years and that it is the leader in the southeast among all universities. Tom left with an understanding that he would remain in contact with the committee via Denise as they move forward with continuing to enhance services on campus.
FACULTY SENATE SCHOLASTIC POLICIES
Minutes from February 21, 2012; 2:30 – 4:00

SCHOLASTIC POLICIES COMMITTEE 2011-2012
Bob Horton (bhorton) (HEHD)
Xiaobo Hu (xhu) (BBS)
Julie Northcutt (jknorth) (AFLS)
Kelly Smith (kcs) (AAH)
Graciela Tissera (gtisser) (AAH)
David Tonkyn (tdavid) (AFLS)
Narendra Vyavahare (narenv) (E&S)

In attendance: all committee members, plus guests Jan Murdoch, Linda Nilson, Wickes Westcotte, Debbie Jackson, Logan Roof, Nick Baulch

2011-2012 Meetings: 8/23, 9/20, 10/25 (1:00 – 2:00), 11/15, 12/6, 1/17, 2/21, 3/13 (1:00 – 2:00), 4/17
All meetings are 2:30 – 4:30 except as otherwise noted.

Evaluation of Instruction Form – Leads: Xiaobo and Naren
We had an excellent discussion about the purposes of the course-end evaluations and the validity of what we are currently using. We have decided to tackle the issue. Linda Nilson shared some research with us and resources that contain questions that have been validated. One of these sources, SALG (Student Assessment of their Learning Gains), is free. Another, from the IDEA CENTER, has fees attached.

What we have in place now is, in effect, a Customer Satisfaction Survey, which perhaps gives us some important information, but is also being used to make important personnel decisions.

Our charge is for each committee member, and each of the other participants who is willing to do so, to come up with a list of the domains you think important to measure (e.g., Customer Satisfaction, Class Overall, Increase in Student Skills) and, for each of the domains you identify, a list of a few questions for each of these domains. Ultimately, we hope to get the survey down to 10-12 questions, with space for comments by each question.

Visit http://www.salgsite.org/instrument for questions that we can adopt without cost (we had instrument 25442 for our discussion today). If you use questions for which we would have to pay, please indicate that with your list. Please send an electronic version of what you come up with to bhorton@clemson.edu prior to next meeting, which will be at 1:00 on 3/13.

Self-Plagiarism and Academic Integrity
In January, we decided to include self-plagiarism as a violation of Academic Integrity unless the instructor has approved use of work completed for other classes. We approved the addition of #4 below and will pass this recommendation on to the Executive Advisory Committee.
I. Academic Integrity Policy

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

B. Academic dishonesty is further defined as:
   1. Giving, receiving, or using unauthorized aid, including the inappropriate use of electronic devices, in any work submitted to fulfill academic requirements. In examination situations all electronic devices must be off and stowed unless otherwise authorized by the instructor.
   2. Plagiarism, which includes the intentional or unintentional copying of language, structure, or ideas of another and attributing the work to one's own efforts;
   3. Attempts to copy, edit, or delete computer files that belong to another person or use of computer accounts that belong to another person without the permission of the file owner or account owner;
   4. Submitting work that has been turned in for credit in another course without the consent of the instructor.

C. All academic work submitted for grading or to fulfill academic requirements contains an implicit pledge and may contain, at the request of an instructor, an explicit pledge by the student that no unauthorized aid has been received.

D. It is the responsibility of every member of the Clemson University community to enforce the Academic Integrity Policy.
Faculty Senate Research Committee

Draft

RE: Committee Report January-February 2012

I-
The committee met on February 7th. The committee consolidated information gathered by different members of the committee regarding: a) single proposal submission; b) hiring of adjunct professors; c) instrumentation infrastructure; c) discussion on cluster hiring in humanities.

II-
The committee met with Dr. Sonnenfeld on February 15, 2012, Hunter Laboratory, Room 381 1:00 pm.

The committee heard a review of current status of Clemson University from Dr. Sonnenfeld. He introduced the steps he has taken since he coming into office to improve the infrastructure for research and innovations in the proposal management system. He also introduced the new computer-based module that addresses regulatory issues pertaining to conduct of research and dissemination of information.

The committee further discussed with the VPR:

- Internal proposal selection for limited submission opportunities, transparency and expert input.
- Timeliness of dissemination of information regarding funding opportunity: Information flow.
- Faculty rotation at the VPR office
- Cluster hiring: integration of humanities and social studies.
- Research Agreements (Universities, National Laboratories and private entities): Procedures.
- IP Ownership.
- Consulting agreements: Type, length of approval, conflict of interest issues, expert advice).
- Conflict of Interest Issues: General considerations.

Dr. Sonnenfeld informed us of the steps his office has already taken and is planning to take to address these challenges. Most of the changes have been along the suggestion for improvement of the FSRC.

III-Perahia participated in the research council meeting this month.
- The VPR shared with the council innovation in the VPR office and future plans.
- Some discussions were carried out regarding internal funds allocation through small grants.
- A committee to discuss the procedures for limited submission proposals selection has been established with elected, nominated and ex-officio members. This council discussed and a committee tasked with providing improvements to the current process has been established. The committee will report back to the VPR by May 1.
Policy Committee  Feb 21, EAC report

Meetings will be held the third Tuesday of each month (except for a couple of conflicts) at 2:30 p.m.

The chair reviewed the action items. Discussion also ensued as each issue came up.

1. EAC - Met with Debbie Jackson and D. Knox. Discuss proposed changes to Assessment Committee. Scholastic Policy might want to discuss ways to get Curriculum committee and Assessment Committee on the same page.
2. FMLA as applied to probationary period: Currently faculty are required to request an extension with two months of relevant event. That may need to be extended. John Mueller will meet with Policy next month to bring us up to date on requirements imposed by FMLA and other relevant federal and state law.
3. Student evaluations: Coming up as new business?
4. Department By-laws: Senate take over Pat Smart's role of reviewing department by-laws for provost office? Suggestion by Fran that we develop a template and set up a regular review schedule of department by-laws. Work of Policy Committee?
5. Hiring academic administrators. Page 39, paragraph 4 of the Manual. The question is: which faculty (department, school or college) and Faculty or faculty. Dutkiewicz will research textual history of this section; Brittain will draft alternate language. Dan will let the board know that we are clarifying these sections
6. Review of Academic Administrators. We are drafting language to clarify who should be evaluated.
7. Program termination/RIF. The issue remains as to what a “program” is for this policy. In progress.

COMPLETED Business

1. Graduate Fellowships and Awards Committee. Faculty Manual change approved, and will be forwarded to the Executive/Advisory Committees. The change reads: “Non-voting members are the director of financial aid or designee and an assistant/associate Dean of the Graduate School or designee (chair) of the Graduate Dean. Passed by EAC voted on by Senate.
2. Wording changed for assessment committee to be clear that members provide oversight – don’t do the work! Rejected by Dori Helms per Debbie Jackson’s complaint
3. IP (Intellectual Property) policy. Pennington will be issuing a Doodle poll to set a time for a meeting with Larry Dooley. Meeting scheduled Oct 13 – concerns passed along, waiting to hear back on revision to IP policy – no more to do for now.
4. Interim chairs. Discussion revolved around acting vs. interim chairs; whether they should be elected or appointed by the Dean; and what time limit should be imposed to ensure that searches for permanent chairs are done. Time limit seems to be at the longest 3 years. Dutkiewicz shared a recent experience with the Libraries new interim chair appointed by the Dean after nominations through an advisory committee. Brittain asked for two drafts of a policy, one to take a Dean-appointed approach; the other, to take a faculty-elected approach. Drafts
will be prepared by Dutkiewicz (Dean appoints) and Katsiyannis (faculty elects). Revised language received. Vote on final draft and pass to EAC.

5. PTR committees in small departments: Cindy Lee says her department (EEES) is concerned about the effort required to form a PTR committee if there are faculty subject to Part II. Dan is of the opinion that you need to go through part I to know that and forming such a committee isn’t that time consuming. I agree and think this should be left alone. Unless there are serious disagreements here, I will communicate that with Cindy.

6. Meeting with Cathy Sams: Questions about conflict between desire to “protect the Clemson brand”, and academic freedom.

7. Social Media Guidelines: substantially revised? Vote to pass to EAC to pass resolution approving changes?

8. Faculty Authored Textbooks

9. Tenure & Promotion: What does separate mean? Reword and pass along to Dori? Invite Sean Williams to discuss revision?

10. Request to extend probationary period – pass along to Dori?

11. Library attendance at Graduate Curriculum Committee meetings. Dutkiewicz emphasized that the Libraries want representation as they have in the Undergraduate Committee. Also, membership on this sub-committee permits presence on the Graduate Council. Conferring with the GAC is probably the best way to start work on this; Grubb mentioned as good contact with GAC. Vote on proposal to pass to EAC.

12.
Salary report Update (Brett Dalton, CFO)

Budget-CU Budget Funds allocated to Athletics for past fiscal year; also funds from Athletics coming to CU budget

The budgets prior to 2010 have a table in them that breaks out the auxiliary enterprises (including athletics).

For example: The 2009 budget (FY09; 2008-2009). On page 16 of the budget (the 17th page of the PDF file), you will find the table. You will see that there is a "Transfer In" to athletics of $10.8 Million, whereas most of the other auxiliary enterprises transfer money out to the University.

The questions are: From where does this transfer occur, and for what purpose? The amount is larger than the $3 Million Bill says is for differential tuition. Inasmuch as the slope with time is positive, perhaps it is simply the formal accounting of this differential (which is offered to non-athletes as well) plus Vickery Hall??

Can the CFO kindly construct this same table for the 2010 budget with an explanation of what these transfer in entries are.

Academic Infrastructure-major construction/renovation projects

Current construction project

Scheduled construction projects (3-5 years)
Definition of Terms

**Student ratings:**
Typically, Likert-scale close ended questions for students to complete at the end of a course, or more rarely, mid-course and end of course. Also called student evaluations or student satisfaction measures.

**Student comments:**
Structured or unstructured sections for students to write qualitative comments about courses. Structured sections pose specific questions for open-ended, on-demand written responses. Unstructured sections may be labeled “Comments” with no specific directions to students concerning to what their comments should refer. This summary is about student ratings, not comments. See Werts (2011) for summary of research on student comments.

Validity Issues with Course/Instructor Rating Instruments

**Consequential Validity:** Does the instrument provide adequate evidence to support the decisions and the consequences of that decision?
- Student ratings and their comments are insufficient evidence of the effectiveness of teaching or the degree to which learning occurred; thus, not defensible as the sole evidence in personnel decisions (Bowman, 2010; Catano & Harvey, 2011).
- Little is known about how faculty use the results of student ratings as formative and reflective evidence for improving their teaching practices (Algozzine, Beatty, Bray, Flowers, Gretes, Howley, Mohanty & Spooner, 2004; Onwuegbuzie, Daniel & Collins, 2007).
- Administrators may misinterpret student ratings (Onwuegbuzie, Daniel & Collins, 2007; Sproule, 2000).
- Indications of unintended consequences of the use of student ratings for faculty personnel decisions include grade inflation, reduction of coursework and assignments, and elimination of some course content (Clayson, 2009; Crumbley & Reichelt, 2009; Eizler, 2002; Hall & Fitzgerald, 1995; Isley & Singh, 2007; Zabaleta, 2007).

**Criterion Validity:** Does the instrument define and measure the criterion construct that it purports to measure?
- The definition of effective teaching remains elusive and the diversity of instruments among higher education institutions used to solicit student ratings frequently have not established specific or consistent underlying variables as criteria for effective teaching (Abrami, d’Apollonia & Rosenfield, 2007; Abrami, Rosenfield & Deci, 2007; Algozzine, Beatty, Bray, Flowers, Gretes, Howley, Mohanty & Spooner, 2004; Catano & Harvey, 2011; Clayson, 2009; Onwuegbuzie, Daniel & Collins, 2007).
Concurrent Validity – Does the instrument demonstrate consistency (moderate to high positive correlation) in measurement among alternative measures?

- Peer (other faculty members') ratings of instructors have a low correlation with student ratings (Hobson & Talbot, 2001).
- The majority of student rating measures may use an inadequate level for unit of analysis as classes are nested within degree/program curriculum within disciplines, and at each level, student perceptions about learning are influenced beyond the classroom and instructor (Lüdtke, Robitzsch, Trautwein & Kunter, 2009; Marsh, Muthén, Asparouhov, Lüdtke, Robitzsch, Morin & Trautwein, 2012).
- Typically university student rating instruments have not been validated against Students' Evaluations of Educational Quality (SEEQ) (Marsh, 1982), one of very few validated university student ratings instruments (Abrami, d'Apollonia & Rosenfield, 2007; Abrami, Rosenfield & Deci, 2007; Catano & Harvey, 2009; Crumbley & Reichelt, 2009; Lüdtke, Robitzsch, Trautwein & Kunter, 2009; Marsh, Muthén, Asparouhov, Lüdtke, Robitzsch, Morin & Trautwein, 2012; Sproule, 2000).

Relationship between Student Ratings and Measures of Learning

Objective measures of learning (tests) and ratings

- Student ratings have nearly no relationship with their learning (Bowman, 2010; Clayson, 2009).
- Student self-reports of learning are unrelated to their tests results during the course and in subsequent, more advanced coursework (Bowman, 2010; Clayson, 2009; Carrell & West, 2008; 2010).

Influence of grades on ratings of instructors

- A 2008 panel study at the U.S. Air Force Academy (n=12,000 students) showed a positive correlation between less-experienced instructors' student evaluation ratings and grades, but an inverse relationship with students' subsequent performance in more advanced courses (Carrell & West, 2008; 2010).
- A "leniency and a reciprocity effect" describes the relationship between grades and student ratings (Clayson, 2009, p. 26).
- One of the strongest predictors of student ratings of instructors is the projected course grade. One of the unintended consequences may be grade inflation (Eizler, 2002).
- Consistent findings in studies of student evaluations associate grades with ratings of instructors (Hall & Fitzgerald, 1995).
- Perceived expected grades have a strong significant effect on student ratings of instructors (Isley & Singh, 2007).
- The lower the grade, the stronger the correlation between the grade and low rating of instructors. Grade inflation may be an unintended consequence of student ratings (Zabaleta, 2007).

Influence of timing on ratings of instructors

- Timing of the evaluation affects ratings. Scores should be adjusted for length of course (1 to 3 hours – the longer the course, the lower the rating) (Isley & Singh, 2007, p. 57).
- The time of day for which a class is schedule affects ratings. Early evening classes (5-7 PM) received the lowest ratings (Zabaleta, 2007).
- Validity of student evaluations of instruction is threatened by administration immediately before tests or exams or other high-value assignments and/or coincidental to returning results and feedback to students on those assignments, tests, or exams (Hall & Fitzgerald, 1995).
- Students rate courses lower during the semester than after the course is over (Clayson, 2009).

**Influence of gender on ratings of instructors**
- In the USAF 2008 study in math and sciences, professor gender was found to have little effect on male students, but female professors have an effect on female student performance, and high-performing female students are more likely to take more math and science courses after experiencing a female professor (Carrell, Page, & West, 2010).
- Gender bias exists in student evaluations of instructors. Female students may have a preference for female instructors due to perceptions about more interactive instruction and quality of feedback on assignments. Male students may prefer male instructors given perceptions about course organization and tendencies to lecture (Centra & Gaubatz, 2000).
- In the Sciences (Biology, Chemistry, Physics), a gender bias was established by students of both genders against female instructors (Potvin, Hazari, Tai & Sadler, 2009).

**Other biases influencing rating of instructors**
- Adjuncts and tenured faculty received more favorable ratings than non-tenured faculty (Isley & Singh, 2007, p. 57). Raw ratings should be adjusted by faculty rank (tenured professors have higher ratings) (McPherson & Jewell, 2007).
- Students assign lower ratings to more experienced instructors (Carrell & West, 2008; 2010).
- Students assign lower ratings to older instructors (Carrell & West, 2008; 2010; McPherson & Jewell, 2007; Zabaleta, 2007). [Note that age and experience may be conflated in these studies depending on the way these variables are defined and measured.]
- Faculty production of high quality research publications is positively correlated to higher student ratings of instruction (Stack, 2003).

**Recommendations**
- Ratings are more valid for formative inferential purposes when presented and interpreted as longitudinal trends rather than in snapshots (Algozzine, Beatty, Bray, Flowers, Grete, Howley, Mohanty & Spooner, 2004; Bowman, 2010; Hobson & Talbot, 2001; Isley & Singh, 2007; McPherson & Jewell, 2007).
- Required, university-developed instruments should be accompanied with reliability and validity data (Abrami, d’Apollonia & Rosenfield, 2007; Abrami, Rosenfield & Deci, 2007; Hobson & Talbot, 2001).
- Raw scores should not be used in faculty evaluations (Isley & Singh, 2007; McPherson & Jewell, 2007; Morley, 2012; Sproule, 2000). Scores should be adjusted for the following factors:
  - Faculty rank and/or age
  - Student grades (or expected grades)
  - Class size
  - Course rigor
  - Response rate
  - Length of course (1 to 3 hours – the longer the course, the lower the rating)
- Item means should not be the only type of data presentation as inter-item correlation, or inter-rater correlation techniques, may be more explanatory of ratings within particular courses in

- To supplement student ratings of instruction, faculty should also provide measures of student learning through pre and post testing as an indication of teaching effectiveness or longitudinal measures of student learning should be included (Bowman, 2010; Stark-Wroblewski, Ahlering & Brill, 2007).
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Executive Summary

The academic profession, the University, Clemson students, and the citizens of South Carolina are best served if both lecturers and regular faculty are integrated as a community of professional teachers and scholars subject to peer evaluation and able to access the tenure process and the concomitant increased protection of academic freedom and economic security that tenure provides. (In this report, the term lecturers applies to teaching lecturers). We recommend that units be mandated to regularly review all lecturers in a manner consistent with the regular review of other faculty; lecturers eventually achieve promotion to at least Senior Lecturer rank or not be reappointed; there be established and recognized a rich system of multiple professional paths for faculty in pursuit of our common mission like one finds in U.S. medical schools; Senior Lecturers have the ability to convert to the tenure track, a feature present in the Pennsylvania State System of Higher Education; there be established a distinct programmatic tenure status, for which the University is not under obligation to extant AAUP guidelines to place faculty members whose programs have been discontinued elsewhere within the University; individuals with regular faculty rank of Assistant Professor be eligible for programmatic tenure without promotion to Associate Professor; and that a new higher special faculty rank of Master Lecturer come with such programmatic tenure.

Membership: Heather Batt (Senior Lecturer, Food, Nutrition, and Packaging), Sandy Edge (Lecturer, BBS Undergraduate Advising Center), Lance Howard (Senior Lecturer, History), Jeremy King (Committee Chair, Associate Professor, Physics and Astronomy), John Leininger (Professor, Graphics Communication), Francis McGuire (Alumni Professor, Parks, Recreation and Tourism Management), Robert Taylor (Professor and Chair, Mathematical Sciences), Peggy Tyler (Librarian, University Libraries)

Committee Charge: The Committee was formally charged on 30 August 2011 by Faculty Senate President Dan Warner. The charge was threefold:

"First, develop proposed revisions to the Faculty Manual that uncouple the tenure and promotion process and include more general but stringent guidelines for tenure. In particular, these guidelines should incorporate the requirements for interaction between the Chair and the TPR committee that are being reflected in the developing Workload policy.

Second, develop proposed revision to the Faculty Manual that define the role of the TPR committee in the annual reappointment of lecturers and the paths for promotion to Senior and Master Lecturer as well as promotion to Instructor."
Third, participate and promote discussion by all the faculty of the essential role of tenure for insuring Academic Freedom in the classroom and its importance for faculty with Teaching Intensive positions."

Committee Operations/Activities: In its work and deliberations, the Committee

- Considered the recommendations contained in the Interim Report of the 2009-2010 Joint Provost-Faculty Senate Select Committee on Best management Practices in Support of Academic Lecturers chaired by Bill Pennington and 2010-2011 Ad Hoc Committee on the Status of Lecturers chaired by Dan Warner (attached at the end of this report).

- Reviewed the little known 1966 AAUP Report of the Special Committee on Academic Personnel Ineligible for Tenure attached at the end of this report, which sought to interpret the AAUP's 1940 Statement in the context of contingent faculty. This committee recommended that all full-time teaching personnel, whatever their title, should be eligible for tenure following a probationary period.

- Surveyed the landscape of institutional policies and found that no SACS-accredited institution had provisions for tenure for contingent faculty.

- Reviewed the 2010 AAUP Committee on Contingency and the Profession report "Tenure and Teaching-Intensive Appointments" which is available at the following URL: http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/c01run/1tp/teachertenure.htm (attached as a supplement to this report). We note that this 2010 AAUP report contains an appendix of particular interest on policies and developments at other higher educational institutions seeking to stabilize their system of tenured faculty against collapse.

- Met with two approximately 20-person focus groups of Lecturers and Senior Lecturers in the Department of Mathematical Sciences and the College of Business and Behavioral Science to assess attitudes, needs and desires, and to receive feedback on provisional Committee recommendations.

Committee Findings: The current Committee operating this 2011/2012 academic year, made the following findings that served as context for our detailed recommendations:

- We recognized the existence of SACS guidelines concerning regular evaluation of all faculty, provision of the opportunity for professional development of all faculty, and ensuring protection of academic freedom.

- We recognized that some lecturers on campus are essentially administrative faculty hired and evaluated by administrators.

- Viewing lecturers and regular faculty rank faculty as a professional community of educators who are most effective when their teaching is informed by scholarship or significant professional development, and whose members should learn from, nurture, and evaluate each other in order to achieve professional growth, is beneficial to the academy, the University, our students, and the citizens of South Carolina.
- Lecturers should be given sufficient time and resources to achieve, exhibit, and document growth, professional development, and scholarly activities.

- Policy efforts at other (non-SACS) institutions provide examples of provision of tenure to lecturers that enhances the economic security and academic freedom of high-performing faculty.

- No single rigid professional path for lecturers makes sense given crystal clear unit-to-unit differences in culture, aspirations, and expectations.

- Relatedly, departments/units should have reasonable flexibility and control concerning tenure/promotion criteria and other related policies.

- We recognized that there may exist inter- (and, in some cases intra-) college differences in the provision of benefits to full-time lecturers. In some cases, these differences are enabled by continuous renewal of Temporary Lecturers.

**Nature of Recommendations:** The committee believes that the academy, the University, Clemson students, and the citizens of South Carolina are best served if both lecturers and regular faculty are integrated as a community of professional teachers and scholars who support and evaluate each other and who can all access the tenure process and the concomitant protection of academic freedom and economic security that tenure provides to members of such a professional community.

Our most significant recommendations combine three salient features in use elsewhere: a system of multiple professional paths that can lead to tenure as is common in U.S. medical schools; the ability of lecturers to convert to the tenure track, a feature present in the Pennsylvania State System of Higher Education; and the addition of so-called programmatic tenure, under which the University is not under obligation to the normal AAUP guideline to place faculty members whose programs have been discontinued elsewhere within the University; programmatic tenure is a status employed by St. John’s University (NYC) in their conversion of contingent faculty to the tenure-track.

**Committee Statement of Recommendations:**

It is helpful to place in this Committee’s Statement of Recommendations in the historical context of the work of previous committees. A previous committee chaired by Bill Pennington during the 2009/2010 academic year made several recommendations regarding lecturers. After a minimum of 5 years, a Lecturer could apply for promotion to Senior Lecturer with the concurrence of the unit Chair and TPR committee; the proposed criteria for promotion were significant contributions to instructional mission. After a minimum of 4 years, a Senior Lecturer could apply for promotion to Master Lecturer; the proposed criteria for promotion were exemplary contributions to instructional mission. Master Lecturers would be offered 5-year contracts. The unit Chair and TPR committee would make independent recommendations to the Dean regarding promotion to Master Lecturer. Finally, the Pennington committee proposed that Master Lecturers be considered regular faculty with respect to voting privileges.
During the following 2010/2011 academic year, a committee chaired by Dan Warner made the following recommendations regarding lecturers: Lecturers should be evaluated annually by the unit Chair and TPR committee. After 4 years, the Chair and TPR carry out an evaluation with 3 possible outcomes: promotion to senior lecturer, or conversion to Instructor (a regular faculty rank on the tenure track), or a final year of service followed by non-renewal of the appointment. The Warner committee also recommended that tenure and promotion for Assistant Professors be severed so that Assistant Professors could be tenured.

It is with this historical context that the above qualitative nature of the recommendations are made specific here. The specific recommendations are presented pictorially in the first attachment to this report—a figure that shows the proposed system of professional pathways for Clemson faculty.

The left branch of the diagram shows special faculty ranks. The right branch depicts regular faculty tenure-track ranks. The key features are as follows:

- Lecturers would be evaluated annually by both the unit chair or director as well as the TPR committee, and their current 1-year renewable terms would be retained.
- After 4 years, independent review by the Chair and TPR committee would result in either promotion to Senior Lecturer (if requested) or one additional 4-year cycle of 1-year terms (assuming satisfactory performance and availability of funds). During that second 4-year term, Lecturers can request promotion to Senior Lecturer. Departments would be responsible for defining promotion criteria.
- At the end of the second 4-year period, another independent review by the Chair and TPR committee would result in either promotion to Senior Lecturer or non-renewal (with 1 year notice of non-renewal).
- Senior Lecturers would have 3-year renewable terms with 1 year notice of non-renewal as they do now. Annual evaluation by the Chair and TPR committee would continue.
- After a period of at least 4 years, a Senior Lecturer could (if he/she chooses) request promotion to a new rank of Master Lecturer. Departments and colleges would be responsible for defining the criteria for this rank. Promotion to Master Lecturer would come with a more restricted programmatic tenure. The idea behind programmatic tenure is that in the event of program elimination, the University is under no obligation (like that suggested by the AAUP for regular tenure) to attempt to place faculty with programmatic tenure elsewhere in the University. Such a position would be attractive to those that are most interested in an instruction-intensive career in the University.
- Alternatively, a Senior Lecturer could (if he/she chooses) request promotion to the rank of Assistant Professor that would come with programmatic tenure. Departments would be responsible for defining the criteria for programmatic tenure for Assistant Professors. Such a position would be attractive to those lecturers (and their units) that are interested in carrying out significant scholarly activities, partaking in more
extensive university service, or securing grant funding as a PI, but can not or would not or do not have the expectation to do so at the highest and most sustained levels expected of higher regular faculty ranks. This rank and associated programmatic tenure provides economic security and enhances academic freedom for high performing former lecturers that can and are participating in the University mission beyond classroom instruction in notably valuable ways, but not necessarily with the steadiness and magnitude of a regular faculty member.

- If such Assistant Professors with programmatic tenure can later meet the requirements for regular tenure and Associate Professor or full Professor rank, they can request such tenure and promotion. This request would be evaluated using criteria and procedures already in place.

- It may be that some units might find value in awarding programmatic tenure to assistant professors originally hired as untenured assistant professors. For example, a Department undertaking significant student engagement activities under the 2020 plan might find that an excellent teacher that works well in engaging students might not meet the criteria for promotion and normal tenure, but is still a valuable asset that should be retained. However, other Departments may wish to replace such a candidate, originally hired with inflexible expectations of high and sustained scholarly output, who does not achieve regular tenure and promotion with a new hire. We suggest that the ability to award programmatic tenure to an individual already in a regular faculty position should simply be an option for Departments—allowable only if Departments explicitly allow this possibility in their bylaws.

- Finally, we recommend that the Faculty Senate extend its productive work with the Administration and Human Resources concerning non-teaching lecturer classification and access to the optional supplemental (403b) retirement program to: a) ensuring appropriate classification of full-time teaching lecturers, and b) ensuring consistent access to health and retirement benefits for full-time lecturers.

Supplemental Materials: Attached to this report for reference and convenience are the following materials:

Proposed professional paths/flows for Clemson faculty

The Interim Report of the 2009-2010 Joint Provost-Faculty Senate Select Committee on Best Management Practices in Support of Academic Lecturers

The Final Report of the 2010-2011 Ad Hoc Committee on the Status of Lecturers

1966 AAUP Report of the Special Committee on Academic Personnel Ineligible for Tenure

2010 AAUP Report “Tenure and Teaching-Intensive Appointments”
Joint Provost-Faculty Senate Select Committee on Best Management Practices in Support of Academic Lecturers

Interim Report to the Faculty Senate on the proceedings and progress from November 10, 2009 to the present.

Membership:
Bill Pennington (chair); Roxanne Amerson; Heather Batt; Dorismel Diaz-Perez; Sandy Edge; Linda Howe; Beth Kunkel; Michelle Martin; Chris Minor; Caroline Parsons, Amy Pope; Eddie Smith (resigned January 2010 due to scheduling conflicts, replaced by C.S. Parsons) Bob Taylor; Peg Tyler; Gaven Watkins

Terms of Reference

Term: 15 October 2009 to 13 April 2010
Purpose: To examine issues related to Academic Lecturers. Committee will provide a series of observations and recommendations on the status of lecturers, successes, failures, and ways to improve the practices related to Academic Lecturers, and to provide them opportunities for grievance hearings and for appropriate participation in academic affairs at the university.

After our first meeting on November 10, 2009 during which the committee was charged by Provost Helms and Faculty Senate President Bowerman, we met on a weekly basis throughout most of November, December and the spring semester. Our initial emphasis was on gathering the opinions and concerns of Lecturers throughout the university.

Based on the issues raised in these discussions, we felt that our primary goal should be creation of an additional rank, the Master Lecturer, in order to provide recognition and responsibilities concurrent with the significant contributions and commitment of a select group of outstanding career Lecturers. It is our recommendation that this group be provided the rights and privileges of Regular Faculty in order that they may give voice to the concerns of all Lecturers. Attachment A, Proposed Changes to the Faculty Manual, is the final product of our efforts.

In addition to the above, we have also made significant progress toward creation of a Best Practices Guide in Support of Academic Lecturers (Attachment B). It must be recognized that the needs and concerns of Lecturers vary widely across the five colleges and within the departments of each college. As such, our recommendations can only be seen as a broad guide for the hiring and support of Lecturers.
Proposed Changes to the Faculty Manual

Respectfully submitted by the

Rationale Statement

The rationale for the proposed changes to the current definitions of lecturer, senior lecturer, and to the creation of the rank of master lecturer were developed as an avenue of recognition and promotion for valuable members of the teaching profession at Clemson University and to afford faculty members with committed careers to the University the rights, privileges and responsibilities of regular faculty. These proposed changes will align our University with procedures and practices at many of our peer Top 20 institutions.

The proposed changes to the current definition of senior lecturer, and the creation of the rank of master lecturer were not developed to change the role of tenure track faculty, nor to allow non-tenure ranks to replace nor infringe upon the tenure-track faculty ranks of assistant professor, associate professor, or professor.

(Proposed rewording to Faculty Manual, Part III, D8)

Senior Lecturer. After five academic year terms of service, a lecturer may apply for promotion to senior lecturer; equivalent experience at Clemson, such as that obtained in a visiting position, may be counted towards the 5 year probationary term. A department chair/school director with the concurrence of the department/school tenure-promotion-(re)appointment committee make the recommendation to the college dean who makes the promotion decision. Senior lecturers shall be offered three-year contracts with the requirement of one year's notice of non-renewal before July 15. Senior lecturers cannot have administrative duties beyond those of regular faculty. The criteria for promotion from lecturer to senior lecturer will typically consist of significant contributions to the instructional mission of the Department/University. Specific guidelines for promotion to senior lecturer are determined by the Departments/Colleges consistent with their bylaws and promotion procedures.

Senior Lecturer. After six years of satisfactory performance a lecturer may be reclassified as a senior lecturer. Equivalent experience at Clemson, such as that obtained in a visiting position, may be counted. A department chair, with the concurrence of the department's advisory committee, may recommend an individual to the college dean who makes the appointment. Senior lecturers may be offered contracts ranging from one to three years with the requirement of one year's notice before termination. This rank is not available to faculty with greater than 50% administrative assignment.
(Proposed addition to Faculty Manual, Part III D9)

Master Lecturer. After a minimum of four years, a senior lecturer may apply for promotion to master lecturer. A department chair/school director and the department/school tenure-promotion-(re)appointment committee make independent promotion recommendations to the college dean, who makes the promotion decision and any resulting appointment. Master lecturers shall be offered five-year contracts with the requirement of one year’s notice of non-renewal before July 15. Master lecturers cannot have administrative duties beyond those of regular faculty. The criteria for promotion from senior lecturer to master lecturer will typically consist of exemplary contributions to the instructional mission of the Department/University. Specific guidelines for promotion to master lecturer are determined by the Departments/Colleges consistent with their bylaws and promotion procedures.

(Proposed rewording to Faculty Manual, Part III, E)

Master lecturers are considered regular faculty members with respect to voting privileges and membership on committees. Other special faculty rank appointments do not carry voting privileges except as may be provided in relevant school/college/department faculty bylaws.
Best Practices for Promotions of Senior Lecturers & Masters Lecturers

JOINT PROVOST-FACULTY SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE ON BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES IN SUPPORT OF ACADEMIC LECTURERS

Promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer

The senior lecturer appointment is intended to recognize the efforts, contributions, and performance of lecturers who are not merely satisfactorily effective classroom teachers, but who have also made (an) additional significant contribution(s) to the instructional mission of the University. Accordingly, length of service as lecturer is, itself, not a sufficient criterion for promotion to senior lecturer. Specific guidelines and criteria for promotion from lecturer to senior lecturer are determined by departments/schools. It will be expected to conform to the following general criteria.

These criteria must, at a minimum, include: (a) 5 years of at least very good performance as lecturer as judged by the department chair and/or department tenure-promotion-(re)appointment committee; and (b) (an) identifiable significant contribution(s) to the instructional mission of the Department/School/University that extends beyond even excellence in student-based assessment of instruction and ordinary expectations of lecturers in fulfillment of their responsibilities. Such contributions might include, but are not limited to: teaching a genuine breadth of courses, honors courses, or courses at a variety of levels; assisting in the development or evaluation of curricula; creation or implementation of beneficial pedagogical innovations or instructional materials; pedagogical scholarship; significant consulting activities related to instructional duties; mentoring colleagues in the instruction profession; advising or mentoring students in extracurricular activities, scholarly activities, theses, dissertations, independent study, capstone projects, etc; supervision of students engaged in instructional activities; contributions in recruiting/retaining students; significant professional development activities; service to the academy or relevant professional organizations; student advising or career counseling.

Adequate documentation is essential in any promotion. In particular, it is incumbent upon lecturers to document and provide evidence of such activities to the department chair/school director and department/school tenure-promotion-(re)appointment committee for evaluation and consideration. Department chairs and tenure-promotion-(re)appointment committees recommending promotion must ensure that the minimum criteria above have, in their best professional judgment, been fulfilled. College deans shall make decisions concerning promotion to senior lecturer on the basis of fulfillment of these criteria.

Promotion from Senior Lecturer to Master Lecturer

The master lecturer appointment is intended to recognize the efforts, contributions, and performance of senior lecturers whom are not merely dedicated effective classroom teachers but who have made exemplary contributions to the instructional mission of the University and are educators in the broadest context of the mission of the University. Accordingly, length of service as senior lecturer is, itself, not a sufficient criterion for promotion to master lecturer. Specific guidelines and criteria for promotion from senior lecturer to master lecturer are determined by departments/schools. It will be expected to conform to the following general criteria.

These criteria must, at a minimum, include: (a) 4 years of excellent performance as senior lecturer as judged by the department chair and/or department tenure-promotion-(re)appointment committee; and (b) leadership roles in multiple identifiable and sustained significant contributions to the instructional mission of the Department/School/University that extend beyond even excellence in student-based assessment of instruction and ordinary expectations of senior lecturers in fulfillment of their responsibilities. Such contributions might
include, but are not limited to: assisting in the development or evaluation of curricula; creation or implementation of beneficial pedagogical innovations or instructional materials; pedagogical scholarship; significant consulting activities related to instructional duties; mentoring colleagues in the instruction profession; advising or mentoring students in extracurricular activities, scholarly activities, theses, dissertations, independent study, capstone projects, etc; supervision of students engaged in instructional activities; contributions in recruiting/retaining students; significant professional development activities; service to the academy or relevant professional organizations; student advising or career counseling.

Adequate documentation is essential in any promotion. In particular, it is incumbent upon senior lecturers to document and provide evidence of such contributions to the department chair/school director and department/school tenure-promotion-(re)appointment committee for evaluation and consideration. Department chairs and tenure-promotion-(re)appointment committees recommending promotion must ensure that the minimum criteria above have, in their best professional judgment, been fulfilled. College deans shall make decisions concerning promotion to master lecturer on the basis of fulfillment of these criteria.
On September 6, 1955, Dr. F. M. Kinard, Dean of the College, appointed a committee of faculty members consisting of F. B. Schirmer, Chair; W. C. Bowen, J. C. Cook, Gaston Gage, B. E. Goodale, and J. E. Miller to formulate plans for organizing the teaching faculty of Clemson College. After lengthy deliberation the committee proposed a Constitution and By-laws of the Academic Faculty and Faculty Senate of Clemson College. The Constitution was adopted by the General Faculty, and on April 9, 1956, the Constitution was approved by the Board of Trustees. On January 27, 1956, the Constitution was approved by the Board of Trustees.

PREFACE

Faculty Manual, May 1956
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>Teaching Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>First mention of &quot;research&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>Teaching Faculty/Research Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>First mention of &quot;lecturers&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Research Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Research Faculty/Lecturers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"First mention of "lecturers"
0-4 years Lecturers/Visiting Lecturers/Temporary Lecturers
Ranging from "Fill-ins" to 2-3 year teaching "post-docs" to entry-level career lecturers

5+ years "Career" Lecturers
Ranging from those who teach their courses, hold their office hours and advise their students to those who do all of the above and serve on committees, develop new courses, advise student groups, etc.

6+ years Senior Lecturer
Recognition for excellence in performing as the latter class of Career Lecturers

10+ years Master Lecturer
Recognition for stellar performance at Senior Lecturer level. Master lecturers are considered regular faculty members with respect to voting privileges and membership on committees.

Master Lecturers are considered regular faculty members with respect to voting privileges and membership on committees.
"... don't make the mistake of thinking we are all the same. We play different roles in different departments. Some are intended as short-timers and others are not."
Future Work

One Clemson

The coming years will test this university like no others. If we are to be successful, we will truly need to become One Clemson. Disenfranchising a significant portion of the teaching faculty is not the way to get there. Neither is minimizing the experience and talents of a group of incredibly committed educators.
Ad Hoc Committee on the Status of Lecturers

Draft Proposal on Contingent Faculty and the Tenure Process.

The Problem. According to the Clemson University Office of Institutional Research, in 2010 the Instructional Faculty consisted of 570 tenured faculty, 278 tenure track faculty, and 328 non-tenure track faculty. More than a quarter (27.9%) of the faculty teaching at Clemson are contingent. Although there are a number of job titles most of them are listed as lecturers, and all of them are hired on short term contracts, typically one year.

The Tenure Process is the mechanism for insuring that a university has a professional faculty. To quote the AAUP 2010 report, "Faculty serving on a contingent basis generally work at significantly lower wages, often without health coverage and other benefits, and in positions that do not incorporate all aspects of university life or the full range of faculty rights and responsibilities. ... This means that [contingent] faculty work in subprofessional conditions, often without basic protections for academic freedom.

Clemson University is accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. The SACS guidelines for faculty state:

3.7.1. The institution employs competent faculty members qualified to accomplish the mission and goals of the institution. When determining acceptable qualifications of its faculty, an institution gives primary consideration to the highest earned degree in the discipline. The institution also considers competence, effectiveness, and capacity, including, as appropriate, undergraduate and graduate degrees, related work experiences in the field, professional licensure and certifications, honors and awards, continuous documented excellence in teaching, or other demonstrated competencies and achievements that contribute to effective teaching and student learning outcomes. (Faculty competence)

3.7.2. The institution regularly evaluates the effectiveness of each faculty member in accord with published criteria, regardless of contractual or tenured status. (Faculty evaluation)

3.7.3. The institution provides ongoing professional development of faculty as teachers, scholars, and practitioners. (Faculty development)

3.7.4. The institution ensures adequate procedures for safeguarding and protecting academic freedom. (Academic freedom)

Relative to contingent faculty none of these four accreditation guidelines are systematically supported. In particular, the contingent faculty evaluation is not consistent across departments and rarely involves peer review; the provision of ongoing professional development is rarely made available; and academic freedom simply does not exist outside the tenure process.
The only restriction in the Faculty Manual on hiring lecturers is that the department head must assure the dean that there are adequate funds in the budget for the lecturer's salary and benefits. Moreover, the Faculty Manual allows for the re-hiring of lecturers and the majority of lecturers on campus have been hired year after year after year. This means that we have evolved two separate groups – the regular faculty and the contingent faculty. This contingent faculty could be called an administrative faculty, since, by and large, they serve at the pleasure of administrators. The contingent faculty are hired by them, reviewed by them, and rehired by them. This fails to achieve the level of professionalism expected of the faculty at a university, and this lack of professionalism is a disservice to the university and to its students.

The Tenure Process. A major flaw in the tenure process at Clemson University is the linking of tenure and promotion. This link was established in 1997 under Provost Steffen Rogers. However, things have changed since then. Roughly speaking, across the university the current standard for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor is that the candidate has established a national reputation in their area of research or scholarship. While it would be desirable to have all students taught by nationally known professors, the existence of the large contingent faculty, underscores the fact that Clemson University does not have the resources to achieve that pinnacle. However, the university can provide all students with a fully professional faculty by restoring tenure to its original standard.

As stated in the AAUP 2010 report, “The tenure system was designed as a big tent, aiming to unite a faculty of tremendously diverse interests within a system of common professional values, standards, and mutual responsibilities.” For a research university it is perfectly reasonable to require external criteria for promotion, specifically: letters from well-known external researchers, publications in well-known journals, and funding from external agencies. Tenure, however, should take into account the role of the faculty member in the institution. If the faculty member is hired for a research intensive position, then research should be the dominant criteria, but if the faculty member is hired for a teaching intensive position, then teaching should be the dominant criteria.

Separating the tenure decision from the promotion decision will require that departmental TPR committees develop separate sets of guidelines for tenure and for promotion. In addition, each TPR committee will have to work more closely with its chair relative to understanding each faculty member's role.

A Career Path for Lecturers. The Faculty Manual describes two categories of lecturers. "This rank is assigned to individuals with special qualifications or for special functions in cases in which the assignment of other faculty ranks is not appropriate." This is commonly interpreted as personnel with special skills outside the usual academic disciplines, or as personnel well trained in the academic discipline that are hired to handle teaching and other academic requirements that cannot be met by the current faculty. The following proposal builds on that distinction.
The original hiring process for lecturers will remain as it currently stands, since frequently lecturers are hired to fill last minute needs. However, in addition to the Department Head's annual evaluations, the TPR committee will evaluate all lecturers and provide a written recommendation for each lecturer regarding the rehiring of that lecturer. If the rehiring recommendations from the Department Head and the TPR committee differ, the rehiring decision will be decided by the Dean.

If a lecturer has completed a fourth consecutive year, then the Department Head and the TPR committee will assess the role of the lecturer. If the lecturer has special qualifications outside the usual academic disciplines, then the lecturer can be promoted to Senior Lecturer. If the lecturer is well trained in the academic discipline and is primarily engaged in teaching and other scholarly activities, then the lecturer can be promoted to Instructor. If neither of these options is recommended, the lecturer will be rehired to serve a fifth and final year. (Note that this fifth year is currently required by the one year notice in the Faculty Manual.) **No lecturers can be rehired as lecturers after 5 years.** If the Department Head and the TPR committee do not agree on this recommendation, then the promotion decision will be decided by the Dean.

The Senior Lecturer position is already detailed in the Faculty Manual. Senior Lecturers have a three year contract. Following the recommendation of the 2009-2010 Senate Select Committee, there will also be a Master Lecturer position with a five year contract for which Senior Lectures would be eligible after serving six years as a Senior Lecturer. The TPR Committee should still be engaged in the evaluation of Senior and Master Lecturers and the recommendations for rehire. Neither Senior Lecturers nor Master Lecturers are regular faculty, and they are excluded from activities reserved to regular faculty.

The Instructor position is a regular faculty position. Consequently, Instructors can be fully engaged in all the duties and activities reserved to regular faculty, including service on College and University Curriculum committees. The annual reappointment would proceed under the standard Tenure Process. The description of the Instructor rank in the Faculty Manual would need to be modified as follows.

The master's degree or equivalent is required, with preference given to those pursuing the terminal degree. Appointees should show promise for advancement to a higher rank. Instructors are eligible for promotion to assistant professor only if they have the terminal degree and satisfy the other qualifications for the rank of assistant professor. Instructors not promoted by the end of the sixth year of service will receive a one-year terminal appointment. Instructor is not a tenurable rank, but the years of service in that rank may be credited toward tenure.

For outstanding lecturers, who have been repeatedly rehired and reappointed to support the University's goal of providing every student with excellent professional instruction, this path will lead in 10 years to a position as a tenured assistant professor. It is anticipated that these faculty will be strongly engaged in professional development and scholarly activity, but that such a teaching intensive career path will not likely lead to
promotion to associate professor. Nonetheless, these faculty as well as the University and its students will benefit from this effort to broaden and enhance the professional quality of its entire faculty.

**Implementation Issues.** Implementing these changes will require several steps.

First, the general proposal must be supported by the Faculty Senate and Provost.

Second, several sections of the Faculty Manual will need to be modified, a job which will fall to the Policy Committee of the Faculty Senate.

Third, Departments will need to develop new and separate guidelines for tenure and for promotion.

Fourth, Department Heads and TPR Committees will need to develop procedures that will ensure that the TPR Committees are evaluating faculty for rehire, reappointment, and tenure in accordance with the work assignments and goals agreed to by the Department Head and the individual faculty members.

Fifth, after the proposed changes have been approved, the countdown clock for lecturers will begin. No lecturer who has been hired or rehired that year will be allowed to be rehired as a lecturer after 5 years. In other words, prior years of service will not count against any lecturer. However, lecturers may count their previous experience in pursuing the Senior Lecturer path or the Instructor path.

**Proposed Change.** In Part IV, Personnel Practices, Section G, Tenure Policies, the committee recommends that the following sentence be deleted.

A recommendation to confer tenure for an assistant professor must be accompanied by a favorable recommendation for promotion to associate professor.

When this sentence was added in 1997 under Provost Steffen Rogers, the written rationale was that this was necessary to satisfy the SACS requirements on Faculty Qualification. Clearly that is not an accurate reading of the statement on Faculty Competence. In the verbal discussions the main justification, as reported by the Faculty Senators involved, was to streamline the tenure and promotion process by combining the two decisions.

With the pursuit of Top 20, the promotion guidelines were effectively raised. Broadly speaking, promotion to Associate Professor should indicate that the candidate has established a national reputation for scholarship in his or her discipline, and promotion to full Professor should indicate that the candidate has established an international reputation for scholarship in his or her discipline.
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Report of the Special Committee on
Academic Personnel Ineligible for Tenure

The report which follows is published here, at the direction of the Association’s Council, in order that chapters, conferences, members and other interested persons may have an opportunity to submit their comments to the Special Committee. All comments should be directed to the Association’s Washington Office.

Preamble

The Special Committee considered problems with regard to nontenure positions particularly as they concern three categories of academic people: (1) part-time teachers, (2) full-time teachers who are not considered regular members of faculties, and (3) persons who are appointed to full-time research positions. The Special Committee’s first effort has been to survey and analyze the policies and practices of reputable universities with regard to nontenure positions, reports of which were previously made to the Council and Committee A. Its second concern has been to examine these practices in relation to the 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure of the Association of American Colleges and the American Association of University Professors. Its third and final effort has been to formulate an interpretation of the 1940 Statement that might serve to guide the Association in advising interested persons about problems and disputes involving nontenure appointments.

The Special Committee soon concluded that the 1940 Statement could not be interpreted as guaranteeing tenure rights to part-time teachers. Its provisions for a probationary period apply explicitly to “. . . appointment to the rank of full-time instructor or higher rank.” The Special Committee feels, however, that the Association should continue to be actively concerned with cases belonging to this category, and should use its influence to persuade institutions to adopt and use suitable grievance procedures so that disputes involving part-time teachers can be judiciously resolved within the institutions. Where such procedures are inadequate or lacking, the Association should vigorously uphold the right of part-time teachers to the same academic freedom that teachers with tenure have. This policy should of course apply equally to full-time teachers during their probation period.

There has been much discussion by the Special Committee, as there has been among other organs of the Association, of the question whether the increasing use of people without doctors’ degrees as full-time teachers calls for clarification of the probationary requirements set forth by the 1940 Statement. That is, does an educational institution have to count years of full-time service accumulated by a tenure candidate before he has received his doctorate in determining when the decision to grant or not grant tenure must be made? Or, conversely, is it legitimate for an institution to appoint a doctoral candidate as a full-time teacher, in a rank below, or different from, that of instructor, and consider that his term of probation for tenure begins only if and when he receives the doctorate? The 1940 Statement, whether intentionally or not, appears to leave room for the second interpretation by saying that the probationary period should begin with appointment at the rank of instructor or a higher rank. It does not, however, say at what rank a full-time teacher with the doctorate must be appointed. After full discussion, the Special Committee is unanimously agreed that the first interpretation should be Association policy; that is, any person whom an institution appoints to a full-time teaching position should be treated as a candidate for tenure under the requirements of the 1940 Statement, no matter what rank or title he may be given by the institution. If an institution wants to exclude a doctoral candidate (or any other person whom it considers inadequately qualified for regular faculty membership and status) from tenure candidacy, it should not appoint him as a full-time teacher. The Special Committee believes that less injustice will be done, both to teachers and to institutions, if this policy is enforced than if the apparent loophole is left open. A serious doctoral candidate ought not to do full-time teaching anyhow; it is not in his interest or that of the institution to have his attainment of the degree delayed or prevented by overwork. Nor are academic salaries any longer so low, or financial support in the form of
fellowships and loans so difficult to attain, that a serious doctoral candidate cannot survive a few years on part-time pay. The Special Committee feels particularly strongly that an institution which is unable to recruit enough doctors to fill all its full-time teaching positions ought not to deny tenure to full-time teachers lacking doctors' degrees. The Special Committee does not believe that the present shortage of fully qualified teachers is in any sense a temporary emergency. It was foreseen twenty years ago, and it should have been prevented. It will continue indefinitely if institutions allow themselves to make do with underqualified and underprivileged teachers of the kind implied by the term "subfaculty." Institutions should do all they can to increase the number of qualified teachers. The Special Committee believes that anyone who does an instructor's work should be given appropriate rank and privileges. In short, the Special Committee wishes to eliminate the second problem category by refusing to grant that, for purposes of the 1940 Statement, there is any such thing as a full-time teacher at a rank below that of instructor.

The third problem category, that of research people who are not teachers, is relatively new to higher education. It was not foreseen, and its full effect on the regulation and conduct of academic institutions is not yet foreseeable. In particular, it seems clear to the Special Committee that the two associations had no major category of such academic people in mind when they formulated the 1940 Statement. A question may be, therefore, whether it is possible for the Special Committee to apply the 1940 Statement to this category. Its deliberations may in fact have led to another question: does the 1940 Statement itself need some revision, amendment, or supplement in order to provide proper guidance for Association policy in this area? The 1940 Statement plainly assumes that the normal basic activity of university professors is teaching and that research is a functionally related activity by means of which teaching is enriched and extended. On this assumption it is entirely reasonable and proper to maintain, as the 1940 Statement evidently does, that a researcher is the same thing as a teacher insofar as his right to academic freedom, his status as a faculty member, and his entitlement to tenure are concerned. In 1940, with negligible exceptions, researchers in universities were teachers, part of whose teaching was by word of mouth and part by the medium of print. The two parts served the same purpose of transmitting the teacher's individual ideas into the arena of public discussion, and the same principles of freedom and of responsibility applied to both.

Now, however, there are an important number of researchers working in universities and university-operated agencies to whom this assumption does not so clearly apply. Workers on Department of Defense and Atomic Energy Commission projects offer the extreme example; but anyone who works on a project which is defined by a contract between the employing institution and a sponsoring agency, government, industry, or foundation is likely to be more or less limited in his freedom to decide for himself what line of investigation he will pursue. The question arises whether universities ought to be engaged in this kind of contract research at all. The Special Committee regards this as an important question, but not one that can be settled at this time by a component of the AAUP. The fact is that many of the best universities are so engaged, and the question to be answered is what the AAUP policy should be toward the people involved, particularly concerning the conditions of academic freedom and tenure under which they work.

The Special Committee recognizes that many and perhaps most of the researchers doing contract work are qualified by education and training to be members of teaching faculties. What makes them different is their function. A related consideration, which administrators are quick to point out, is that the shifting character of the financial support for contract work imposes a special problem in relation to tenure. It is not so much a matter of the total amount of money available as it is of the fact that individual research contracts run for limited terms, and that researchers are not always transferable from one contract project to another within the same institution. Administratively, the logical solution is to let the individual researcher's contract run for not longer than the term of the project contract. The situation is roughly parallel to that which arises when an institution decides to discontinue a course or department or college. The AAUP recognizes that legitimate academic reasons may require such a change, and that it is not always possible for the institution to retain all the people whose positions are eliminated. Such a situation, rare in teaching faculties, is normal and frequent in contract research.

These problems are closely related to the fact that many research projects are carried out by teams of researchers under the supervision of project directors. The director of a project, often a faculty member with tenure, and very often a kind of entrepreneur in proposing the project and attracting financial support for it from sources outside the institution, has a legitimate need for freedom in the selection and rejection of team members, and for adequate authority to assign their tasks and coordinate their activities. Furthermore, individual team members are not free to publish results of work they have done on the project without the consent of other members and especially of the director. For these reasons, traditional concepts of academic freedom and tenure do not apply to the activities of contract research teams. The Special Committee has gone as far as it believes possible, under the circumstances, in asserting and defending in the statement which follows such academic freedom and job security as can be had. Its members feel that an effort to go beyond the limits imposed by the facts of the situation would make the statement weaker, not stronger.

The Special Committee is by no means indifferent to the conditions under which members of contract research project teams have to work, nor does it advocate indifference on the part of the AAUP. It believes that good administrative and personnel policies ought to operate in this area as in all other areas of academic life, and that the AAUP should try to define good policies and
encourage institutions to apply them. It also believes that, whenever academic institutions designate full-time researchers as faculty members, either by formal appointment or by conferring the titles of instructor, assistant or associate professor, or professor, those researchers should have all the rights of other faculty members, and that the AAUP should apply the 1940 Statement of Principles to them as strictly as to anyone else.

Statement of the Special Committee on Academic Personnel Ineligible for Tenure

A clear definition of acceptable academic practice in American colleges and universities requires some amplification and interpretation of the 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure. Most of the 1940 Statement applies without change to the operation of the universities today. The academic freedom statement however leaves some question about the freedom of research for the secondary staff of large research projects restricted by government or industrial support and security. The academic tenure provisions leave some doubt about the tenure rights of part-time teachers and of persons appointed with titles other than those of the four ranks of instructor to professor.

To make quite clear that the policy of the Association provides protection in matters of academic freedom to all teachers at all ranks and on any fractional appointment and to all investigators with university appointments, the following amplifying statement is proposed:

(1) The academic freedom of all teachers and investigators with full-time or part-time appointments in a university should have the full protection of the Association.

The committee recognizes that it is appropriate to have, within the university, faculty members with instructor or professional status who are exclusively investigators. These professors should be selected by the faculty and should have the full privileges of other professors. The following statement is within the 1940 Statement but more directly describes the status of the research faculty member with an academic appointment:

(2) Full-time teachers and investigators who are appointed to the rank of Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor and Professor should have the rights and privileges appropriate to their rank including tenure or the eligibility for tenure after the appropriate probationary period.

Acceptable academic practice for tenure is described in the 1940 Statement of Principles only for full-time appointments beginning with the rank of instructor. The Special Committee recommends that these provisions be extended to include all full-time teacher appointments in the university. Part-time appointments are often given to scholars who are still working on their advanced degree programs. If, however, a full-time appointment can be made as a lecturer or acting instructor, without obligating the institution to a limited probation period, it will diminish the protection of the Association's statement of policy on tenure. To provide for protection of the young teachers' tenure rights, the committee proposes:

(3) All full-time teachers, but not investigators, in the universities regardless of their titles should acquire tenure after a probationary period as provided for appointments to the rank of full-time instructor or a higher rank in the 1940 Statement.

The Association extends the full protection of academic freedom to all teachers and investigators on full-time or part-time university appointments. The policy for the tenure of investigators with full-time university appointments without one of the usual academic ranks has not been adequately determined. In the science and technology areas of the twenty largest universities, there are now twice as many full-time investigators as full-time academic appointments. Most of these investigator appointments are made from research grants of short duration that are subject to frequent and uncertain renewal. The selection and termination of appointees is made by the project director without the usual procedures of review involved in departmental academic appointments. Until the funds for the support of investigators are assured for substantial periods and until the university determines policies for the distribution and use of these funds it will be difficult for the university to assume the obligation for continuous tenure appointments. The committee makes no recommendation for a tenure policy for investigators who do not have regular academic appointments.

Special Committee on Academic Personnel Ineligible for Tenure:
Robert B. Brode (Physics, University of California, Berkeley), Chairman
Richard P. Adams (English, Tulane University)
William G. Bowen (Economics, Princeton University)
Winston W. Ehrmann (Sociology, Washington Office)
Richard B. Richter (Medicine, University of Chicago)
Tenure and Teaching-Intensive Appointments

(SEPTMBE 2010)

This report was prepared by a subcommittee of the Committee on Contingency and the Profession. The parent committee approved its publication in draft form in October 2009, and it has approved publication of this final report, which has been revised in response to comments received on the draft.

I. The Collapsing Faculty Infrastructure

The past four decades have seen a failure of the social contract in faculty employment. The tenure system was designed as a big tent, aiming to unite a faculty of tremendously diverse interests within a system of common professional values, standards, and mutual responsibilities. It aimed to secure reasonable compensation and to protect academic freedom through continuous employment. Financial and intellectual security enabled the faculty to carry out the public trust in both teaching and research, sustaining a rigorous system of professional peer scrutiny in hiring, evaluation, and promotion. Today the tenure system has all but collapsed.

Before 1970, as today, most full-time faculty appointments were teaching-intensive, featuring teaching loads of nine hours or more per week. Nearly all of those full-time teaching-intensive positions were on the tenure track. This meant that most faculty who spent most of their time teaching were also campus and professional citizens, with clear roles in shared governance and access to support for research or professional activity. Today, most faculty positions are still teaching intensive, and many of those teaching-intensive positions are still tenurable. In fact, the proportion of teaching-intensive to research-intensive appointments hence tenure, are indispensable to the success of an institution in fulfilling its obligations to its students and to society. That statement has now been endorsed by more than two hundred academic organizations.

1. With respect to faculty tenure, the Association holds to the following tenets: (1) with the exception of brief special appointments, all full-time faculty appointments should be either tenured or probationary for tenure (Statement on Procedural Standards in the Renewal or Nonrenewal of Faculty Appointments); (2) the probationary period should not exceed seven years (1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure); (3) tenure can be granted at any professional rank (1970 Interpretive Comment 5 on the 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure); (4) tenure-line positions can be part time as well as full time (Regulation 13 of the Recommended Institutional Regulations on Academic Freedom and Tenure); (5) faculty appointments, including part-time appointments in most cases, should incorporate all aspects of university life and the full range of faculty responsibilities (Contingent Appointments and the Academic Profession); and (6) termination or nonrenewal of an appointment requires affordance of requisite academic due process (Recommended Institutional Regulations).

2. The 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure characterizes the tenure system as a "means to certain ends; specifically: (1) freedom of teaching and research and of extramural activities, and (2) a sufficient degree of economic security to make the profession attractive to men and women of ability. Freedom and economic security,
has risen sharply.4 However, the majority of teaching-intensive positions have been shunted outside of the tenure system. This has in most cases meant a dramatic shift from "teaching-intensive" appointments to "teaching-only" appointments, featuring a faculty with attenuated relationships to campus and disciplinary peers. This seismic shift from "teaching-intensive" faculty within the big tent of tenure to "teaching-only" faculty outside of it has had severe consequences for students as well as faculty themselves, producing lower levels of campus engagement across the board and a rising service burden for the shrinking core of tenurable faculty.

The central question we have to face in connection with this historic change is real and unavoidable: Should more classroom teaching be done by faculty supported by the rigorous peer scrutiny of the tenure system? Most of the evidence says yes, and a host of diverse voices agree. This view brings together students, faculty, legislators, the AAUP, and even many college and university administrators. At some institutions, however, particularly at large research universities, the tenure system has already been warped to the purpose of creating a multitier faculty. In order to avoid this, as E. Gordon Gee of Ohio State University puts it, individuals must have available to them "multiple ways to salvation" inside the tenure system. Tenure was not designed as a merit badge for research-intensive faculty or as a fence to exclude those with teaching-intensive commitments.

By 2007, almost 70 percent of faculty members were employed off the tenure track.5 Many institutions use contingent faculty appointments throughout their programs; some retain a tenurable faculty in their traditional or flagship programs while staffing others—such as branch campuses, online offerings, and overseas campuses—almost entirely with faculty on contingent appointments. Faculty serving on a contingent basis generally work at significantly lower wages, often without health coverage and other benefits, and in positions that do not incorporate all aspects of university life or the full range of faculty rights and responsibilities. The tenure track has not vanished, but it has ceased to be the norm. This means that the majority of faculty work in subprofessional conditions, often without basic protections for academic freedom.

Some of these appointments, particularly in science and medicine, are research intensive or research only, and the faculty in these appointments often work under extremely troubling conditions. However, the overwhelming majority of non-tenure-track appointments are teaching only or teaching intensive. Non-tenure-track faculty and graduate students teach the majority of classes at many institutions, commonly at shockingly low rates of pay.

This compensation scheme has turned the professoriate into an irrational economic choice, denying the overwhelming majority of individuals the opportunity to consider college teaching as a career. This form of economic discrimination is deeply unfair, both to teachers and to their students; institutions that serve the economically marginalized and the largest proportion of minority students, such as community colleges, typically employ the largest numbers of non-tenurable faculty.6 As the AAUP’s 2009 Report on the Economic Status of the Profession points out, the erosion of the tenure track rests on the "fundamentally flawed premise" that faculty "represent only a cost, rather than the institution’s primary resource." Hiring faculty on the basis of the lowest labor cost and without professional working conditions “represents a disinvestment in the nation’s intellectual capital precisely at the time when innovation and insight are most needed.”

A broad and growing front of research shows that the system of permanently temporary faculty appointments has negative consequences for student learning.7 Mindful that their working conditions are their students'

4. By 1998, among full-time faculty, the ratio of teaching-intensive appointments to research-intensive ones had risen significantly from 1.5:1 to 2:1, or from about 60 percent to 67 percent of the total. This was accomplished, as Schuster and Finkelstein document, "largely by the resort to ‘teaching only’ appointments" (99). However, the percentage of all faculty who were in teaching-intensive appointments rose much more sharply, largely because of a massive increase in teaching-intensive part-time appointments (ibid.).


learning conditions, many faculty holding contingent appointments struggle to shield students from the consequences of an increasingly unprofessional workplace. Faculty on contingent appointments frequently pay for their own computers, phones, and office supplies, and dip into their own wallets for journal subscriptions and travel to conferences to stay current in their fields. Some struggle to preserve academic freedom. However heroic, these individual acts are no substitute for professional working conditions.

We are at a tipping point. Campuses that overuse contingent appointments show higher levels of disengagement and disaffection among faculty, even those with more secure positions. We see a steadily shrinking minority, faculty with tenure, as increasingly unable to protect academic freedom, professional autonomy, and the faculty role in governance for themselves—much less for the contingent majority. At many institutions, the proportion of faculty with tenure is below 10 percent, and too often tenure has become a status to be administrators.


II. It Is Time to Stabilize the Faculty
In opposition to this trend, a new consensus is emerging that it is time to stabilize the crumbling faculty infrastructure. Concerned legislators and some academic administrators have joined faculty associations in calling for dramatic reductions in the reliance on contingent appointments, commonly urging a maximum of 25 percent. Across the country, various forms of stabilization have been attempted by administrators and legislators, proposed by faculty associations, or negotiated at the bargaining table.

Many stabilization efforts focus on winning employment security for full-time faculty serving on contingent appointments, a fast-growing class of appointment. In some cases, such positions effectively replace tenure lines; in others, they represent a more welcome consolidation of part-time contingent appointments. Increasingly, however, teachers and researchers in both full- and part-time contingent positions are seeking and receiving provisions for greater stability of employment: longer appointment terms, the expectation or right of continuing employment, provisions for orderly layoff, and other rights of seniority. These rights have been codified in a variety of contract language, ranging from “instructor tenure” to “continuing” or “senior lectureship” to certificates of continuing employment. Some of these plans and provisions for stabilization are surveyed in appendix B.

As faculty hired into contingent positions seek and obtain greater employment security, often through collective bargaining, it is becoming clear that academic tenure and employment security are not reducible to each other. A potentially crippling development in these arrangements is that many—while improving on the entirely insecure positions they replace—offer limited conceptions of academic citizenship and service, few protections for academic freedom, and little opportunity for professional growth. These arrangements commonly involve minimal professional peer scrutiny in hiring, evaluation, and promotion.

III. Conversion to Tenure Is the Best Way to Stabilize the Faculty
The Committee on Contingency and the Profession believes that the best way to stabilize the faculty

Several noteworthy forms of conversion to tenure have been implemented or proposed at different kinds of institutions. The most successful forms are those that retain experienced, qualified, and effective faculty, as opposed to those that convert positions while leaving behind the faculty currently in them. As the AAUP emphasized in its 2003 policy document Contingent Appointments and the Academic Profession, stabilization of positions can and should be accomplished without negative consequences for current faculty and their students. Some of the different ways that conversion to tenure has been implemented or proposed are surveyed in appendix A.

The best practice for institutions of all types is to convert the status of contingent appointments to appointments eligible for tenure with only minor changes in job description. This means that faculty hired contingently with teaching as the major component of their workload will become tenured or tenure-eligible primarily on the basis of successful teaching. Similarly, faculty serving on contingent appointments with research as the major component of their workload may become tenured or eligible for tenure primarily on the basis of successful research.) In the long run, however, a balance is desirable. Professional development and research activities support strong teaching, and a robust system of shared governance depends upon the participation of all faculty, so even teaching-intensive tenure-eligible positions should include service and appropriate forms of engagement in research or the scholarship of teaching.

In some instances faculty serving on a contingent basis will prefer a major change in their job description with conversion to tenure eligibility. For example, some faculty in teaching-intensive positions might prefer to have research as a larger component of their appointments. While the employer should not impose this major change in job description on the faculty member seeking tenure eligibility, the AAUP encourages the employer to accommodate the faculty member. However, faculty themselves should not perpetuate the false impression that tenure was invented as a merit badge for research-intensive appointments.

Finally, stabilizing the faculty infrastructure means substantially transforming the circumstances of teachers and researchers serving part time (about half of the faculty nationwide). Many faculty members serving part time might prefer full-time employment. Stabilizing this group means consolidating part-time work into tenure-eligible, full-time, and usually teaching-intensive positions—through attrition, not layoffs.

For faculty who wish to remain in the profession on a part-time basis over the long term, we recommend as best practice fractional positions, including fully proportional pay, that are eligible for tenure and benefits, with proportional expectations for service and professional development.11 The proliferation of contingent appointments will continue if institutions convert select appointments to the tenure track while continuing to hire off the tenure track elsewhere. We urge that conversion plans include discontinuance of any new off-track hiring, except where such hires are genuinely for special appointments of brief duration.

Tenure was conceived as a right rather than a privilege. As the 1940 Statement of Principles observed, the intellectual and economic securities of the tenure system must be the bedrock of any effort by higher education to fulfill its obligations to students and society.

10. For part-time contingent faculty, the AAUP's 2006 addition to its Recommended Institutional Regulations on Academic Freedom and Tenure (Regulation 13) urges that "[p]rior to consideration of reappointment beyond a seventh year, part-time faculty members who have taught at least twelve courses or six terms within those seven years . . . be provided a comprehensive review with a view toward (1) appointment with part-time tenure where such exists, (2) appointment with part-time continuing service, or (3) non-reappointment. Those appointed with tenure shall be afforded the same procedural safeguards as full-time tenured faculty." The 2003 statement Contingent Appointments and the Academic Profession recommends, "The experience and accomplishments of faculty members who have served in contingent positions at the institution should be credited in determining the appropriate length and character of a probationary period for tenure in the converted position.

11. At least since the publication of its 1980 statement The Status of Part-Time Faculty, the AAUP has recommended that colleges consider creating a class of "regular part-time faculty members, consisting of individuals who, as their professional career, share the teaching, research, and administrative duties customary for faculty at their institution . . . [and] the opportunity to achieve tenure and the rights it confers."
Appendix A: Conversion Practices and Proposals

Some institutions have already taken steps to convert contingent faculty positions to the tenure track. Others, faculty senates or AAUP chapters have proposed mechanisms for doing so. Many of these practices and policies are less than ideal in one respect or another—for example, they may convert the status of one group of faculty members while disregarding another group, or they may convert an existing pool of faculty to the tenure line at once, while putting in place no system for further regularization of faculty appointments or checks on further hiring of non-tenure-track professors. In addition, some of the institutions cited below have since undermined the effect of the conversion to tenure-line appointments. Nevertheless, since these case histories may be useful as examples for faculty and administrations considering conversion, we include them here. In each case, we summarize the salient features of the conversion arrangements and indicate where more information can be obtained. Note that terminology and employment classifications vary from place to place; we have not attempted to standardize them.

Practices

The following institutions have put into place plans to convert contingent appointments to the tenure track.

PENNNSYLVANIA STATE SYSTEM OF HIGHER EDUCATION

The collective bargaining contract between the Pennsylvania State System of Higher Education and the Association of Pennsylvania State College and University Faculties (APSCUF) features separate contract provisions that permit the conversion of both individuals and positions to the tenure track. Some campuses and departments have made more use of this opportunity than others. At Indiana University of Pennsylvania, for instance, since 2000 there have been twenty conversions of persons and twenty-seven conversions of lines. But during the same period, the East Stroudsburg campus reports none. Some campuses have focused more on converting positions than persons, and there is some tension between these two opportunities. Where departments do not take advantage of the opportunity to convert persons, faculty serving contingently sometimes have been laid off just to stop the contract's conversion clock. Most non-tenure-track faculty in the Pennsylvania state system are full-time employees, and under the terms of the collective agreement they are paid according to the same scale as tenure-track faculty and receive full benefits.

Features of the conversion provisions include the following:

- Tenure-track positions can be created after a department surveys its use of non-tenure-track faculty over the past three years and determines that non-tenure-track faculty have been assigned to courses and responsibilities within a disciplinary specialization that should be grouped together to constitute a full-time, tenure-track position. The courses and responsibilities in question may have been taught by a variety of non-tenure-track faculty members.
- When the department recommends creating a full-time, tenure-track position as described above, existing non-tenure-track faculty do not necessarily receive preference for the position.
- The department's recommendation is approved or denied by the institution's president; if denied, the responsibilities in question may not be carried out by non-tenure-track faculty for two years.
- Under a separate provision, individual non-tenure-track instructors can be converted to the tenure track if they have served for five full, consecutive academic years in the same department and are recommended for conversion by the majority of the tenure-track faculty in the department.

St. John's University

In 2008, administrators at St. John's University in New York City converted twenty full-time contingent positions in its Institute for Core Studies—which comprises the university's Writing Institute and two other small programs—into tenure-track appointments. Twenty writing teachers and eleven other faculty members were converted; the writing teachers were moved from the English department to the Institute for Core Studies for purposes of the conversion. Faculty at St. John's, a private institution, are represented in collective bargaining jointly by an AAUP chapter and a free-standing faculty association.

Features of the conversion included the following:

- Tenure criteria are those that had already been in use in one unit of the university, a two-year program called the College of Professional Studies. The criteria require that faculty, in addition to documenting successful teaching, document accomplishments in two of these three areas: publishing, conference presentations, and service.
- The converted teachers were all in their first or second years of service when the conversion occurred. They are scheduled to be evaluated for tenure seven years after the conversion (not after date of hire),
but they can, like other faculty, apply for early tenure review if they desire.

- Once tenured, the converted faculty have only "programmatic tenure"—if their program is discontinued, the administration is not obligated to attempt to relocate them to a place elsewhere in the university. The faculty are eligible to participate in university-wide shared governance bodies.

**Santa Clara University**

In 1989, observing the growth of contingent faculty positions in the College of Arts and Sciences, concerned faculty and administrators created a one-time opportunity for at least fourteen full-time, non-tenure-track faculty, most engaged in teaching-intensive positions, to enter the tenure stream.

In the aftermath of this one-time event, some units at Santa Clara adopted a policy of forcing lecturers to reapply for their jobs at the end of one or three years, sometimes against a national pool. In a drawn-out, as-yet-incomplete contemporary stabilization plan (2005–10), the institution has created a new "renewable" lecturer rank off the tenure track, forcing many faculty to accept lower salaries and reduced benefits in order to avoid continual reapplication for their positions.

Features of the earlier conversion included the following:

- The affected faculty were given the choice of converting to assistant professorships (on the tenure track) or being promoted to a "senior lecturer" position (off the tenure track).
- Tenure was associated exclusively with research-intensive positions, and in most cases, accepting the invitation to the tenure stream meant a major change of job description. While most of the affected faculty had been hired into teaching-intensive positions, service and especially research would henceforth play a role in their evaluations.
- For those best suited for teaching-intensive appointments, the only option was a "senior" lectureship; individuals accepting these positions believed themselves to enjoy some enhanced employment security, although handbook language defined them as at-will employees (that is, ones who could be dismissed with a year's notice).
- Some of those who entered the tenure stream subsequently lost their tenure bids and either left the institution or became senior lecturers.
- Most of those who were granted tenure remained at the institution, including, according to one source, "at least five full professors, one vice provost, one endowed chair, and one Faculty Senate president—all recognized scholars in their fields and leaders at the university."

**Western Michigan University**

In 2002, the AAUP chapter at Western Michigan University negotiated a contract that provided tenure for "faculty specialists"—a formerly non-tenure-track group that includes lecturers, clinical instructors, and certain academic professionals. A subsequent contract added aviation specialists to the tenure stream.

Features of the conversion included the following:

- The "faculty specialist" category was converted to the tenure line, as opposed to just the individuals employed at the time of conversion. Thus, in contrast to the situation at Santa Clara University, new appointments made after the conversion at Western Michigan are tenure-line appointments.
- Though now tenurable, faculty specialists remain differentiated from "traditionally ranked" faculty. Instead of being called "assistant professors," "associate professors," and so on, they can progress through the ranks of faculty specialist I, faculty specialist II, and master faculty specialist.
- Tenure reviews for faculty specialists are based on evaluation of their performance in two areas: "professional competence" and "professional service." Particular emphasis is placed on competence in performing assignments specified in the letter of appointment, and the letter is included in the tenure file. (In contrast, traditionally ranked faculty are also evaluated in a third category, "professional recognition," which includes research activities.)
- Departments may limit the participation of faculty specialists in tenure and promotion reviews of traditionally ranked faculty.
- The contract allows faculty specialists to be laid off more easily than traditionally ranked faculty if their positions are deemed to be no longer needed. The 2008–11 collective bargaining agreement is online at www.wmuuaup.net/files/2008-11_Contract.pdf.

**Proposals**

Though the proposals discussed below have not been enacted, they show ways that contingent faculty positions can be converted to tenure-track ones.

**University of Colorado at Boulder**

Members of the AAUP chapter at the University of Colorado at Boulder created a proposal to convert full-time contingent faculty positions to the tenure track.
after a local reporter asked them to comment on the AAUP Contingent Faculty Index 2006, which documented the numbers of faculty serving on contingent appointments at institutions across the country. The chapter has worked for several years to gather information about faculty serving on contingent appointments on campus, disseminate information about instructor tenure, and advance its conversion proposal. As of April 2010, the university’s faculty senate had passed a resolution to request that the administration initiate discussions to create a system of instructor tenure. The motion passed 33-14; a similar, but weaker motion had failed in 2009. Also recommended by the faculty government was a series of job security protections for faculty serving on contingent appointments and avenues to create traditional tenure lines for qualified contingent faculty. Features of the instructor-tenure proposal include the following:

• Full-time instructor positions would be converted to tenure-track positions with no change in pay, rank, course load, or professional expectations.
• Instructors who have completed a probationary period not to exceed seven years would be offered permanent employment, or instructor tenure, after a satisfactory final review.
• No changes would be required in the existing tenure track for research professors.

More information is available under the tab “Instructor Tenure Project” at www.aaupcu.org.

Rutgers University

Members of the Rutgers University senate (a body composed of administrators, staff, students, and faculty), with assistance from the AAUP-affiliated faculty union, submitted a two-part proposal to the full senate. Part one called for conversion of some non-tenure-track part-time positions to non-tenure-track full-time positions; part two called for conversion of contingent full-time appointments to a new “teaching tenure track.” The university senate endorsed part one and recommended to departments that they combine part-time positions into full-time positions when practicable. But the senate rejected part two, citing, among other concerns, potential complications involved with hiring and promotions in a two-tier tenure system, the possibility that the addition of a teaching tenure track would compromise Rutgers’s position as a member of the Association of American Universities, and concern that new teaching tenure-track lines might be siphoned from the existing pool of research-teaching tenure lines. Senators backing the proposal plan to introduce a revised version strengthening part one and stressing the importance of passing part two by demonstrating that it protects, rather than detracts from, the academic professions.

Features of the proposal included the following:

• Responsibility for determining teaching tenure-track faculty workloads would be assigned to the department or unit, in accordance with the collective bargaining agreement.
• The promotion and tenure process would parallel the existing research-teaching tenure process but with discipline-based criteria specific to the appointments.
• Quality of teaching and dedication to undergraduate education would be recommended criteria for promotion.
• Integration of service and scholarship of teaching into teaching tenure-track faculty assignments would be encouraged.

Appendix B: Forms of Stabilization Other Than Conversion

Many institutions have adopted (or faculty unions have bargained for) provisions that fall well short of tenure but that offer faculty serving on contingent appointments some protection and the institution some stability. Often, these take the form of improved job security, protections for academic freedom, or provisions for inclusion of faculty serving on contingent appointments in academic citizenship and governance. The practices of the institutions below, used as examples, are described in terms of these three areas. The area of job security is further broken down into these common mechanisms: layoff rights, automatic reappointment rights that move faculty from semester to annual appointments and from annual to renewable multiyear appointments, and mechanisms that protect either the “time-based” (the percentage of full-time workload to which a contingent faculty member is entitled) or seniority-based preference.

Note that terminology and employment classifications vary from place to place; here, as in appendix A, we have not attempted to standardize them. In many cases, we summarize complex provisions that may have additional or negative aspects not addressed here. We therefore urge interested readers to read the complete collective bargaining contracts.

California State University

Under the California State University System, the largest not-for-profit system in the nation, tenure-line faculty and part- and full-time non-tenure-track “lecturers” are represented in collective bargaining by the AAUP-affiliated California Faculty Association, and both are in the same
bargaining unit. The union has won enhanced job security provisions for lecturers as described below. The collective bargaining agreement between the California Faculty Association and the trustees of California State University is available at www.calfac.org/contract.html.

Separately, Assembly Concurrent Resolution 73, passed in 2001, is a state legislative mandate to increase the ratio of tenure-line to lecturer faculty in the CSU system to 3:1. It urges administrators and the union to collaborate in developing a plan to ensure that no currently employed lecturers lose their jobs because of the change and that qualified lecturers are seriously considered for tenure-track positions. Although ACR 73 could open a path to conversion, it is an unfunded mandate.

The collective bargaining agreement includes provisions relating to job security in the following areas.

Automatic mechanisms for reemployment rights:
• Following two consecutive semesters or three quarters in an academic year, lecturers with satisfactory performance are offered one-year appointments.
• After six consecutive years of service in a same department or program on the same campus, lecturers with satisfactory performance are offered renewable three-year appointments.

Time-based and seniority-based rights:
• Lecturers receive a work preference based on seniority that allows accrual up to a full-time load. (However, volunteers, administrators, and graduate teaching assistants receive preference of assignment over part-time lecturers.)

Layoff and recall rights:
• For full-time lecturer appointments, layoff procedures must be followed when reducing lecturers’ hours or prematurely ending their employment.
• Alternatives to layoff of full-time lecturers must be explored.
• Lecturers on three-year appointments have recall rights for a period of up to three years.

Although the collective bargaining agreement does not include an article on academic freedom, the statewide academic senate has adopted policies that are based on AAUP standards and apply to all faculty. Although not grievable through the contractual procedure, violations of academic freedom may be brought before a faculty hearing committee.

The collective bargaining agreement does not include provisions relating to academic citizenship and shared governance. The degree of inclusion of lecturers in shared governance varies among the twenty-three campuses, which establish their own policies. Some campus senates have dedicated lecturer seats while others allow

lecturers to run for regular seats. The CSU statewide academic senate has urged local campus senates to integrate lecturers into shared governance. It presently has two statewide lecturer senators. While the collective bargaining agreement defines all unit members as “faculty,” some campus senate constitutions restrict the definition to tenure-track faculty and full-time lecturers. Generally speaking, lecturers cannot serve on campus and department committees, unlike in the union, where they are represented at all levels of governance.

**City University of New York**

Under the City University of New York System, tenure-line faculty, full-time non-tenure-track “lecturers,” and part-time “adjunct faculty” are represented in collective bargaining by the American Federation of Teachers- and AAUP-affiliated Professional Staff Congress. Faculty serving on contingent appointments have improved their job security through the collective bargaining agreement between CUNY and the Professional Staff Congress, which is available at http://portal.cuny.edu/cms/id/cuny/documents/informationpage/2002-2007_PSC_CUNY_Contract.pdf.

The agreement includes provisions relating to job security in the following areas.

Automatic mechanisms for reemployment rights:
• After five years of continuous full-time service, lecturers become eligible for “certificates of continuous employment,” which guarantee full-time reappointment subject to satisfactory performance, sufficiency of enrollment, and the program’s academic and financial stability.
• Under the collective bargaining agreement, university bylaws, and other applicable rules and regulations, lecturers who fill these non-tenure-track lines are treated no differently than faculty hired on tenure-track lines.
• Lecturers offered yearly appointments have priority for assignment over adjuncts with semester appointments for a course they are capable of teaching.
• Adjuncts who are appointed for a seventh semester are given a yearly appointment.
• Appointees who have commenced work prior to official board approval have the option of receiving pro-rata compensation for time worked.

Time-based and seniority-based rights:
• Part-time lecturers wishing to apply for full-time lecturer status must have taught for eight of the ten most recent semesters in the same or a related department, with a minimum of six classroom contact hours in seven of the ten semesters.
When faculty service has been continuous and a break occurs in full-time service by virtue of reduced schedule, such less-than-full-time service is prorated toward its equivalency in full-time service and accrued toward the faculty member's base time. Layoff and recall rights:

- There is no contractual provision for compensation for cancellation of classes provided that adjuncts are informed "as soon as it is known to college authorities" and before classes commence.
- Lecturers without certificates of continuous employment and adjunct faculty may be laid off or have their time base reduced if courses are assigned to tenure-stream faculty or graduate students teaching in the department of their major.

Academic freedom is addressed in the preamble to the contract. The agreement includes no explicit provisions on academic freedom for faculty members.

The collective bargaining agreement includes the following provisions relating to academic citizenship and shared governance:

- The university faculty senate allows each college a seat to be shared by a lecturer delegate and a (tenure-line) college lab technician. Adjuncts do not have a separate seat.
- Inclusion of lecturers in shared governance varies among the colleges of CUNY.
- Generally speaking, although adjuncts are invited to attend departmental meetings, they may not vote.

New School

At the New School, part-time faculty are represented in collective bargaining by Academics Come Together—United Auto Workers. Such faculty are classified as "probationary" from the first semester or session of teaching through the fourth; as "postprobationary" from the fifth through the tenth; and as "annual" or "multiyear" faculty thereafter. The collective bargaining agreement is available at www.actuaw.org/sitebuildercontent/sitebuilderfiles/New_School_contract.pdf.

The collective bargaining agreement includes provisions relating to job security in the following areas. Automatic mechanisms for reemployment rights:

- Beginning with the eleventh semester or session, faculty are eligible for either annual or three-year appointments (called "multiyear"); to get a three-year appointment, they must successfully complete a special review.

Time-based and seniority-based rights:

- With a few exclusions, such as summer courses and private lessons, course base load is set and preserved based on the highest of the last two years of the postprobationary period for annual appointments or the last three years prior to the multiyear period. Both credit and noncredit courses count toward base load. The agreement identifies provisions for maintaining faculty base loads by seniority; senior faculty can displace less senior faculty to maintain base load.

Layoff and recall rights:

- After the first two semesters or sessions of a newly developed course offering, postprobationary faculty whose courses are canceled are entitled to assignment of a replacement course or a cancellation fee equaling 15 percent of the pay they would have received for the course. In the same circumstances, annual faculty receive 30 percent of the pay and length-of-service credit for the semester or session, and multiyear faculty receive 50 percent of the pay.
- If a program is discontinued, annual faculty receive a fee of 50 percent of salary from the prior year and recall rights for two years. Multiyear faculty receive 75 percent of salary from the last year of the previous multiyear appointment and recall rights for two years, or, at the faculty member's discretion, a one-time terminable appointment as an annual faculty member.

The agreement includes the following provisions relating to academic freedom:

University policies on academic freedom shall be in effect for all faculty, full and part time.

Although the agreement includes no specific grievance provision for infringement of academic freedom, it does refer individuals whose acts abridge that freedom to the appropriate academic division for disciplinary review.

The agreement includes the following provisions relating to citizenship and shared governance:

- Each academic division is entitled to two representatives to the faculty senate. An additional eleven members are allocated based on the numbers of full-time equivalent faculty in each division. Part-time faculty may run for and be elected to these positions.

Governance opportunities for part-time faculty vary by department, ranging from inclusion through elected positions to no inclusion at all.

Oakland University

At Oakland University, all full-time faculty and part-time faculty who teach sixteen or more credits a year are represented in collective bargaining by an AAUP chapter. The unit includes the following categories of
faculty, listed in descending order of job security: full-
time tenure-track faculty, full-time "special instructors," and part-time "special lecturers." The full-time special instructors receive the same benefits as tenure-track fac-
culty, including sabbatical eligibility. The contract is available online at www.oaklandaaup.org/2006-09_
Contract.pdf.

The agreement includes provisions relating to job
security in the following areas.

Automatic mechanisms for reemployment rights:
• Special instructors are first employed for a period of
three years and may be reappointed twice for two-
year periods before undergoing an up-or-out review
that results in either appointment with job security
or termination.
• For the first four years of employment, special lec-
turers work on one-year contracts; after that, they
have two-year renewable contracts.

Time-based and seniority-based rights:
• Once special instructors are granted job security,
laying them off becomes more difficult. Special in-
structors with job security may apply to be promoted
to the rank of associate professor with tenure.
• Special lecturers earn more as their seniority grows.
They are eligible to buy into medical and vision
plans, and the portion of premiums paid by the uni-
versity grows as lecturers' seniority increases.

Layoff and recall rights:
• Special instructors without job security are laid off
after all part-time faculty but before most tenure-
line assistant professors and before all tenured fac-
culty. Special instructors with job security are laid off
after most assistant professors but before all tenured
faculty.
• Special instructors have recall rights.
• Special lecturers do not have layoff or recall rights.

Regarding academic freedom, the collective bar-
gaining agreement stipulates that neither party may
abrogate "the rights, privileges, and responsibilities of
individual faculty members in the conduct of their
teaching and research, including, but not limited to,
the principles of academic freedom and academic
responsibility."

The agreement includes the following provisions re-
lating to academic citizenship and shared governance:
• Special instructors "are entitled to all perquisites of
faculty membership and employment."
• Professional responsibilities include teaching,
research, and creative activity and service; "active
participation in all three aspects of the workload is
the standard."

RIDER UNIVERSITY
At Rider University, tenure-line faculty and part-time
"adjuncts" of all ranks (lecturer, instructor, assistant
professor, associate professor, or professor) are represen-	ed in collective bargaining in the same bargaining unit
by the Rider University chapter of the AAUP. The collective
bargaining agreement between Rider University and the
AAUP chapter is available at www.rider.edu/files/

The agreement includes provisions relating to job
security in the following areas.

Automatic mechanisms for reemployment rights:
• Adjuncts with a minimum of three years of "priority
appointment" may be granted annual contracts
contingent on sufficient enrollment for the assigned
courses.
• Adjuncts with priority appointment or "preferred"
status may teach up to nine classroom contact
hours in a single semester. (See the section below
for how priority-appointment and preferred status
are gained.)
• For appointment to courses, full-time faculty take
precedence over both priority and nonpriority
adjunct faculty (including for overload requests that
occur before a due date), and adjuncts with priority
status take precedence over those without it.

Time-based and seniority-based rights:
• After completing four semesters, adjuncts may apply
for promotion from adjunct instructor to adjunct
assistant professor; after six semesters, from adjunct
assistant professor to adjunct associate professor;
and after six semesters, from adjunct associate pro-
fessor to adjunct professor.
• After teaching approximately half time for three
years (specifics vary by campus and unit) and suc-
cessfully completing a review by full-time members
of their department or program, adjuncts are eligi-
ble for priority-appointment status.
• After teaching approximately half time for six years
(specifics vary by campus and unit), adjuncts are
eligible for preferred status.

Layoff and recall rights:
• Without proper cause, the university may not dis-
charge or suspend an adjunct whose term appoint-
ment has not expired.
• Adjuncts can take a twenty-four-month break in
service, whether voluntary or because of a lack of
work, and not lose preferred status.

The agreement includes the following provisions
relating to academic freedom:
• The clause on academic freedom includes all adjuncts.
Adjuncts, like other faculty, have recourse to the grievance process if they allege that their academic freedom rights are violated.

Relating to citizenship and shared governance, adjuncts are eligible to participate in academic governance committees. They are not eligible to become department chairs.

While enhanced job security is provided under the collective bargaining agreement through continuing annual appointments, the agreement does not entitle adjunct faculty to full-time tenure-track appointments when they become available, nor does it offer opportunity for conversion to tenure eligibility. Adjuncts must undergo the same appointment procedure as all other applicants. Additionally, the possession of faculty rank gained under the Rider University promotion procedure as an adjunct faculty member does not entitle the successful adjunct faculty candidate to the corresponding rank if he or she does secure a tenure-line position.

**University of California**

In the University of California System, tenure-line faculty, also called “senate faculty,” are not unionized, with the exception of those at the Santa Cruz campus; lecturers and instructional faculty, or “non-senate faculty,” are unionized and are represented in collective bargaining by the American Federation of Teachers. The collective bargaining agreement between the University of California—American Federation of Teachers and the regents of the University of California is available at [http://atyourservice.ucop.edu/employees/policies_employee_labor_relations/collective_bargaining_units/nonsenateinstructional_nsi/agreement.html](http://atyourservice.ucop.edu/employees/policies_employee_labor_relations/collective_bargaining_units/nonsenateinstructional_nsi/agreement.html).

The agreement includes provisions relating to job security in the following areas.

**Automatic mechanisms for reemployment rights:**
- Initial appointments may be for a period of up to two years. Reappointment during the first six years may be for a period of up to three years.
- Non-senate faculty become eligible for continuing appointments following the completion of six years in the same department, program, or unit on the same campus and a satisfactory peer evaluation. With certain exceptions, the appointment percentage will be at least equal to that of the previous year.
- Reemployment rights are provided for appointments prior to six years of service (for the same period of the appointment duration up to a year) and for continuing appointments (for up to two years).
- The agreement mandates for non-senate faculty campus-based professional development fund pools and councils for professional development whose responsibility is to develop guidelines and procedures for awarding the funds.

**Time-based and seniority-based rights:**
- Appointments may be permanently augmented up to a full-time workload.
- There are “permanently augmented” and “temporarily augmented” continuing appointments. Temporary augmentation does not enhance time base.
- Tenure-track faculty and graduate students take precedence over non-senate faculty in course assignments if several criteria are met, including pedagogical relevance. For non-senate faculty there is a seniority aspect that lowers the chance of reduction of a continuing appointment.

**Layoff and recall rights:**
- In terminating employment or reducing time base, the university must observe layoff with reemployment rights for all faculty, regardless of appointment type.
- Alternatives to layoff are available to continuing non-senate faculty.
- The contract specifies procedures for dismissal based on unsatisfactory academic performance documented in the personnel review file and opportunity for a remediation plan. It also establishes procedures for disciplinary action and dismissal for misconduct.

The agreement includes the following provisions relating to academic freedom:
- The academic freedom policy in effect at the time and place of employment extends to non-senate faculty.
- Alleged violations of academic freedom may be reviewed in accordance with procedures established by the campus academic senate.
- The grievance process is the union’s major way of maintaining academic freedom and job security for non-senate faculty.

The agreement includes the following provisions relating to citizenship and shared governance:
- Non-senate faculty are eligible to participate in reviews of other non-senate faculty in instances of possible disciplinary action and dismissal. Non-senate faculty may solicit peer input.
- Although non-senate faculty do not have senate representation, the agreement includes a compensation waiver authorizing them to participate in any and all academic senate committees.

In spite of the enhanced job security provided by the collective bargaining agreement, the position of non-senate faculty remains precarious, with no conversion to tenure eligibility. Lecturers may be laid off...
While the term tenure is not used at Canada's Vancouver Community College and other British Columbia public colleges, "regular" faculty positions are expected to last until retirement. All faculty at Vancouver Community College—"regular," "term," and "auxiliary"—are represented in collective bargaining by the Vancouver Community College Faculty Association; the faculty association in turn is a member of the Federation of Post-secondary Educators of B.C., which negotiates for its members on the system level. Notable provisions of job security have been established through both systemwide and local contracts. The collective bargaining agreements are available at www.fpse.ca/agreements/collective. The summary below pertains to Vancouver Community College; specifics of agreements at other federation institutions vary.

The agreement includes provisions relating to job security in the following areas.

Automatic mechanisms for reemployment rights:
- Faculty may be hired directly into regular status as "probationary regular" for a one-year period, after which they become "permanent regular," provided they have not had an unsatisfactory evaluation.
- Regular faculty hold appointments at half time or above, which are expected to be continuous from year to year until retirement.
- Term faculty appointments stipulate starting and ending dates and carry no expectation of automatic renewal. Term faculty are granted regular status without probation if they have held appointments at half time or above for at least 380 days within a continuous twenty-four-month period and have not received an unsatisfactory evaluation during their term appointments.
- After six months of service, term faculty have the right of first refusal to reappointment by seniority over other terms or new hires.

Time-based and seniority-based rights:
- Regular faculty working part time have the right by seniority to accrue further time up to full-time status. Seniority is accrued at the same rate by full- and part-time regulars, so a part-time regular faculty member may have more seniority than a full-time colleague.
- Laid-off instructors who are on recall accrue seniority on the same basis as other regular instructors. Before any term appointment is made in a department or area, all regular employees who are eligible for recall shall be recalled.
- Regular and term faculty share both teaching and nonteaching mandated duties regardless of full- or part-time status.
- Term and regular faculty who maintain set workload levels during a fiscal year receive professional-development time and funding.

Co-chairs, Committee on Contingency and the Profession

MAYRA BESOSA (Spanish), California State University, San Marcos

MARC BOUSQUET (English), Santa Clara University

LACY BARNES (Psychology), Reedley College

CARY NELSON (English), University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

MARCCIA NEWFIELD (English), Borough of Manhattan Community College, City University of New York
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The Subcommittee
Proposed Faculty Manual Change
Part III, Section E, #6 (Lecturer)

Current Wording:

6. **Lecturer.** This rank is assigned in cases where the assignment of regular faculty ranks is not appropriate or possible. Individuals having initial lecturer appointments beginning after 15 May 2011 shall have no administrative duties inconsistent with those of regular faculty. These academic appointments are non-tenure track, shall be for one-year terms and may be renewed. For the purposes of academic appointment and reappointment, a one-year term begins August 15 and ends May 16 although lecturers may be extended benefits over the summer. Notice of renewal or non-renewal must be provided before July 15 for the following August 15-May 16 term. After May 16 following completion of four or more one-year terms of continuous appointment as a lecturer, one year’s notice of non-renewal must be provided. No notice of non-renewal shall be required if a Lecturer resigns, is terminated, or is dismissed for cause (Part IV, section K).

Proposed Wording:

6. **Lecturer.** This rank is assigned in cases where the assignment of regular faculty ranks is not appropriate or possible. Individuals having initial lecturer appointments beginning after 15 May 2011 shall have no administrative duties inconsistent with those of regular faculty. These academic appointments shall be for one-year terms and may be renewed for a maximum of 9 full academic years. For the purposes of academic appointment and reappointment, a one-year term begins August 15 and ends May 16 although lecturers may be extended benefits over the summer. Notice of renewal or non-renewal must be provided before July 15 for the following August 15-May 16 term. After May 16 following completion of four or more one-year terms of continuous appointment as a lecturer, one year’s notice of non-renewal must be provided. No notice of non-renewal shall be required if a Lecturer resigns, is terminated, or is dismissed for cause (Part IV, section K).

Lecturers shall be evaluated annually by their department chair/school director and by their unit tenure-promotion-(re)appointment committee. Following a Lecturer’s fourth year of service, the department chair/school director and the unit tenure-promotion-(reappointment) committee shall conduct a comprehensive review of the Lecturer either in response to a request for promotion to Senior Lecturer or to advise the Lecturer of his/her progress towards promotion to Senior Lecturer. If (a) a Lecturer fails to request promotion to Senior Lecturer by the customary Fall semester deadline for regular faculty during the Lecturer’s eight year of service, or b) is not promoted to during their eight year of service, then the Lecturer shall not be reappointed following a final ninth year of service.
Proposed Faculty Manual Change
Part III, Section E, new #9 (Master Lecturer)

Proposed Wording:

9. Master Lecturer. After a minimum of four full academic years of service, a Senior Lecturer may apply for promotion to Master Lecturer; equivalent experience at Clemson may be counted towards the 4 year service requirement. A department chair/school director and the department/school tenure-promotion-(re)appointment committee make independent promotion recommendations to the college dean, who reviews the recommendations and supporting materials and makes a recommendation to the Provost. The Provost reviews the recommendations and supporting materials and forwards a recommendation for final action to the President. Promotion to Master Lecturer comes with programmatic tenure. Master Lecturers shall be evaluated like regular faculty on an annual basis by their department chair/school director, and undergo post-tenure review like regular faculty. Master Lecturers cannot have administrative duties beyond those of regular faculty.

The Master Lecturer appointment is intended to recognize the efforts, contributions, and performance of Senior Lecturers who are not merely dedicated effective classroom teachers having also made a significant contribution to the instructional mission of the University, but who are educators in the broadest context of the mission of the University. Accordingly, length of service as Senior Lecturer is, itself, not a sufficient criterion for promotion to Master Lecturer. Instead, the process and criteria for promotion from Senior Lecturer to Master Lecturer are determined by departments/schools and must be described in their bylaws and be consistent with the guidelines described here and the guidelines for programmatic tenure described in Part IV, Section H.

These criteria must, at a minimum, include: (a) 4 years of at least satisfactory performance as Senior Lecturer (or in a Clemson position providing equivalent experience) as judged by the department chair and/or department tenure-promotion-(re)appointment committee; and (b) leadership roles in multiple identifiable and sustained significant contributions to the instructional mission of the Department/School/University that extend beyond ordinary instructional expectations of Senior Lecturers in fulfillment of their responsibilities. Furthermore, such contributions must be worthy of (or have achieved) regional, national, or international distinction and shall be exclusive of classroom instruction per se. Such contributions might include, but are not limited to: assisting in the development or evaluation of curricula; creation or implementation of beneficial pedagogical innovations or instructional materials; pedagogical scholarship; significant consulting activities related to instructional duties; mentoring colleagues in the instruction profession; advising or mentoring students in extracurricular activities, scholarly activities, theses, dissertations, independent study, capstone projects, etc; supervision of students engaged in instructional activities; contributions in
recruiting/retaining students; significant professional development activities; service to the academy or relevant professional organizations; student advising or career counseling.

Senior Lecturers must document and provide evidence of such contributions to the department chair/school director and department/school tenure-promotion-(re)appointment committee for evaluation and consideration. Department chairs and tenure-promotion-(re)appointment committees recommending promotion must ensure that the minimum criteria above have been fulfilled. College deans shall make decisions concerning promotion to Master Lecturer on the basis of fulfillment of these criteria.
Proposed Faculty Manual Change
Part III, Section E, #6 (Lecturer)

Current Wording:

6. Lecturer. This rank is assigned in cases where the assignment of regular faculty ranks is not appropriate or possible. Individuals having initial lecturer appointments beginning after 15 May 2011 shall have no administrative duties inconsistent with those of regular faculty. These academic appointments are non-tenure track, shall be for one-year terms and may be renewed. For the purposes of academic appointment and reappointment, a one-year term begins August 15 and ends May 16 although lecturers may be extended benefits over the summer. Notice of renewal or non-renewal must be provided before July 15 for the following August 15-May 16 term. After May 16 following completion of four or more one-year terms of continuous appointment as a lecturer, one year’s notice of non-renewal must be provided. No notice of non-renewal shall be required if a Lecturer resigns, is terminated, or is dismissed for cause (Part IV, section K).

Proposed Wording:

6. Lecturer. This rank is assigned in cases where the assignment of regular faculty ranks is not appropriate or possible. Individuals having initial lecturer appointments beginning after 15 May 2011 shall have no administrative duties inconsistent with those of regular faculty. These academic appointments shall be for one-year terms and may be renewed for a maximum of 9 full academic years. For the purposes of academic appointment and reappointment, a one-year term begins August 15 and ends May 16 although lecturers may be extended benefits over the summer. Notice of renewal or non-renewal must be provided before July 15 for the following August 15-May 16 term. After May 16 following completion of four or more one-year terms of continuous appointment as a lecturer, one year’s notice of non-renewal must be provided. No notice of non-renewal shall be required if a Lecturer resigns, is terminated, or is dismissed for cause (Part IV, section K).

Lecturers shall be evaluated annually by their department chair/school director and by their unit tenure-promotion-(re)appointment committee. Following a Lecturer’s fourth year of service, the department chair/school director and the unit tenure-promotion-(reappointment) committee shall conduct a comprehensive review of the Lecturer either in response to a request for promotion to Senior Lecturer or to advise the Lecturer of his/her progress towards promotion to Senior Lecturer. If (a) a Lecturer fails to request promotion to Senior Lecturer by the customary Fall semester deadline for regular faculty during the Lecturer’s eight year of service, or  b) is not promoted to during their eight year of service, then the Lecturer shall not be reappointed following a final ninth year of service.
Proposed Faculty Manual Change
Part III, Section E, #8 (Senior Lecturer)

Current Wording:
8. Senior Lecturer. After six years of satisfactory performance a lecturer may be reclassified as a senior lecturer. Equivalent experience at Clemson, such as that obtained in a visiting position, may be counted. A department chair, with the concurrence of the department's tenure-promotion-(re)appointment committee, may recommend an individual to the college dean who makes the appointment. Senior lecturers may be offered contracts ranging from one to three years with the requirement of one year's notice of non-renewal before July 15. Senior Lecturers cannot have administrative duties beyond those of regular faculty.

Proposed Wording:
8. Senior Lecturer. After four full academic years of service, a lecturer may apply for promotion to Senior Lecturer; equivalent experience at Clemson, such as that obtained in a visiting position, may be counted towards the 4 year service requirement. A department chair/school director and the department/school tenure-promotion-(re)appointment committee make independent promotion recommendations to the college dean, who makes the promotion decision and appointment. Senior lecturers shall be offered three-year contracts with the requirement of one year's notice of non-renewal before July 15. Senior Lecturers shall be evaluated like regular faculty on an annual basis by their department chair/school director, and at least every 2 years by their department/school tenure-promotion-(re)appointment committee. Senior Lecturers cannot have administrative duties beyond those of regular faculty.

The Senior Lecturer appointment is intended to recognize the efforts, contributions, and performance of Lecturers who are not merely satisfactorily effective teachers, but who have also made (an) additional significant contribution(s) to the instructional mission of the University. Accordingly, length of service as Lecturer is, itself, not a sufficient criterion for promotion to Senior Lecturer. Instead, the process and criteria for promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer are determined by departments/schools and shall be described in their tenure and promotion document and be consistent with the guidelines described here.

These criteria must, at a minimum, include: (a) 4 years of at least satisfactory performance as Lecturer (or in a Clemson position providing equivalent experience) as judged by the department chair and/or department tenure-promotion-(re)appointment committee; and (b) an identifiable significant contribution to the instructional reputation or mission of the Department/School/University that extends beyond ordinary instructional expectations of Lecturers in fulfillment of their responsibilities. Such a contributions might include, but are not limited to: teaching an unusual breadth of courses, honors courses, or courses at a variety of levels; assisting in the development or assessment of courses or curricula; creation or implementation of beneficial pedagogical innovations or instructional materials; pedagogical scholarship; significant consulting activities related to instructional duties; mentoring colleagues
in the instruction profession; advising or mentoring students in extracurricular activities, scholarly activities, theses, dissertations, independent study, capstone projects, etc; supervision of students engaged in instructional activities; contributions in recruiting/retaining students; significant professional development activities; service to the academy or relevant professional organizations; student advising or career counseling.

Lecturers must document and provide evidence of their performance and additional contributions/activities to the department chair/school director and department/school tenure-promotion-(re)appointment committee for evaluation and consideration for promotion to Senior Lecturer. Department chairs/school directors and tenure-promotion-(re)appointment committees recommending promotion to Senior Lecturer must ensure that the minimum criteria above have been fulfilled. College deans shall make decisions concerning promotion on the basis of fulfillment of these criteria.
Proposed Faculty Manual Change
Part III, Section E, new #9 (Master Lecturer)

Proposed Wording:

9. Master Lecturer. After a minimum of four full academic years of service, a Senior Lecturer may apply for promotion to Master Lecturer; equivalent experience at Clemson may be counted towards the 4 year service requirement. A department chair/school director and the department/school tenure-promotion-(re)appointment committee make independent promotion recommendations to the college dean, who reviews the recommendations and supporting materials and makes a recommendation to the Provost. The Provost reviews the recommendations and supporting materials and forwards a recommendation for final action to the President. Promotion to Master Lecturer comes with programmatic tenure. Master Lecturers shall be evaluated like regular faculty on an annual basis by their department chair/school director, and undergo post-tenure review like regular faculty. Master Lecturers cannot have administrative duties beyond those of regular faculty.

The Master Lecturer appointment is intended to recognize the efforts, contributions, and performance of Senior Lecturers who are not merely dedicated effective classroom teachers having also made a significant contribution to the instructional mission of the University, but who are educators in the broadest context of the mission of the University. Accordingly, length of service as Senior Lecturer is, itself, not a sufficient criterion for promotion to Master Lecturer. Instead, the process and criteria for promotion from Senior Lecturer to Master Lecturer are determined by departments/schools and must be described in their bylaws and be consistent with the guidelines described here and the guidelines for programmatic tenure described in Part IV, Section H.

These criteria must, at a minimum, include: (a) 4 years of at least satisfactory performance as Senior Lecturer (or in a Clemson position providing equivalent experience) as judged by the department chair and/or department tenure-promotion-(re)appointment committee; and (b) leadership roles in multiple identifiable and sustained significant contributions to the instructional mission of the Department/School/University that extend beyond ordinary instructional expectations of Senior Lecturers in fulfillment of their responsibilities. Furthermore, such contributions must be worthy of (or have achieved) regional, national, or international distinction and shall be exclusive of classroom instruction per se. Such contributions might include, but are not limited to: assisting in the development or evaluation of curricula; creation or implementation of beneficial pedagogical innovations or instructional materials; pedagogical scholarship; significant consulting activities related to instructional duties; mentoring colleagues in the instruction profession; advising or mentoring students in extracurricular activities, scholarly activities, theses, dissertations, independent study, capstone projects, etc; supervision of students engaged in instructional activities; contributions in
recruiting/retaining students; significant professional development activities; service to the academy or relevant professional organizations; student advising or career counseling.

Senior Lecturers must document and provide evidence of such contributions to the department chair/school director and department/school tenure-promotion-(re)appointment committee for evaluation and consideration. Department chairs and tenure-promotion-(re)appointment committees recommending promotion must ensure that the minimum criteria above have been fulfilled. College deans shall make decisions concerning promotion to Master Lecturer on the basis of fulfillment of these criteria.
H. Programmatic Tenure. The purpose of programmatic tenure is to provide the economic security and fullest protection of academic freedom to Master Lecturers in recognition of their excellence in furthering the core instructional mission of the University for the public good. Programmatic tenure provides the same protections against dismissal without cause as does the status of normal non-programmatic tenure described above in Sections D and G with the exception of program termination: if an academic program is discontinued, the University has no obligation to retain those individuals holding programmatic tenure within the program or to place them in another academic program or other position in the University. For this purpose, individuals with programmatic tenure cannot be dismissed without cause if they are the only faculty member associated with an academic program. Because of the importance of programmatic tenure to achieving the public good, dismissals made on such a basis or on the basis of ambiguous or capricious academic program assignments or declarations are grievable.

The primary qualifications for programmatic tenure are substantiated commitment to and demonstrable excellence in the primary core instructional mission of the unit and University that are recognized locally, regionally, nationally, or internationally. Because promotion to Master Lecturer confers programmatic tenure: Departments shall ensure that their Master Lecturer promotion standards are consistent with those for programmatic tenure described above; Departments shall evaluate individuals holding the special faculty rank of Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, and Master Lecturer with the same procedure and frequency as used for regular faculty; Departments shall insure that individuals holding programmatic tenure undergo the same process of post tenure review as those individuals holding regular tenure; and individuals seeking the Master Lecturer rank shall document and provide evidence consistent with Department guidelines for promotion to Master Lecturer and the above guidelines for programmatic tenure. (In this section of the Faculty Manual, “Departments” should be understood to refer to departments, schools, and other similar units with Lecturers or Senior Lecturers or Master Lecturers).

The procedures (as distinct from the criteria or length of service requirements) for considering, evaluating, and conferring programmatic tenure are the same as described for regular tenure in Part IV, Sections D and G. Only the special faculty rank of Master Lecturer is eligible for programmatic tenure, which is conferred with promotion to this rank.
Proposed Faculty Manual Change:

Part VII, Section L “Committees Restricted to Regular Faculty as Voting Members”

Current Wording:
Based on the description of the responsibilities shared by Faculty at Clemson University, voting members on the following committees are limited to regular faculty: Departmental Tenure, Promotion, and Reapportionment Committee; Departmental Post-Tenure Review Committee; Departmental, College, and University Curriculum Committees; Departmental and College Advisory Committees; Faculty Senate; and Grievance Board.

Proposed Change:
Based on the description of the responsibilities shared by Faculty at Clemson University, voting members on the following committees are limited to regular faculty: Departmental Tenure, Promotion, and Reapportionment Committee; Departmental Post-Tenure Review Committee; Departmental, College, and University (but not necessarily Departmental and College) Curriculum Committees; Departmental and College Advisory Committees; Faculty Senate; and Grievance Board.

Final Wording:
Based on the description of the responsibilities shared by Faculty at Clemson University, voting members on the following committees are limited to regular faculty: Departmental Tenure, Promotion, and Reapportionment Committee; Departmental Post-Tenure Review Committee; University (but not Departmental and College) Curriculum Committees; Departmental and College Advisory Committees; Faculty Senate; and Grievance Board.

Rationale: The proposed change would allow faculty having special faculty rank to serve on Department and College curriculum committees if relevant bylaws allow. This provision allows those units desiring to do so to take advantage of local experience, expertise, and commitment of specialty faculty ranks in their educational mission. In order to maintain consistency with the Clemson University constitution, which (intentionally or not) charges faculty holding regular faculty rank with responsibilities (whether exclusive to them or not) including curriculum, the proposed change maintains the prohibition against specialty faculty ranks serving as voting members on the (undergraduate and graduate) University Curriculum Committees.
Proposed Faculty Manual Change
Part IX. Professional Practices, Section D. Teaching Practices, #11 (Evaluation of Teaching by Students)

Current Wording

11. Evaluation of Teaching by Students. The university provides a standard form that meets the minimum requirements of best practices for student evaluation of teaching faculty. This form must be approved by the Scholastic Policies Committee of the Faculty Senate. Individual departments may develop questions supplemental to the university’s minimum standard questions or employ comprehensive supplemental questions, but the standard questions are required. These forms will be distributed in every class near the end of the semester. The instructor will announce to the students that completed forms will not be examined until course grades have been submitted. It is required that instructors leave the room while forms are being completed by students. A student proctor will conduct the evaluation.

Student assessment of instruction is mandatory for all instructors at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. Summary of statistical ratings from student assessment of instruction will become part of the personnel review data for annual review, reappointment, tenure and promotion, and for post-tenure review consideration. The university will retain electronic copies of all summaries of statistical ratings for the purpose of verification that the evaluations have been carried out. Summary of statistical ratings from student assessment of instruction would be available to department chairs through the data warehouse but the actual responses from students (including comments) would not be available unless the faculty opted to submit them. Faculty may also opt to make available additional information regarding their teaching.

Other evaluation methods which must be given at least equal weight in the teaching evaluation process include one or more of the following:

• evaluation of course materials, learning objectives, and examinations by peers and/or supervisors,
• in-class visitation by peers and/or supervisors,
• a statement by the faculty member describing his/her methodology,
• exit interviews/surveys with current graduates and alumni,
• additional criteria as appropriate to the discipline, and
• any rejoinders or comments on student evaluations provided by the faculty member.

Final Wording (with changes) Approved April 2010 by Faculty Senate but not approved by the Provost:

11. Evaluation of Teaching. The university provides a standard form that meets the minimum requirements of current research-based practices for student evaluation of teaching. This form
must be approved by the Scholastic Policies Committee of the Faculty Senate. Individual
departments and faculty may develop questions supplemental to the university’s minimum
standard questions or employ comprehensive supplemental questions, but the standard questions
are required.

Student assessment of instruction is mandatory for all instructors at both the undergraduate and
graduate levels. Before the last two weeks of the semester, the instructor must activate the on-
line evaluation and then inform the students that the evaluation should be completed by the end
of the semester. The instructor will announce to the students that the completed evaluations will
not be reviewed until course grades have been submitted. If instructors use class time for the
on-line evaluation, then they must leave the room during the evaluation.

Summary of statistical ratings from student assessment of instruction (except instructor-
developed questions) will become part of the personnel review data for annual review,
reappointment, tenure and promotion, and for post-tenure review consideration. Statistical rating
summaries will be available to department chairs through the data warehouse, but responses to
instructor-developed questions and all student comments will not be available unless an
instructor opts to submit them.

The university will retain (at least for six years) copies of summaries of all statistical ratings and
student comments to verify that the evaluations have been carried out and provide an archive for
individual faculty who may need them in the future.

The process of evaluating teaching shall also involve other evaluation results besides the
summary of statistical ratings from the student evaluations as agreed upon by the faculty member
and the individual responsible for signing his/her annual evaluation. These other evaluation
results, taken together, must be given a weight at least equal to that assigned to student
evaluations, and may include (but are not limited to) any of the following:

• evaluation of course materials, learning objectives, and examinations by peers and/or
  supervisors,
• comments on the student evaluations (with instructor approval)
• in-class visitation by peers and/or supervisors,
• a statement by the faculty member describing his/her methods,
• exit interviews/surveys with current graduates and alumni,
• additional criteria as appropriate to the discipline

Proposed wording approved by the Senate (March 13, 2012):

11. Evidence of Learning in Evaluation of Teaching. The evaluation of faculty teaching and
student learning is an important process requiring a multi-faceted approach. Research
Proposed Final Wording:

11. Evidence of Learning in Evaluation of Teaching. The evaluation of faculty teaching and student learning is an important process requiring a multi-faceted approach. Research supports the use of multiple sources of evidence in evaluation, and effective evaluations should include several of the following:

- evidence-based measurements of student learning (such as pre and post testing or student work samples)
- evaluation (by peers and/or administrators) of course materials, learning objectives, and examinations
- in-class visitation by peers and/or supervisors
- 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 to the discipline

The university provides a standard form that meets the minimum requirements of current research-based practices for student rating of course experiences. This form must be approved by the Scholastic Policies Committee of the Faculty Senate. Individual departments and faculty may develop questions supplemental to the university's minimum standard questions or employ comprehensive supplemental questions, but the standard questions are required.

Student rating of course experiences is mandatory for all instructors at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. Before the last two weeks of the semester, the instructor must activate the on-line evaluation and then inform the students that the evaluation should be completed by the end of the semester. The instructor will announce to the students that the completed evaluations will not be reviewed until course grades have been submitted. If instructors use class time for the on-line evaluation, then they must leave the room during the evaluation.

Summary of statistical ratings from student ratings of course experiences (except instructor-developed questions) will become part of the personnel review data for annual review, reappointment, tenure and promotion, and for post-tenure review consideration. Statistical rating
summaries will be available to department chairs through the data warehouse. Comments are the property of faculty.

The university will retain (at least for six years) copies of summaries of all statistical ratings and student comments to verify that the evaluations have been carried out and provide an archive for individual faculty who may need them in the future.

Rationale:

The Committee received updated report reviewing the literature on the value of student comments in the summative evaluation of teaching. Per requests of the Policy Committee, an updated summary of the validity of student ratings is all provided in this rationale. Student ratings tend to be regarded as satisfaction measures of course experiences and not accurate reports of either course content or learning gains. Learning gains must be directly measured as appropriate for the discipline and developmental level of the students. Therefore, summative evaluations of teaching must include more than one source of evidence of teaching effectiveness, and certainly, require more substantive evidence than students' self-reports of perceived satisfaction. Given the complexities of measuring learning and teaching effectiveness, no single source should outweigh any other source. Finally, both literatures, the one on ratings as well as on the value of student comments repeatedly cautions that appropriate analysis and not raw data can be used in summative processes. For ratings, percentages and means have been found insufficient to represent the complexity of the underlying variables and multi-dimensionality of teaching. Furthermore, raw (individual and unanalyzed) comments have no intrinsic meaning in any evaluative process, but especially not in summative judgments. When used for formative purposes, student comments must be systematically analyzed and frequently, faculty will require developmental support in interpreting the analysis for use in improving teaching. Under no conditions are any set of raw data (ratings or comments) of any value in either summative or formative evaluation processes. The substantive literature on this points are attached in the summary reports.
Proposed Faculty Manual Change
Part IX. Professional Practices, Section D. Teaching Practices, #11 (Evaluation of Teaching by Students)

Final Wording (with changes) Approved April 2010 by Faculty Senate:

11. Evaluation of Teaching. The university provides a standard form that meets the minimum requirements of current research-based practices for student evaluation of teaching. This form must be approved by the Scholastic Policies Committee of the Faculty Senate. Individual departments and faculty may develop questions supplemental to the university's minimum standard questions or employ comprehensive supplemental questions, but the standard questions are required.

Student assessment of instruction is mandatory for all instructors at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. Before the last two weeks of the semester, the instructor must activate the on-line evaluation and then inform the students that the evaluation should be completed by the end of the semester. The instructor will announce to the students that the completed evaluations will not be reviewed until course grades have been submitted. If instructors use class time for the on-line evaluation, then they must leave the room during the evaluation.

Summary of statistical ratings from student assessment of instruction (except instructor-developed questions) will become part of the personnel review data for annual review, reappointment, tenure and promotion, and for post-tenure review consideration. Statistical rating summaries will be available to department chairs through the data warehouse, but responses to instructor-developed questions and all student comments will not be available unless an instructor opts to submit them.

The university will retain (at least for six years) copies of summaries of all statistical ratings and student comments to verify that the evaluations have been carried out and provide an archive for individual faculty who may need them in the future.

The process of evaluating teaching shall also involve other evaluation results besides the summary of statistical ratings from the student evaluations as agreed upon by the faculty member and the individual responsible for signing his/her annual evaluation. These other evaluation results, taken together, must be given a weight at least equal to that assigned to student evaluations, and may include (but are not limited to) any of the following:

- evaluation of course materials, learning objectives, and examinations by peers and/or supervisors,
- comments on the student evaluations (with instructor approval)
- in-class visitation by peers and/or supervisors,
- a statement by the faculty member describing his/her methods,
- exit interviews/surveys with current graduates and alumni,
- additional criteria as appropriate to the discipline

Ad Hoc Committee on Teaching Effectiveness Proposed Wording (November 2011):

11. Evidence of Learning in Evaluation of Teaching. The evaluation of faculty teaching and student learning is an important process requiring a multi-faceted approach. Research supports the use of multiple sources of evidence in evaluation, and effective evaluations should include several of the following:

- evidence-based measures of student learning (such as pre and post testing or samples of student work)
• 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

The university provides a standard form that meets the minimum requirements of current research-based practices for student evaluation rating of teaching course experiences. This form must be approved by the Scholastic Policies Committee of the Faculty Senate. Individual departments and faculty may develop questions supplemental to the university’s minimum standard questions or employ comprehensive supplemental questions, but the standard questions are required.

Student assessment of instruction rating of course experiences is mandatory for all instructors at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. Before the last two weeks of the semester, the instructor must activate the on-line evaluation and then inform the students that the evaluation should be completed by the end of the semester. The instructor will announce to the students that the completed evaluations will not be reviewed until course grades have been submitted. If instructors use class time for the on-line evaluation, then they must leave the room during the evaluation.

Summary of statistical ratings from student assessment of instruction (except instructor-developed questions) will become part of the personnel review data for annual review, reappointment, tenure and promotion, and for post-tenure review consideration. Statistical rating summaries will be available to department chairs through the data warehouse, but responses to instructor-developed questions and all student comments will not be available. Comments are the property of faculty and as recommended by current research should not be submitted to peer reviewers or administrators in their raw form.

The university will retain (at least for six years) copies of summaries of all statistical ratings and student comments to verify that the evaluations have been carried out and provide an archive for individual faculty who may need them in the future.
Rationale:

The Committee received updated report reviewing the literature on the value of student comments in the summative evaluation of teaching. Per requests of the Policy Committee, an updated summary of the validity of student ratings is all provided in this rationale (two reports attached). Student ratings tend to be regarded as satisfaction measures of course experiences and not accurate reports of either course content or learning gains. Learning gains must be directly measured as appropriate for the discipline and developmental level of the students. Therefore, summative evaluations of teaching must include more than one source of evidence of teaching effectiveness, and certainly, require more substantive evidence than students’ self-reports of perceived satisfaction. Given the complexities of measuring learning and teaching effectiveness, no single source should outweigh any other source. Finally, both literatures, the one on ratings as well as on the value of student comments repeatedly cautions that appropriate analysis and not raw data can be used in summative processes. For ratings, percentages and means have been found insufficient to represent the complexity of the underlying variables and multidimensionality of teaching. Furthermore, raw (individual and unanalyzed) comments have no intrinsic meaning in any evaluative process, but especially not in summative judgments. When used for formative purposes, student comments must be systematically analyzed and frequently, faculty will require developmental support in interpreting the analysis for use in improving teaching. Under no conditions are any set of raw data (ratings or comments) of any value in either summative or formative evaluation processes. The substantive literature on this points are attached in the summary reports.

Ad Hoc Committee’s (November 2011) Proposed Final Wording:

11. Evidence of Learning in Evaluation of Teaching. The evaluation of faculty teaching and student learning is an important process requiring a multi-faceted approach. Research supports the use of multiple sources of evidence in evaluation, and effective evaluations should include several of the following:

- evidence-based measurements of student learning (such as pre and post testing)
- 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

The university provides a standard form that meets the minimum requirements of current research-based practices for student rating of course experiences. This form must be approved by the Scholastic Policies Committee of the Faculty Senate. Individual departments and faculty may develop questions supplemental to the university’s minimum standard questions or employ comprehensive supplemental questions, but the standard questions are required.

Student rating of course experiences is mandatory for all instructors at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. Before the last two weeks of the semester, the instructor must activate the on-line evaluation and then inform the students that the evaluation should be completed by the end of the semester. The instructor will announce to the students that the completed evaluations will not be reviewed until course grades have been submitted. If instructors use class time for the on-line evaluation, then they must leave the room during the evaluation.

Summary of statistical ratings from student assessment of instruction (except instructor-developed questions) will become part of the personnel review data for annual review, reappointment, tenure and promotion, and for post-tenure review consideration. Statistical rating summaries will be available to department chairs through the data warehouse, but responses to instructor-developed questions and all student comments will not be available. Comments are the property of faculty.

The university will retain (at least for six years) copies of summaries of all statistical ratings and student comments to verify that the evaluations have been carried out and provide an archive for individual faculty who may need them in the future.
RESOLUTION TO ESTABLISH

A CLEMSON UNIVERSITY CHILDCARE CENTER

Clemson University President's Commission on the Status of Women
Clemson University President's Commission on the Status of Black Faculty & Staff
Clemson University Faculty Senate
Clemson University Staff Senate
Clemson University Office of Access and Equity
Clemson University Graduate Student Government

WHEREAS, Clemson University seeks to join the ranks of other top universities and institutions of higher learning across the state of South Carolina and the nation by investing in future generations with a childcare center worthy of our mission;

WHEREAS, A Clemson University childcare center would enhance efforts to recruit and retain top faculty, staff, graduate and undergraduate students who consider family needs when making education and career decisions;

WHEREAS, Top-30 institutions must be competitive in recruiting top faculty, staff and students who seek quality care for their children, and twenty-eight (28) out of thirty (30) of those institutions currently provide childcare centers towards that end;

WHEREAS, An on-campus childcare center would improve the morale of many current Clemson employees and students who seek quality care for their children;

WHEREAS, Both past and recent research conducted at Clemson University which included data from faculty, staff and graduate students as well as community childcare centers has demonstrated the need and support for a university childcare center; and

WHEREAS, Having a childcare facility at Clemson University would provide opportunities to develop innovative models for childcare in an academic setting including but not limited to engaging undergraduate and graduate students in meaningful practicum experiences and providing research opportunities for faculty in early childhood curricula development and enrichment;

RESOLVED, That the Clemson University President’s Commission on the Status of Women, Clemson University President’s Commission on the Status of Black Faculty & Staff, Clemson University Faculty Senate, Clemson University Staff Senate, Clemson University Office of Access and Equity, and Clemson University Graduate Student Government are unified in strongly expressing the need to establish and strongly urging the establishment of a childcare center on the campus of Clemson University.
MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE
APRIL 10, 2012

1. Call to Order: The meeting was called to order by President Dan Warner at 2:30 p.m. and guests were welcomed and recognized.

2. Approval of Minutes: The General Faculty & Staff Minutes of December 21, 2011 and the Faculty Senate meeting Minutes dated March 13, 2012 were approved as written.

3. Approval of Agenda: President Warner asked for approval of the rearrangement of the Agenda in order that business from the 2011-12 proposed Faculty Manual changes could be acted upon during the Policy Committee Report. Vote to approve rearrangement was seconded, taken and passed unanimously.

4. "Free Speech": None

5. Special Order of the Day: Brett Dalton, Chief Financial Director informed the Senate of the 2020 Plan and the Four Strategic Priorities contained therein, with an emphasis on infrastructure maintenance and improvements (Attachment).

6. Committees:
   a. Senate Committees
      1) Finance Committee – Chair Rich Figliola stated that the Committee had planned to analyze the Salary Report but had actually just received it and have not had the time to do so. President Barker and Provost Helms will provide Senator Susan Chapman the salary data in a form that can be better analyzed. There were 4.2 million dollars in raises in equal distribution among faculty, staff and administration on a percentage basis. Senator Figliola stated that the Faculty Senate needed to look at this Report more closely.

      2) Welfare Committee – Chair Denise Anderson noted that was the representative at a meeting with the Provost to discuss the new classroom scheduling software that would be coming on-line.


      4) Research Committee – Chair Dvora Perahia submitted and briefly explained the Committee Report Academic Year 2011-12 dated April 10, 2012 (attachment).
5) Budget Accountability Committee – Senator Figliola reported that the Committee had invited Brett Dalton to speak with the Senate today and that there was nothing new to report.

6) ad hoc Committee on Teaching Effectiveness – Senator Jane Lindle submitted the Final Report on Teaching Effectiveness 2011-12 (Attachment).

7) ad hoc Committee on the Status of Lecturers – Senator Jeremy King stated that the final report was submitted and approved last month.

5) Policy Committee – Chair Sean Brittain submitted and explained the 2011 Committee Report which includes Completed and Pending Business (Attachment). He then presented three proposed Faculty Manual changes for approval from the Committee:

   a. Part III. E. 6 - Lecturer. Discussion followed. Vote to accept change was taken and passed with two-thirds required vote.

   b. Part III. E. 8 - Senior Lecturer. Discussion followed during which a friendly amendment was offered and accepted. Vote to accept amendment was seconded and approved. Vote on amended proposed change was taken and passed with two-thirds required vote.

   c. Part III. E. 9 - Master Lecturer. There was much discussion during which a friendly amendment was offered and accepted. Vote to accept amendment was seconded and approved. There was much more discussion on the amended proposed Faculty Manual change. Vote on amended proposed change was taken and failed (not receiving the two-thirds required vote).

   d. Other University Committee/Commissions: None

7. Old Business: None

8. President Warner presented a plaque and a copy of the book, Life Death & Bialys by Dylan Schaffer to Kelly C. Smith, the 2012 Recipient of the Alan Schaffer Faculty Senate Service Award; congratulated retiring Faculty Senators by thanking them for their service and presented certificates to them.

9. Outgoing President’s Report: Outgoing President remarks were made by President Daniel D. Warner, who then introduced Jeremy King, as the Faculty Senate President for 2012-13. New officers were installed at approximately 4:20 p.m.

Scott Dutkiewicz, Secretary

Cathy Toth Sturkie, Program Coordinator
10. **New Business:** President Jeremy King introduced new senators; asked Senators to return their committee preference forms as quickly as possible so that the new session may proceed; noted that he was in the process of setting standing committees and committee chairs; encouraged Senators to notify the Senate Office with the two names of Advisory Committee members; announced that a Faculty Senate Orientation/Retreat will be held on May 8, 2012 (invitations forthcoming); and stated his plans for the Senate.

  President King asked for approval to continue the Budget Accountability Committee. Senator Chapman offered a friendly amendment, which was accepted, that the Senate consider merging the Senate’s Standing Finance Committee and Budget Accountability Committee. Motion was seconded. Vote was taken to continue the Budget Accountability Committee and to have the Policy Committee consider a merger of both committees and passed unanimously.

  President King then offered his theme for the coming year by noting the passing of Harvard social/political scientist James Q. Wilson, known for his "broken window" theory: the idea that decay of buildings and neighborhoods and social fabrics can begin with a single broken window that goes unfixed.

  President King remarked that we at Clemson still live in a pleasant neighborhood with buildings having solid foundations and sound interiors. However, there are broken windows -- challenges that must be addressed including communication, compensation, and the University mission itself—that must be repaired to avoid a broken window cascade leading to larger problems that will be more difficult to address in the future.

11. **Adjournment:** 4:44 p.m.

   [Signature]

   Denise Anderson, Secretary

   [Signature]

   Cathy Toth Sturkie, Program Coordinator

Absent: T. Dobbins, D. Layfield (B. Surver for), S. Ashton, C. Starkey, A. Winters, C. Cantalupo, C. Marinescu (P. Srimani for), N. Vyavahare, A. Katsiyannis
February 2012

Serve the Public Good

Drive Innovation

Provide Talent

2020 Plan:

Clemson University
Invest in your strategic priorities:

2020 Road Map

Build to compete — facilities, infrastructure and technology

• Enhance student quality & performance
• Provide engagement opportunities for all students
• Attract, retain, & reward top people
• Build to compete — facilities, infrastructure & technology

Performance & enhance student quality &
• Attract, retain, & reward top people — adequate "tools"

• Quality Students: 73.6% - facilities related to their majors as "extremely important" or "very important" in selecting college

• Engagement: 2006 study concluded that "facilities... on a campus can mean the difference between whether they enroll or not"

• Why "Build to compete"?

• Supports each plan element
Why "Build to compete"?

Since 2000

- NC = $3.1 Billion
- GA = almost $2 Billion
- SC = $200 M - No bond bill since 1998
- Average age of beds
- Utility infrastructure
- Average age of core space
- Average age of 49 years or older for 75 percent of Clemson's academic space
- $230 + million in deferred maintenance
2020 Road Map

Build to compete - facilities, infrastructure and technology

Leverage information technology: academic performance, athletic facilities

Provide competitive academic, research, student life, &

Fix what's broken - protect existing assets

Research productivity, administrative efficiency
2020 Roadmap:

Build to compete: Academic & Research

- Lee Hall: Renovations and addition
- Class of '56 Academic Success Center
- Life Sciences Complex
- Lee Hall: Renovations and addition
- Evaluating Business school - lowest faculty satisfaction scores
- Major renovations / additions
- Wind Turbine Drivetrain Test Facility
- Renovate Freeman Hall
- Watt Innovation Center

- Miscellaneous

- 2020 Roadmap:
2020 Roadmap: Build to compete: Student housing & recreation

Douthit Hills:
- Clemson upperclassmen
- Bridge to Clemson
- Dining and Bookstore - "increases space in union"

Core Campus Redevelopment - 1954
- Replace final section of Johnstone
- Replace Harcombe
- Bridge to Clemson
- Clemson upperclassmen

Additional elements to be revealed strategically
- Enhance & increase recreation opportunities
2020 Roadmap:

Stewardship:

- General deferred maintenance:
  - HVAC
  - Building systems
  - Increase preventative maintenance
  - Wastewater Treatment Plant

- Utility systems:
  - Production: Heat / Chillers:
  - Regulatory compliance
  - No winter peak load redundancy
  - 50% of system is 40 yrs old

Build to compete: Stewardship:

2020 Roadmap:
2020 Roadmap:

Build to compete: Stewardship

Utility Systems:
• Distribution: steam, chilled water, electrical
• Average weighted age 30 yrs
• Significant portion over 40 yrs
• Sub-station / components
• Lack of redundancy

Management & Conservation:
• Less than 5% metered by direct digital control
• No main campus buildings sub-metered
• Aged components / condition - inefficient
• 10-15% thermal loss
• 3-5% electrical
• 5-8% chilled water

Build to compete: Stewardship

2020 Roadmap:
2020 Roadmap: Build to compete: Technology

Improve/ update mission critical systems: 
- 70's era homegrown SIS, SRS, etc...

Improve Management Information Systems: 
- Invest in efficient support systems (fewer people)

Maintain HPC strength & research network connectivity: 
- Continue upgrades to on-campus network
- Improve Learning environments:
  - Increase quality & number of technology enhanced spaces (Watt Innovation Center)

Better coordination & management of investments infrastructure:
- More people, fewer people
2020 Roadmap: Athletics

Build to compete: Facilities

- Doug Kingsmore Stadium
- Indoor Practice Facility
- WestZone phase III
- Tennis Facility Additions & Enhancements
- Littlejohn Coliseum phase II
- Players' facility and lobby of Legacy Field enhancements
- Doug Kingsmore Stadium phase II
- Littlejohn Coliseum phase III
- WestZone phase III
- Indoor Practice Facility
outhit Hills

Project Overview

Five critical elements:
- 733 Beds for upperclassman-students
- 752 Beds for Bridge to Clemson students
- Mixed-use retail development
- 400 seat new dining hall
- Relocation of bookstore (25,000 sq. ft.)

* New retail establishments (10,000 - 27,000 sq. ft.)

TOTAL PROJECT COSTS ($118-125M)

Parking

400 seat new dining hall
Why This Location for Bridge?

- Positions Bridge students on campus, but at the edge of campus
- Houses Bridge students all together in a more traditional residence-hall setting
- Allows for expansion
- Positions Bridge students on campus, but at the edge of campus
Why It’s Right for Clemson

Douthit Hills Redevelopment:

- Gives students academic and social advantages
- Creates a supportive environment for the Bridge to Clemson students
- Strengthens students' connection to Clemson
- Allows more undergraduates to live on-campus
- Creates a "wow" first impression for visitors
- Improved on-campus housing options
- Allows more undergraduates to live on-campus
2020 Plan:

- Enhance student quality & performance
- Provide engagement opportunities for all students
- Attract, retain, & reward top people
- Build to compete - facilities, infrastructure, and technology
FACULTY SENATE SCHOLASTIC POLICIES
Minutes from March 13, 2012; 1:00 – 2:15; Madren Center

SCHOLASTIC POLICIES COMMITTEE 2011-2012
Bob Horton (bhorton) (HEHD)
Xiaobo Hu (xhu) (BBS)
Julie Northcutt (jnknorth) (AFLS)
Kelly Smith (kcs) (AAH)
Graciela Tissera (gtisser) (AAH)
David Tonkyn (tdavid) (AFLS)
Narendra Vyavahare (narenv) (E&S)

Attending: Hu, Smith, Horton
Guests: Janie Lindle, Debbie Jackson, Linda Nilson

2011-2012 Meetings: 8/23, 9/20, 10/25 (1:00 – 2:00), 11/15, 12/6, 1/17, 2/21, 3/13 (1:00 – 2:00), 4/17
All meetings are 2:30 – 4:30 except as otherwise noted.

Evaluation of Instruction Form – Leads: Xiaobo and Naren
We had continued discussions, framed by an excellent and informative PowerPoint that Janie Lindle prepared and presented. We looked at constructs that research suggests are valid for students to evaluate and those that aren’t. We will continue these discussions at our April meeting, when we will hand this issue off to the 2012-2013 Scholastic Policies committee.

COMPLETED
Grade Entry
The question is whether the length of time before the system times out has been/can be/will be extended. Stan Smith has made the contacts and requests; the timer will now last 45 minutes instead of 30 minutes.

Agreements with GTC & TCTC – Hap Wheeler
We approved articulation agreements with GTC and TCTC in which they are creating or have 200-level courses that meet area requirements in our majors, normally met by 300 level courses at CU. Scholastic Policies supported changing Undergraduate Announcements so that curriculum committees could consider whether or not to allow the 200-level courses to count for the 300-level courses; these courses would not go on TCEL, but would be restricted for those students who completed all courses in the articulation agreement. However, the Executive Advisory Committee determined that this was not an issue for Faculty Senate but for the Curriculum Committees.

Faculty Textbook Compliance
We approved new forms that faculty should use when requiring a text or other course materials for which they may receive compensation. The forms have been sent to Erin Swann in Legal. We also recommended changes to the Faculty Manual so that the forms and policy align; these changes were forwarded to the Policy Committee.
Course Substitutions
Horton served as Scholastic Policies' representative on (and chair of) a committee looking into including a timeline on substitutions so students don't submit them at the last minute and still expect to graduate on time. The Undergraduate Council had tabled the suggestions from the committee, with sentiment suggesting they preferred "must" instead of "should" for requiring substitutions to be submitted the semester prior to graduation. However, Scholastic Policies endorsed "should," noting that there would be exceptions, many of which would be legitimate. This recommendation was sent to the Undergraduate Council.

Final Exams
We suggested modifications to the policy on final exams. The biggest concern was for online courses, and we suggested that a professor of an online course who wants a synchronous exam indicate the time in the syllabus.

Consideration of Policy for Awarding of Degrees Posthumously
After considerable discussion and review of policies at other ACC institutions (information obtained by Stan Smith) s, we considered and approved a modification to our policy for award posthumous degrees.

Academic Grievances
Scholastic Policies supported the changes suggested by the Undergraduate Student Government to the policy on Academic Grievances.

Academic Integrity: Lead Kelly Smith.
We agreed that issues of cheating not associated with classes and planning to cheat should be referred to the Office of Community and Ethical Standards. We also recommend that the Office of Undergraduate Studies inform faculty of this when the situation warrants. We intend to monitor this to determine whether we should reconsider this policy at some future time.

Final Exam Schedule
We were asked to consider the exam schedule. Two professors said they believed that those who taught 8:00 classes should not be scheduled for the last exam on Friday night. We determined this was not a matter of policy, but have relayed the concerns to Stan Smith, who has discussed this with Records and Registrations staff.

Attendance Policy
Student Senate led this in an effort to have Redfern perhaps excuse student absences, distinguishing between those who visited and those who should not be in class. David Tonkyn and Bob Horton represented Scholastic Policies on this. After two meetings with George Clay and a Redfern doctor, we were unable to reach any agreeable changes. Redfern, however, will update their website with more current and useful information to indicate what services are available and how student visits will be communicated.
Self-Plagiarism and Academic Integrity
We passed the following, and Executive Advisory and the Senate endorsed it. It was then forwarded to the Undergraduate Council.

I. Academic Integrity Policy
A. Any breach of the principles outlined in the Academic Integrity Statement is considered an act of academic dishonesty.
B. Academic dishonesty is further defined as:
   1. Giving, receiving, or using unauthorized aid, including the inappropriate use of electronic devices, in any work submitted to fulfill academic requirements. In examination situations all electronic devices must be off and stowed unless otherwise authorized by the instructor.
   2. Plagiarism, which includes the intentional or unintentional copying of language, structure, or ideas of another and attributing the work to one's own efforts;
   3. Attempts to copy, edit, or delete computer files that belong to another person or use of computer accounts that belong to another person without the permission of the file owner or account owner;

4. Submitting work that has been turned in for credit in another course without the consent of the instructor.
C. All academic work submitted for grading or to fulfill academic requirements contains an implicit pledge and may contain, at the request of an instructor, an explicit pledge by the student that no unauthorized aid has been received.
D. It is the responsibility of every member of the Clemson University community to enforce the Academic Integrity Policy.
UNFINISHED

Evaluation of Instruction Form – Leads: Xiaobo and Naren
We had continued discussions, framed by an excellent and informative PowerPoint that Janie Lindle prepared and presented. We looked at constructs that research suggests are valid for students to evaluate and those that aren’t. This issue will be handed off to the 2012-2013 Scholastic Policies committee.

iROAR: There is no action needed by SP, but we should keep current on this issue.

PASS-FAIL OPTIONS
This has been brought to Scholastic Policies for consideration.

MEMORANDUM

TO: Jan Murdoch, Dean of Undergraduate Studies
    Bob Horton, Chair of Scholastic Policies Committee

FROM: Stan Smith

DATE: March 16, 2012

SUBJECT: Pass-Fail Policy Option

Some undergraduate courses at Clemson are only taught on a Pass-Fail basis. This memorandum does not relate to those courses. This recommendation relates to the option undergraduate students have to enroll in traditionally graded (A, B, C, D, F) courses on a Pass-Fail basis when the credits earned are used only to satisfy elective credits in their respective degree programs.

The Pass-Fail option for students to satisfy electives in degree programs first appeared in the 1971-72 Undergraduate Announcements. The wording in the Pass-Fail option policy in the 2011-12 Undergraduate Announcements is basically the same as the wording in the 1971-72 Undergraduate Announcements.

Recently, this Pass-Fail option policy was reviewed. Based on the reduced number of free electives in most Clemson degree programs and with an interest in both simplifying and clarifying the policy, the revised wording below is recommended. In spring semester 2012,
fifteen undergraduate students elected to use the Pass-Fail option to satisfy free electives in their respective degree programs.

The recommendation below is being submitted to both the Council on Undergraduate Studies and the Scholastic Policies Committee of the Faculty Senate for review.

**Pass-Fail Option**
Juniors or Seniors enrolled in four year curricula may take four courses (maximum of 15 credit hours), with not more than two courses in a given semester, on a Pass-Fail basis. Transfer and five-year program students may take Pass-Fail courses on a pro rata basis. *If a degree program includes elective credit(s), a student may apply up to 12 elective credits earned using the Pass-Fail option.* Only courses to be used as electives may be taken optionally as Pass-Fail.

Letter-graded courses which have been failed may not be repeated Pass-Fail.

Registration in Pass-Fail courses will be handled in the same manner as letter-graded courses. Departmental approval must be obtained via approval form and returned to the Registrar's Office by the last day to register or add a class, as stipulated in the Academic Calendar. Instructors will submit letter grades to the Registration Services Office. These grades will be converted as follows: *A, B, C to P (pass); D, F to F (fail).* Only *P* (minimum letter grade of *C*) or *F* will be shown on a student's permanent record and will not affect the grade-point ratio.

If a student changes to a major that requires a previously passed course and this course has been taken Pass-Fail, he/she may request either to take the course on a letter-graded basis, that the *P* be changed to *C*, or that another course be substituted.

In the event limited enrollment in a class is necessary, priority will be given as follows: majors, letter-graded students, Pass-Fail students, auditors.

**COMPLETED**

**Grade Entry**
The question is whether the length of time before the system times out has been/can be/will be extended. Stan Smith has made the contacts and requests; the timer will now last 45 minutes instead of 30 minutes.

**Agreements with GTC & TCTC – Hap Wheeler**
We approved articulation agreements with GTC and TCTC in which they are creating or have 200-level courses that meet area requirements in our majors, normally met by 300 level courses at CU. Scholastic Policies supported changing Undergraduate Announcements so that curriculum committees could consider whether or not to allow the 200-level courses to count for the 300-level courses; these courses would not go on TCEL, but would be restricted for those students who completed all courses in the articulation agreement. However, the Executive Advisory Committee determined that this was not an issue for Faculty Senate but for the Curriculum Committees.

**Faculty Textbook Compliance**
We approved new forms that faculty should use when requiring a text or other course materials for which they may receive compensation. The forms have been sent to Erin Swann
in Legal. We also recommended changes to the Faculty Manual so that the forms and policy align; these changes were forwarded to the Policy Committee.

**Course Substitutions**
Horton served as Scholastic Policies’ representative on (and chair of) a committee looking into including a timeline on substitutions so students don’t submit them at the last minute and still expect to graduate on time. The Undergraduate Council had tabled the suggestions from the committee, with sentiment suggesting they preferred “must” instead of “should” for requiring substitutions to be submitted the semester prior to graduation. However, Scholastic Policies endorsed “should,” noting that there would be exceptions, many of which would be legitimate. This recommendation was sent to the Undergraduate Council.

**Final Exams**
We suggested modifications to the policy on final exams. The biggest concern was for online courses, and we suggested that a professor of an online course who wants a synchronous exam indicate the time in the syllabus.

**Consideration of Policy for Awarding of Degrees Posthumously**
After considerable discussion and review of policies at other ACC institutions (information obtained by Stan Smith), we considered and approved a modification to our policy for award posthumous degrees.

**Academic Grievances**
Scholastic Policies supported the changes suggested by the Undergraduate Student Government to the policy on Academic Grievances.

**Academic Integrity: Lead Kelly Smith.**
We agreed that issues of cheating not associated with classes and planning to cheat should be referred to the Office of Community and Ethical Standards. We also recommend that the Office of Undergraduate Studies inform faculty of this when the situation warrants. We intend to monitor this to determine whether we should reconsider this policy at some future time.

**Final Exam Schedule**
We were asked to consider the exam schedule. Two professors said they believed that those who taught 8:00 classes should not be scheduled for the last exam on Friday night. We determined this was not a matter of policy, but have relayed the concerns to Stan Smith, who has discussed this with Records and Registrations staff.

**Attendance Policy**
Student Senate led this in an effort to have Redfern perhaps excuse student absences, distinguishing between those who visited and those who should not be in class. David Tonkyn and Bob Horton represented Scholastic Policies on this. After two meetings with George Clay and a Redfern doctor, we were unable to reach any agreeable changes. Redfern, however, will update their website with more current and useful information to indicate what services are available and how student visits will be communicated.
Self-Plagiarism and Academic Integrity
We passed the following, and Executive Advisory and the Senate endorsed it. It was then forwarded to the Undergraduate Council.

I. Academic Integrity Policy
A. Any breach of the principles outlined in the Academic Integrity Statement is considered an act of academic dishonesty.
B. Academic dishonesty is further defined as:
   1. Giving, receiving, or using unauthorized aid, including the inappropriate use of electronic devices, in any work submitted to fulfill academic requirements. In examination situations all electronic devices must be off and stowed unless otherwise authorized by the instructor.
   2. Plagiarism, which includes the intentional or unintentional copying of language, structure, or ideas of another and attributing the work to one’s own efforts;
   3. Attempts to copy, edit, or delete computer files that belong to another person or use of computer accounts that belong to another person without the permission of the file owner or account owner;
4. Submitting work that has been turned in for credit in another course without the consent of the instructor.
C. All academic work submitted for grading or to fulfill academic requirements contains an implicit pledge and may contain, at the request of an instructor, an explicit pledge by the student that no unauthorized aid has been received.
D. It is the responsibility of every member of the Clemson University community to enforce the Academic Integrity Policy.
Committee Report Academic Year 2011-2012

Faculty Senate Research Committee

April 10, 2012

The research committee worked to resolve ongoing challenges that affect research at Clemson University, from hiring processes of personnel that impact research to instrumentation infrastructure and copy-right issues. The current status is provided for each of the major challenges.

a) Single/limited Submission proposals: The process in which the University selects proposals in cases where only limited numbers of submission per university are accepted by the funding agencies does not include expert advice, the decision process is not transparent, and the proposer does not get helpful input.

Current Status: 1) A committee has been established by the Research Council to revisit the current procedures and suggest improvements. The committee is to report back to the VPR by May 1est. 2) A dialog was opened with the team at the provost office whose expertise lie in communication with foundations.

b) Hiring of adjunct professors: there is currently a large number of requirements that impede hiring of adjunct faculty to serve on graduate students’ dissertation committees.

Current Status: The issue was discussed with the D. Jackson at the provost office at the beginning of the academic year. Concerns regarding changes from accreditation point of view were presented. We have proposed to substitute the requirement for transcripts with a letter from current employer that outlines credentials. This procedure is implemented by several recently SACS accredited schools and could be easily implemented. We are still waiting to hear about possible improvements.

c) Intellectual Property (IP) Policy: the language of the current IP policy includes contradicting statements regarding a variety of issues such as copyright and ownership of intellectual properties and others that require clarifications/corrections. Some of these issues were jointly addressed by several committees and the university attorney.

Current Status: IP and copy-right issues have been discussed with CURF attorney together with the policy committee. We are waiting for input.

d) Infrastructure and Research support: a- Enhancing the capabilities of university instrumentation facilities in terms of new instruments for multiple users, maintenance and technical support. b- The support faculty receive for proposal development and submission is not even across the
university. In some colleges the pre-award office is extremely helpful while in others, it hardly exists.

**Current Status:** The VPR has taken significant steps to improve the research infrastructure and has a plan for further improvements.

e) Revisit of past issues: While a simplified reasonable postdoctoral hiring protocol was established by the research committee, Clemson HR (with an OK from CU Access and Equity office) and the provost, about two years ago, it was not implemented.

**Current Status:** We could not find why the new protocol is on hold.
On 30 August 2011, Clemson University Faculty Senate President Daniel D. Warner provided the following two charges to the Ad Hoc Committee on Teaching Effectiveness:

1. First, review last year's [passed Faculty Senate in April 2010] proposed Faculty Manual change [Part IX. Professional Practices, Section D. Teaching Practices, #11 (Evaluation of Teaching by Students)] particularly in light of recent federal regulations [October 2010 reauthorization of Higher Education Act], and, if necessary, submit a revision to the Faculty Senate’s Policy Committee.

2. Second, develop a pamphlet that provides the necessary details for Chairs and TPR committees to properly conduct these alternate assessments of teaching effectiveness.

First Charge:
Necessary Revisions to Faculty Manual Changes to Part IX, D., #11

The Ad Hoc Committee met on 19 September, 4 October, 1 November, and 29 November 2011 and issued a report on Charge #1 to the Faculty Senate Executive Advisory Committee on 29 November 2011 primarily based on the Ad Hoc Committee’s Minutes from 1 November 2011. The Committee reviewed the April 2010 changes approved by the Faculty Senate, but which were not placed in the current or prior year’s Faculty Manuals pending the Provost’s approval. The Committee specifically reviewed empirically-based literature concerning student perceptions of teaching and learning and focused in particular on the appropriate use of students’ open-ended comments in improvement of teaching or learning. All minutes and review documents are attached to this report. The report included the following recommendations regarding the Faculty Manual wording:

• The terminology referring to student perceptions of their classroom and other learning experiences should be more accurately referenced as student ratings of instruction, rather than the original wording of student evaluations of teaching. This change in wording reflects multiple empirical studies of students’ abilities and insights on their own learning, and the fact that classroom experiences are only a single data source of the preparation and design of teaching.

• To enhance Clemson’s approach to evaluating teaching and learning, six additional sources ought to be added to the data sources beyond the single data requirement of student ratings of instruction. The following six sources should be among the options in addition to student ratings that departments and programs can specify in their annual evaluations (Form 3) and tenure, promotion, and reappointment (TPR) guidelines:
  1. evidence-based measurements of student learning (such as pre and post testing or other samples of student work)
2. evaluation (by peers and/or administrators) of course materials, learning objectives, and examinations
3. in-class visitation by peers and/or administrators
4. a statement by the faculty member describing his/her methods and/or a teaching philosophy
5. exit interview/surveys with current graduates/alumni
6. additional criteria as appropriate for the discipline and degree level of the students

- Based on specific investigation of recent literature on the appropriate uses of student rating comments the Ad Hoc Committee had one specific revision for the Faculty Manual wording and another suggestion to forward to the Faculty Senate’s Scholastic Policy Committee as it is the entity charged with specific wording and revisions to Clemson’s instrument for student ratings.
  - All empirical studies described how qualitative data analysis is a time consuming activity that could be most informative to faculty reflection on their instructional practices. However, most peer evaluators and administrators do not have time to effectively analyze all the commentary. All parties, including the faculty members, their peers, and administrators may require training in the effective analysis of qualitative comments. Based on these cautions from the literature on open-ended student comments, the Ad Hoc Committee noted that comments ought to remain the property of faculty for the purposes of faculty reflection and development and not surrendered for summative evaluations of any type. In light of this decision, the Ad Hoc Committee specifically recommended the following wording:

    Comments are the property of faculty and as recommended by current research should not be submitted to peer reviewers or administrators in their raw form.

  - As an ancillary finding on the research on student comments, but outside the purview of the Ad Hoc Committee’s charge, the Committee remarked on the online context for formatting closed-ended ratings with corresponding open-ended comments. The current Clemson online format does not follow best practices in that closed-ended ratings are separated from their corresponding open-ended question. The Ad Hoc Committee asked that this observation be passed to the Scholastic Policy Committee for consideration and revision.

  - The Ad Hoc Committee requested that its report on student comments, a document and its companion slideshow, be placed on the Faculty Senate web pages for all faculty members’ access.
Second Charge:
Materials Supporting Faculty, Administrators and Peer Reviewers’
Use of Evidence of Effective Teaching

The Ad Hoc Committee met on 29 November 2011, 24 January and 21 February 2012, to consider its second charge. The committee also used email in the interim to compile sources and URLs for supporting materials. The Committee makes the following recommendations concerning its second charge.

Recommendation #1: Update all College, Department/Unit/Program guidelines, including both annual evaluation criteria (Form 3s) and TPR guidelines

All College, Department/Unit/Program guidelines, including both annual evaluation criteria (Form 3s) and Tenure, Promotion, and (Re)appointment (TPR) guidelines, need to recognize that there are seven possible criteria to evaluate learning and teaching, with student ratings of instruction as only one of the seven criteria. The Ad Hoc Committee recommends that as many as appropriate for the discipline be included, but the findings of this committee are that student ratings alone are insufficient measures for summative evaluations of faculty teaching roles. The seven criteria include the following:

1. evidence-based measures of student learning (such as pre and post testing or other samples of student work)
2. evaluation (by peers and/or administrators) of course materials, learning objectives, and examinations
3. in-class visitation by peers and/or administrators
4. a statement by the faculty member describing his/her methods and/or a teaching philosophy
5. exit interview/surveys with current graduates/alumni
6. additional criteria as appropriate for the discipline and degree level of the students, and
7. student ratings of instruction

Recommendation #2: Supporting Materials

The Ad Hoc Committee proposed two web portals:

1. one for faculty on how to prepare teaching dossiers with links to other institutions, resources, and workshops such as those at OTEI, and
2. one for peer reviewers and administrators on strategies for evaluating teaching dossiers with links to other institutions, resources, and workshops such as those at OTEI

• Implementation Information: Attached as appendices to this documents are resources and links suggested for these portals.
Recommendation #3: Location and maintenance of Web Support

These dual portals need to directly linked as an embedded hotlink to the Faculty Manual Part IX, D., #11. As the current Faculty Manuals are accessible as .pdfs, then a hotlink can be made within the document to the portals for this information. The Committee also recommends that updates and maintenance of these materials occur at least annually, and more often as the University changes and upgrades its web pages. The Committee expressed deep concern that the maintenance of Clemson pages degrade without warning and often without recognition of severed links to important College, Department/Unit/Program information.

Recommendation #4: Access to Criteria and Guidelines

The College, Department/Unit/Program guidelines conforming to Faculty Manual requirements for Part IX, D., #11 need to be accessible by all faculty and their evaluators (administrators and peer reviewers, Tenure, Promotion, and (Re)appointment (TPR) committees) at any time.

- **Rationale:** Some departments provide these documents only once per year via attachments to emails and do not have posted copies on the web for ready access at any point. Many departments do not have explicit instructions/guidelines for preparing annual review (Form 3) evaluations regarding Part IX, D., #11.

- **Suggestion:** Perhaps the Faculty Senate web page or the Provost’s web pages could host a repository (similar to the Syllabus repository) where College, Department/Unit/Program Annual Evaluation guidelines and TPR guidelines can be posted and updated each Academic year.
Appendix A: Supporting Sources

Appendix A1: Evidence-Based Measures of Student Learning
Appendix A2: Evaluation of Course Materials, Learning Objectives, and Examinations
Appendix A3: In-Class Visitation by Peers and/or Administrators
Appendix A4: Statement of Instructional Methods or Teaching Philosophy
Appendix A5: Exit Interview/Surveys with Graduates/Alumni
Appendix A6: Additional Criteria as Appropriate for Discipline and Student/Degree Level
Appendix A7: Student Ratings of Instruction

Appendix B: Minutes of the Committee

Appendix C: Materials on Student Comments
Appendix A1: Evidence-Based Measures of Student Learning

Print Sources


Online Sources

http://www.salgsite.org/

https://engineering.purdue.edu/SCI/workshop/tools.html

http://www.ncsu.edu/per/TestInfo.html

http://www7.nationalacademies.org/bose/DBER_Homepage.html


http://www7.nationalacademies.org/bose/DBER_Homepage.html
Appendix A2: Evaluation of Course Materials, Learning Objectives, and Examinations

Print Sources


Online Sources

http://ctl.utexas.edu/teaching-resources/advance-your-career/assemble-your-teaching-portfolio/
http://www.utexas.edu/provost/policies/evaluation/tenure/
http://ucat.osu.edu/teaching_portfolio/teaching_port.html
http://www.vcu.edu/cte/resources/nfrg/DevelopingaTeachingPortfolio.pdf
http://cft.vanderbilt.edu/teaching-guides/reflecting/teaching-portfolios/
http://www.oid.ucla.edu/publications/evalofinstruction/eval4
http://www2.acenet.edu/resources/chairs/docs/Seldin.pdf - Guidelines for chairs
http://ltc.uvic.ca/servicesprograms/teaching_dossier_kit.php
http://www.tss.uoguelph.ca/resources/idres/packageTd.html
Appendix A3: In-Class Visitation by Peers and/or Administrators

Online Sources

University of Medicine and Dentistry (New Jersey): 24 links
http://cte.umdnj.edu/career_development/career_peer_review.cfm

Center for Excellence in Learning and Teaching (Iowa State):
http://www.celt.iastate.edu/faculty/peer_review.html

Center for Instructional Development and Research (U. of Washington):
http://depts.washington.edu/cidrweb/consulting/peer-review.html

University of Minnesota:
http://www1.umn.edu/ohr/teachlearn/resources/peer/index.html

"Teaching and Learning Excellence" (U Wisconsin – Madison):
https://tle.wisc.edu/teaching-academy/peer/examples

"Peer Review of Teaching" project (U of Nebraska – Lincoln):
http://www.courseportfolio.org/peer/pages/index.jsp

"Peer Review of Teaching" (North Carolina State U):
http://www.ncsu.edu/provost/peer_review/

"Center for Excellence in Teaching, Learning, and Assessment” (Howard U):
http://www.cetla.howard.edu/teaching_resources/PeerReview.html

"Centre for Teaching, Learning, and Technology” (U of British Columbia):
http://ctl.t.ubc.ca/programs/all-our-programs/peer-review-of-teaching/

"Center for Teaching and Learning” (Truman State U):
http://tctl.truman.edu/resources/PeerGuidelines/PeerReviewTeach.asp
Appendix A4: Statement of Instructional Methods or Teaching Philosophy

Print Sources


Online Sources

http://ctl.utexas.edu/teaching-resources/advance-your-career/assemble-your-teaching-portfolio/
http://www.utexas.edu/provost/policies/evaluation/tenure/
http://ucat.osu.edu/teaching_portfolio/teaching_port.html
http://www.vcu.edu/cte/resources/nfrg/DevelopingaTeachingPortfolio.pdf - Lists even more possible materials to include than the above
http://cft.vanderbilt.edu/teaching-guides/reflecting/teaching-portfolios/
http://www oid.ucla.edu/publications/evalofinstruction/eval4
http://www2.acenet.edu/resources/chairs/docs/Seldin.pdf - Guidelines for chairs
http://ltc.uvic.ca/servicesprograms/teaching_dossier_kit.php
http://www.tss.uoguelph.ca/resources/idres/packagetd.html
Appendix A5: Exit Interview/Surveys with Graduates/Alumni

Print Sources


Appendix A6: Additional Criteria as Appropriate for Discipline and Student/Degree Level

This information should vary by College, Department, and program.

Criteria Recommended in the Leading Literature on Evaluating Teaching Effectiveness


- Narrative description of teaching materials, including improvements and the ways they enhance teaching and learning
- Curriculum revisions
- Description and evaluation of instructional innovations
- Representative course syllabi with assessment of what each says about your beliefs about teaching and learning, the nature of the course, and your way of teaching it
- Teaching improvement/professional development activities (with documentation) and how you have applied what you learned
- Short- and long-term teaching goals
- Teaching honors, awards, or nominations
- Successful mentees/graduates in the field
- Student scores on a comprehensive exam or knowledge survey before and after the course. Information on knowledge surveys is at [http://serc.carleton.edu/NAGTWorkshops/assess/knowledgesurvey/index.html](http://serc.carleton.edu/NAGTWorkshops/assess/knowledgesurvey/index.html)
- Successive drafts of student papers of varying quality, with instructor comments
- Student publications or conference presentations prepared under your direction

Survey of students’ perceived learning gains in the course (used as proxy for actual student learning)

- Student Assessment of Learning Gains (SALG) survey instrument at [www.salgsite.org/](http://www.salgsite.org/)
- Transparency in Learning and Teaching survey instrument (ongoing study). Form at [https://illinois.edu/sb/sec/1428](https://illinois.edu/sb/sec/1428) and information at [http://www.teachingandlearning.illinois.edu/transparency.html](http://www.teachingandlearning.illinois.edu/transparency.html)

“How much has this course improved your skills/abilities in each of the following?” List of skills is at [http://www.clemson.edu/OTEI/services/webinars.html](http://www.clemson.edu/OTEI/services/webinars.html)
Weaknesses of students’ perceived learning as evidence of teaching effectiveness: 1) Students can be poor assessors of their actual learning gains (Bowman, 2011; Weinberg, Hashimoto, & Fleisher, 2009). 2) Students overestimate their knowledge and abilities when they know the least and underestimate them when they know the most (Kruger & Dunning, 1999, 2002; Longhurst & Norton, 1997); likely exceptions are the best students and students in course with a great deal of technical vocabulary. Also see the literature on student self-assessment and http://serc.carleton.edu/NAGTWorkshops/assess/knowledgesurvey/index.html

Materials recommended by other sources (see list of web sites below)

Improvement in students’ attitudes (e.g., final reflection/personal-growth essay; survey at beginning and end of course). For a rationale for using this variable, see K. K. Perkins, W. K. Adams, S. J. Pollock, N. D. Finkelstein, & C. E. Weiman. Correlating Student Attitudes with Student Learning Using the Colorado Learning Attitudes about Science. The article and the survey are at http://www.colorado.edu/physics/EducationIssues/papers/Perkins_PERCfinal.pdf

Quality of or improvements in finals, grades, assignments, participation, portfolios, and other student products

First-day survey of students’ reasons for taking your course, if it is you

Students’ opinion of success in meeting the learning outcomes (extra evaluation item)

Peer testimonials of your former students’ learning

Performances of your former students in more advanced courses, as documented by grades (e.g., Weinberg et al., 2009)

Former and current students attracted to majoring in the discipline and/or going to graduate school because of you

Current or former students winning awards or competitions in the subject matter you have taught them

Service as chair of senior projects, Creative Inquiry groups, and graduate committees

National and licensing exam results in your area(s) of teaching (e.g., nursing)

Job placements of former students and their employers’ opinions of their preparedness and work quality

Impact of service-learning projects and the reactions of the service-learning clients

Unsolicited student feedback after the course or years later
Good Online Sources of Information on Items That Document Teaching Effectiveness

These web pages reiterate the teaching portfolio items recommended by Seldin et al. (2010), and some offer links to examples.

http://ctl.utexas.edu/teaching-resources/advance-your-career/assemble-your-teaching-portfolio/

http://www.utexas.edu/provost/policies/evaluation/tenure/

http://ucat.osu.edu/teaching_portfolio/teaching_port.html

http://cft.vanderbilt.edu/teaching-guides/reflecting/teaching-portfolios/

http://www.oid.ucla.edu/publications/evalofinstruction/eval4

http://www2.acenet.edu/resources/chairs/docs/Seldin.pdf - Guidelines for chairs

http://ltc.uvic.ca/servicesprograms/teaching_dossier_kit.php

http://www.tss.uoguelph.ca/resources/idres/packagetd.html

http://www.vcu.edu/cte/resources/nfrg/DevelopingaTeachingPortfolio.pdf - Lists even more forms of evidence of teaching effectiveness than those given above

Print Sources


Appendix A7: Student Ratings and Comments

Bibliography on Ratings


Bibliography on Comments


Appendix B: Minutes of the Committee
Faculty Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Teaching Excellence

Meeting Minutes

19 Sept. 2011, 9 AM, 420 Tillman Hall

Present: Dan Warner, President Faculty Senate
Linda Nilson, Teaching Learning
Jane C. Lindle, Chair Ad Hoc Committee, Recorder

Products:

1) Due for January or February to Policy Committee and Scholastic Policy Committee for Faculty Manual changes in language of drafts for evaluation of faculty teaching –
   a) including changes in the existing forms for student assessment of courses and instructors ---
      adjust the means with expected grades and actual grades due
      i) Lindle will invite Horton (Chair of the SP ) to discuss the application of adjusted means
         within the current student assessment of course/instruction with IR personnel, Wicks Wescott
      ii) This discussion will also include a projected date for implementing the adjusted means
   b) Inclusion of documentation of the value, validity and reliability of student comments in any Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET)
   c) Extension of the Faculty Manual's current list of possible required added measure/s to evaluation of faculty teaching;
      i) The current list reads as follows:

Faculty Manual, Part 9, Section D, #11 (Evaluation of Teaching by Students)
The process of evaluating teaching shall also involve other evaluation results besides the summary of statistical ratings from the student evaluations as agreed upon by the faculty member and the individual responsible for signing his/her annual evaluation. These other evaluation results, taken together, must be given a weight at least equal to that assigned to student evaluations, and may include (but are not limited to) any of the following:

- evaluation of course materials, learning objectives, and examinations by peers and/or supervisors,
- comments on the student evaluations (with instructor approval)
- in-class visitation by peers and/or supervisors,
- a statement by the faculty member describing his/her methods,
- exit interviews/surveys with current graduates and alumni,
- additional criteria as appropriate to the discipline

   ii) Likely extension of this list should include measures of student learning in courses

2) Due in Spring (March) - document or webinar for Chairs and TPR chairs about multiple measures of teaching effectiveness and how to interpret them, among this information the following may be included
   a) How to interpret current and new statistics on SET (adjusted means for sex, expected and actual grades)
b) How to use SET as consumer satisfaction data with an emphasis on the requirement for additional data on instructional impact

c) How to interpret and use any and all of the additional measure of teaching effectiveness for the purposes of developing Annual Evaluations (Form-3) and for application to the deliberations by Tenure, Promotion, and Reappointment, peer review committees.

Committee membership should be manageable size with representation from each college. Suggestions for each college:

CAFLS – Molly Espey (Lindle invitation)
CAAH – Mark Spede (Nilson invitation)
CBBS – Mike Coggeshall (Nilson invitation)
COES- Melanie Cooper (Lindle Invitation)
HEHD- Jane Clark Lindle

Some of the issues among additional measures to evaluate faculty members’ teaching effectiveness include the requirements of the Higher Education Act (HEA 2010) that requires institutions to specify learning outcomes per credit hour. This mandate has implications for each faculty member’s courses and their evidence of students’ meeting the outcomes for learning per credit. These implications hold across curriculum and programs, and for all faculty, regardless of rank and tenure. Each faculty member will need to provide evidence of measuring student progress within courses. These additional evaluations of teaching effectiveness impact reappointment reviews, tenure and promotion, and post-tenure reviews.
Faculty Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Teaching Effectiveness
Tuesday, 4 October 2011
Agenda Annotated with Minutes

Present: Lindle (Chair), Coggeshall, Cooper, Espey, Nilson, Spede

Introductions:

Linda Nilson – OTEI

Janie Clark Lindle – HEHD, LCH – primarily graduate education with non-traditional students concerns about the age and condition of student evaluation of teaching (SET) format, and quality of data. Concerns about graduate advising as a form of teaching which is under recognized and under-evaluated.

Mike Coggeshall – Anthropology & Sociology - Undergrads with pre-test and post-test learning assessments

Melanie Cooper – Chemistry Education Research, investigations of how people learn to design more effective learning environments and assessments, particularly formative learning assessments – need to provide evidence of effective teaching

Molly Espey – Was Organizer of group in CAFLS to offer a broader perspective on support for Teaching Excellence and alternatives to student evaluations

Mark Spede- Director of Bands – issues in the P&T process and the over emphasis of student evaluations in the process and utilization of OTEI for support; need more support for developing of evidence of teaching and help TPR and administrators with evaluations of teaching and learning

Review of the Charge

Lindle summarized the Committee’s charge from the Faculty Senate which includes two products. The charge is derived from a proposed faculty manual change about additional evidence of teaching effectiveness to be “given a weight at least equal to that assigned to student evaluations.” While the Provost would like evidence that student comments are important to the evaluations, we will need to provide evidence of the current research on validity of such. In addition, the Higher Education Act reauthorized in 2010, has language on defined measures of student progress, which must be interpreted and described by Offices of Institutional Assessment & Institutional Research. However, because grades are not indicators of student progress, then the assessment of learning by professors is implicated in the recent HEA reauthorization. Further, the use of unadjusted means on a semester basis is not the standard operating procedure for student evaluations at comparable universities. Some of these modifications can be made as part of the initial product which is recommendations for the proposed faculty manual change.

The second product is guidelines and advisory media for department chairs, deans, and Tenure, Promotion & Reappointment Committees. They need support to help orient and guide their
interpretation of measures of effective teaching and learning in the evaluation processes of Form 3s and/or reappointment and peer review processes post-tenure.

Discussion of Products & Plan for Implementation

The discussion about changes to the proposed faculty manual wording included changes to the title, rearrangement and editing of the paragraphs to emphasize the variety of evidence of effective teaching and learning beyond SET. Committee members also shared some of their documents about measures of effective teaching and learning. Faculty colleagues can provide evidence of effectiveness, but they also need some guidance on how to observe and evaluate teaching.

There are concerns about the online evaluations and the degree to which a low return rate also may lead to a bimodal distribution. Some faculty members supplement this SET with in-class and end of class questions. SET results can provide feedback on the learning environment, but do not speak to overall effective teaching. Some questions about content and teaching methods are not valid in terms of having a relationship to the goal of teaching, which is student learning, and among remedies for this problem may be training for administrators. Perhaps a sentence can be added to the policy that prevents rank-ordering faculty on invalid individual questions. Further, learning-centered should be proposed, if not added for the current SET revisions.

Lindle will provide a summary of literature on individual student comments to the committee at its next meeting. Cooper will provide documents from a prior committee.

Spede will draft a new introductory paragraph with language and bullets from an added bullet on evidenced-based measures of learning; and also teaching philosophy added to the bullet on methods for the next meeting. Another bullet concerning consultation with OTEI, but using more enduring terms will be drafted as well.

The other product for chairs, deans, and for TPR committees will be discussed at the next meeting. The discussion will include ideas about the format and content. Accessibility is also an issue.

Next Meeting:

Tuesday, November 1, 2011, 9 AM, room 420 Tillman Hall

Respectfully submitted

Jane Clark Lindle, Chair & Recording Secretary
Agenda Item #1: Review of Recent Literature on the Value of Student Comments

Ms. Amanda B. Werts, PhD Candidate in Educational Leadership, presented her review of research over the past decade or so about the ways in which student comments have been used and what value they have in the process of building effective teaching. The major conclusion is that raw comments which are rarely connected to specific ratings have little value. The primary value of comments, once they have been analyzed systematically, is for the formative development of teaching effectiveness. Raw comments, (i.e. those which have not been analyzed) should not be used in summative evaluations by either peer review committees for reappointment, promotion and tenure process nor by administrators in the annual evaluation (Form 3) process. Ms. Werts explained the design and analysis of the various studies which asserted these conclusions.

The Committee’s discussion of this presentation focused primarily on wording in the Faculty Manual. The current Faculty Manual lists one required element in the teaching effectiveness section, student ratings. These ratings are currently collected online via Student Assessment of Instructors (SAI) ratings. Additionally, the intent of current Faculty Manual language is an assertion that open-ended comments are faculty property, and not required as part of the ratings. In fact, the open-ended comments section of SAI are not tied to any specific ratings items, which according to the literature review violates appropriate practice for use of student comments. The rationale behind this assertion has been a long-replicated, research-based finding that raw comments are not inherently useful. The current review reasserted the same conclusion that individual comments randomly sampled are an arbitrary, unsystematic, and inappropriate use/abuse of them.

The Committee discussed the intent of the Faculty Manual language in light of the research base and in the context of each of the five colleges’ current practice in the Tenure, Promotion and Reappointment (TPR) or Faculty Annual Evaluation (Form 3) processes. Many of the colleges and/or departmental TPR Guidelines and many of the Deans and Department Chairs require,
rather than request, that faculty relinquish individual student comments in their raw form. These requirements do not follow the language in the Faculty Manual, and the Committee discussed the many issues associated with this inconsistency between local guidelines and the overall position in the Faculty Manual. A primary issue is the vulnerability of faculty, particularly junior faculty, to arbitrary interpretation of negative individual student comments, especially given the presentation on the current literature. Conversely, many faculty are unaware of how they should analyze and interpret student comments appropriately. Given this lack of knowledge, faculty, like their evaluators, may inappropriately focus on random comments rather than conducting a systematic analysis. Additionally, administrators or peer review committees may be struck by a few negative remarks instead of using a carefully conducted data reduction process for appropriately interpreting student comments. Notable in the presentation, and its accompanying report, was an observation about possible reasons that negative comments attract more attention than positive ones. The Committee considered multiple means of addressing the concerns raised by the literature review and awareness of current campus practices. Committee considered the following potential actions:

- A review of all TPR documents to assure that these documents are consistent with the Faculty Manual
- Orientation sessions for both faculty and administrators on the Faculty Manual’s sections on personnel practices, and particularly on multiple sources of evidence of effective teaching and learning
- Online or other products that might help with the education of both faculty and administrators about the

Given the work schedule for this Committee, members determined to focus the remainder of the meeting on the wording of the Faculty Manual and recommendations associated with it. The Committee also concluded to postpone discussion of products and other recommendations to its next meeting and to subsequent meetings during the Spring 2012 semester.

The Committee affirmed that the current intent of the Faculty Manual language should be upheld, and further recommended that Ms. Werts’s written report be posted to the Faculty Senate web pages for access and reference by Clemson faculty and administrators.

Agenda Item #2: Discussion of Wording for the Faculty Manual Section on Teaching Effectiveness

In light of the discussion of the literature, the Committee considered several ways to improve the wording for the Faculty Manual section on Teaching Effectiveness (Part IX. Professional Practices, Section D, Teaching Practices, #11), which is currently named “Evaluation of Teaching by Students.” The Committee expressed a desire that the implied focus of this section shifts to evidence of learning and teaching effectiveness, not on a single piece of evidence, the student ratings from the online, Student Assessment of Instructors (SAI).
In further discussion of the wording of the section for the Faculty Manual, the Committee chose to work with the 2010 version approved by the Faculty Senate, even though the current version of the Faculty Manual has wording from an earlier point. The Committee agreed that this version was a part of its charge and thus, the 2010 version, which by vote of the Senate, expresses the direction the faculty desires for this section.

Committee members noted the importance of learning evidence as the proposed focus for this part of the faculty manual. Evidence of learning is a more valid indication of effective teaching than perceptions of satisfaction with a course or course activities or students’ personal opinions about their instructors’ personal characteristics. These multiple sources of evidence, each, require a systematic analysis and may be used as triangulation of data on the effects of teaching, including evidence of learning. The Committee also indicated that it preferred that all possible sources of learning and teaching evidence appear at the beginning of the section. Another point of agreement was that the required source of student ratings should not outweigh all other elements. As the wording now reads, the interpretation could be that student ratings are always never less than 50% of the evidence presented by faculty.

Another concern that the Committee expressed in light of its prior discussion about the conflict between current practices and the Faculty Manual focused on this phrase:

The process of evaluating teaching shall also involve other evaluation results besides the summary of statistical ratings from the student evaluations as agreed upon by the faculty member and the individual responsible for signing his/her annual evaluation.

The Committee again referenced the vulnerability of faculty to administrators who currently insist on receiving comments despite the Faculty Manual’s position. The Committee discussed the risks inherent in this statement. If administrators choose to ignore the Faculty Manual about open-ended comments, then the probability is rather high that administrators also will ignore the statements about the multiple sources of evidence necessary to fairly evaluate teaching and learning. As now written, this clause raises the potential that student ratings could remain the only evidence of teaching submitted in some departments or colleges. The Committee determined that the final phrase should be struck.

Recommendations:

1- Prior Clemson University-wide Committees have considered the issues of open-ended student comments and conducted literature reviews. However, those records seem lost to institutional memory, rather than archived. The current Committee requests that the Faculty Senate post Ms. Amanda B. Werts’s report on the recent literature concerning student comments on the Senate website for ongoing access by Clemson faculty and administrators and as a means of establishing an archive of this work to date. This report is attached to these minutes.
2- The student ratings questions on the current version, the online Student Assessment of Instructors (SAI), need to be revised and updated to current research on effective learning and teaching. Per the Faculty Manual, the Faculty Senate may direct the Scholastic Policy Committee to address research-based updates to the student ratings questions.

3- On the matter of open-ended student comments, the Committee agreed to the following:
   a. Because of the current and historical literature's consistent conclusion that raw comments have no inherent value, all open-ended questions should be removed from the current instrument, pending review, consideration, and confirmation by the Scholastic Policy Committee
   b. Should the Scholastic Policy Committee determine to retain open-ended comments on the ratings instrument, then the open-ended comments should be located in proximity to specific questions in order that any specific item's rating and its associated comments can be appropriately analyzed for formative purposes in faculty's reflections and further development of improvements in instruction and learning.

4- All TPR guidelines should be reviewed to see that they are in accordance with the faculty manual.

5- By attachment to these minutes, wording changes to the Faculty Manual should be forwarded to the Executive/Advisory Committee of the Faculty Senate for action. The Committee agreed to use as a foundation for its recommendations, the 2010 version of the wording changes passed by the Faculty Senate, even though older wording remains in the Faculty Manual. The wording changes include the following features:
   a. Change in the title of the section to emphasize a focus on the results of teaching, which is evidence of learning
   b. Reconstruction of the section to provide an emphasis on multiple sources of evidence, which, while retaining the student ratings requirement, also indicate the following:
      i. Comments remain the property of faculty for the purposes of faculty reflection and development and not surrendered for summative evaluations of any type (neither the Tenure, Promotion and Reappointment - TPR- nor the Faculty Annual Evaluation - Form 3- processes)
      ii. Emphasizing the relative value of student ratings as no greater than any other sources
      iii. Emphasizing that multiple sources of evidence of teaching and learning effectiveness are necessary as no single source provides sufficient evidence
      iv. Emphasizing that trends among all sources have more interpretive value than any single evidentiary source
      v. Emphasizing the necessity of multiple sources as triangulation (i.e. validation) of any summative conclusions
6- The rationale for the wording changes that include the following information:
   a. Explanation for the section title change that effective teaching is shown through evidence of student learning rather than student opinion.
   b. References to Werts's literature review which emphasizes the necessity for reduction of raw comments in a systematic analysis process, which likely requires training for both faculty and administrators on the two processes indicated in the review (conversion to quantified categories and qualitative coding for formative reflection tied to comments directly associated to particular item ratings).
   c. Reiteration of the importance of multiple sources of evidence of learning to fairly evaluate teaching effectiveness.

Next Meeting: Tuesday, November 29, 2011, 9 AM, room 420 Tillman Hall

Agenda includes a Spring 2012 semester schedule and development of a work plan for the products associated with the Committee’s recommendations for the Faculty Manual

Respectfully submitted

Jane Clark Lindle, Chair & Recording Secretary
Faculty Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Teaching Effectiveness  
Tuesday, 29 November 2011  
Agenda Annotated with Minutes

Present: Lindle (HEHD - Chair), Coggeshall (BBS), Cooper (CES), Espey (formerly of CAFLS, now BBS), Nilson (OTEI), Spede (AAH)

Agenda Item #1: Update on the Faculty Senate’s receipt of our proposed changes to the Faculty Manual and Nov. 1 minutes

Lindle reported on the Faculty Senate meeting of November 8th (2011) where Senators had copies of the 1 November 2011 Ad Hoc Committee meeting minutes, the literature review report by Ms. Werts, and the Ad Hoc Committee’s proposed Faculty Manual changes for the section on evaluation of student learning and teaching. There were few comments as the Senate will not take up action until after the Executive Advisory Committee decides which standing committees will review the Ad Hoc Committee’s recommendations. However, two Senators did ask for clarification of how the comments on student ratings should be analyzed and interpreted per the recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee. Both questions focused on steps for analysis of comments, interpretation of that analysis, and then proceed with decision making for either peer review for promotion/tenure/reappointment or for annual evaluation (Form 3s). The Executive Advisory Committee meets today (29 November 2011) in the afternoon, and Lindle will update the Ad Hoc Committee on what steps it will take next.

Agenda Item #2: Spring Semester 2012 Meeting Dates

The Ad Hoc Committee set four dates for its spring semester 2012 meetings. These dates include three Tuesday mornings on January 24, February 21, March 27, and one Thursday morning, April 26. All meetings will begin at 9 AM for approximately an hour to an hour and a half. All meetings will be in room 420 in Tillman Hall.

Agenda Item #3: Tasks and potential products supporting recommended Faculty Manual changes

The Committee discussed what the nature and number of products might be to support the proposed wording of the Faculty Manual. The discussion covered a variety of formats and potential modes of support to help both faculty and evaluators (peer review committees and/or administrators) produce and examine evidence of effective learning and instruction. The faculty users may represent a range of faculty experience, not solely new assistant professors. The potential products could be anything that these users may find helpful from web posts to podcasts or brochures. Clemson’s Office of Teaching Effectiveness and Innovation (OTEI) already offers many workshops that address a range of appropriate evidence for teaching dossiers/portfolios. The issue for this Committee is to provide basis support for the fundamental requirements and recommendations spelled out in the proposed Faculty Manual changes.

The Committee acknowledged concern that its work follows efforts in the spring of 2010 to change the Faculty Manual to move toward a teaching portfolio of multiple sources of evidence of learning rather than a limited consumer satisfaction rating from the student course evaluations.
The Committee deliberated over the investment of its time and effort now to perhaps meet the same fate as the 2010 recommendations, now nearly two years ago. However, because effectiveness in the classroom is more than students' perceptions, the Committee will offer some products that can be helpful to faculty and also their evaluators.

Given the proposed wording in the Faculty Manual, the additional data sources include the following six suggestions:

1. evidence-based measurements of student learning (such as pre and post testing)
2. evaluation (by peers and/or administrators) of course materials, learning objectives, and examinations
3. in-class visitation by peers and/or administrators
4. a statement by the faculty member describing his/her methods and/or a teaching philosophy
5. exit interview/surveys with current graduates/alumni
6. additional criteria as appropriate for the discipline and degree level of the students

And the seventh source is the single requirement, student ratings of courses. Per the new wording proposed for the Faculty Manual, based on the review of literature on student comments as well as the questions from the floor of the Faculty Senate, both faculty and evaluators (peer review committees and administrators) will need support in their analysis and interpretation of student comments.

Although the Faculty Manual currently, and as proposed for changes in this section, only requires the students' ratings of courses, the Committee considered whether or not the other six listed sources of data might be a requirement. Further the Committee deliberated over the necessity of required training for evaluators on their use in decision making about these additional sources. The Committee decided to expect and accept inevitable variation from college to college as well as department to department.

These matters ought to be addressed in the guidelines for Tenure, Promotion and Reappointment Review as well as Post-Tenure Review, but the Committee will not make such a requirement, but perhaps a recommendation.

The Ad Hoc Committee discussed multiple ways to communicate support for the seven types of evidence it proposed for changes to the Faculty Manual. The support needs to define these different types of evidence, provide research-based sources, and links to resources and workshops that can help the two groups of users (faculty and evaluators) develop their own strategies and examples of these seven types of evidence.

The Ad Hoc Committee proposed two web portals:
3. one for faculty on how to prepare teaching dossiers with links to other institutions, resources, and workshops such as those at OTEI, and
4. one for peer reviewers and administrators on strategies for evaluating teaching dossiers with links to other institutions, resources, and workshops such as those at OTEI

The Ad Hoc Committee would like to see these portals connected to the Faculty Manual Section on Evaluation of Learning and Teaching (Part IX, Section D, #11). Because the Faculty Manual is a .pdf on the Faculty Senate page, these portals could also be located on the Faculty Senate page.

The Ad Hoc Committee’s work for the coming spring 2012 semester will begin with a web portal design concerning the recommendations for seven types of evidence for both groups of users. The Committee’s first meeting (January 24) will focus on the development of a design for primary pages for these evidence types and users. Potentially, the design process will continue through the spring and include review of peer institutions’ web sources on teaching portfolios/dossiers.

Another project for the coming semester will be an online survey of user interest for selected faculty (among ranks) and selected evaluators (TPR chairs and administrators who complete Form 3s on faculty).

Next Meeting: January 24, 2012, 9 AM in room 420 Tillman Hall.

Agenda: The structure of the web presence will be further discussed. Each Ad Hoc Committee member will explore web-based resources at peer institutions for one or two of the seven kinds of evidence for either group of users. This exploration should help conceptualize the potential for the web portal/s at Clemson.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence of Learning and Teaching</th>
<th>Committee Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. evidence-based measurements of student learning (such as pre and post testing)</td>
<td>Cooper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. evaluation (by peers and/or administrators) of course materials, learning objectives, and examinations</td>
<td>Espey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. in-class visitation by peers and/or administrators</td>
<td>Spede</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. a statement by the faculty member describing his/her methods and/or a teaching philosophy</td>
<td>Coggeshall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. exit interview/surveys with current graduates/alumni</td>
<td>Lindle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. additional criteria as appropriate for the discipline and degree level of the students</td>
<td>Espey &amp; Nilson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. student ratings of courses, particularly the analysis of comments</td>
<td>Lindle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respectfully submitted,

Jane Clark Lindle, Chair & Recording Secretary
Ad Hoc Committee on Teaching Effectiveness  
Clemson Faculty Senate  
Meeting 24 January 2012

Present: Coggeshall (BBS), Cooper (CES), Espey (formerly CAFLS, now BBS), Lindle (HEHD), Nilson (OTEI), Spede (AAH)

Agenda: Teaching Effectiveness Web Design

Discussion:
Committee members discussed their preferences for web presence on the topic of Evidence of Effective Teaching and Learning. The discussion included consideration of other institutions’ web presence on the matter of evaluation of faculty teaching and student learning, teaching portfolio recommendations, and faculty development web sites for improving teaching and learning in higher education. Some examples of these sites were shared by Committee members:

http://www7.nationalacademies.org/bose/DBER/Homepage.html

One of the most cited traditional sources for peer review of teaching is a book by Chism. Spede shared the reference information as follows:


Committee members also discussed the difficulty in finding relevant TPR and other documents from the department to the college level on Clemson’s site. Although most units have web sites, faculty may not have access to helpful information in their own unit. Important guidelines may be distributed only once a year by email, and then can’t be retrieved from the department web site. The discussion led to the following recommendations:

Recommendation #1: Using the Clemson Syllabus Repository as a rough model, a TPR Guidelines Repository should be created that all faculty can access. This access would help units in updating guidelines and in investigating campus practices.

Recommendation #2: For specific information about resources to meet Faculty Manual policy on the evaluation of teaching, the link for this information should connect off of the front page of the Faculty Senate’s web page. The menu title should be:

Evidence of Effective Teaching and Learning

Recommendation #3: The menu on the Evidence of Effective Teaching and Learning page should have the following two choices:

Faculty and Lecturers
Peer Review Committees and Administrators

Recommendation #4: Sub menus for both choices in #2 should be the 7 specifications of teaching/learning evidence provided in the Faculty Manual policy, as follows:

Faculty and Lecturers

Evidence -based measures of student learning
Course materials, learning objectives, and examinations
In-class visitation by peers and/or administrators
Statement of methods and/or teaching philosophy
Exit interviews with current grads/alumni
Student course evaluations
Additional evidence

Peer Review Committees and Administrators
Evidence -based measures of student learning
Course materials, learning objectives, and examinations
In-class visitation by peers and/or administrators
Statement of methods and/or teaching philosophy
Exit interviews with current grads/alumni
Student course evaluations
Additional criteria

Recommendation #5: The content for each section should consist of links to other sites, media streams and media casts, and .pdfs. The preferred .pdfs should be peer-reviewed articles.

Recommendation #6: Some definition, description and explanation about each link may be necessary.
For example, some of the links will be duplicated in both sections of this site, but in the Faculty portion a note or explanation may state that the linked info is perhaps more descriptive of evaluation and interpretation of evidence, than of producing evidence. The same link in the Peer Review/Administrator portion might explain that the information will help with analyzing the Faculty member’s performance, but might not include guidance on how to change the faculty member’s practices.

Recommendation #7: Under the Additional Criteria/Evidence sub-menus of both sections, a wiki or other collaborative site, where people can post what they find should be created. This portion should be divided by colleges and discipline.

The next meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, February 21, 2012 at 9 AM in Room 420 Tillman Hall.
The following chart lists the tasks for each committee member for the various sub menus recommended for the web site. Committee member should bring to the next meeting up to 10 strong links in their section along with 4 or 5 others for the committee to review.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence of Learning and Teaching</th>
<th>Committee Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. evidence-based measurements of student learning (such as pre and post testing)</td>
<td>Cooper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. evaluation (by peers and/or administrators) of course materials, learning objectives, and examinations</td>
<td>Espey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. in-class visitation by peers and/or administrators</td>
<td>Spede</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. a statement by the faculty member describing his/her methods and/or a teaching philosophy</td>
<td>Coggeshall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. exit interview/surveys with current graduates/alumni</td>
<td>Lindle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. additional criteria as appropriate for the discipline and degree level of the students</td>
<td>Espey &amp; Nilson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. student ratings of courses, particularly the analysis of comments</td>
<td>Lindle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respectfully submitted
Jane Clark Lindle, Chair & Recoding Secretary
Faculty Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Teaching Effectiveness  
Tuesday, 21 February 2012 Minutes

Present: Lindle (HEHD - Chair), Coggeshall (BBS), Cooper (CES), Espey (formerly of CAFLS, now BBS), Nilson (OTEI),  
Regrets: Spede (AAH)

Agenda Item #1: Content Sources for Proposed Web Presence

Coggeshall, Espey and Nilson provided links and citations to sources suitable for the proposed web content concerning the implementation of effective teaching/learning strategies and the interpretation of evidence of teaching and learning. Cooper, Lindle and Spede plan to share documents to follow this meeting

Agenda Item #2: Implementation of the Web Design and Content

Lindle reported that the Executive Advisory Committee and the Faculty Senate had taken no actions on the Ad Hoc Committee’s January 24 minutes and its seven recommendations at either meeting (Jan. 31 and Feb. 14, respectively). The Committee members were particularly concerned about the design and maintenance of the proposed web design and content since Creative Services has placed obstacles to many online pages for many units and departments at Clemson. All seven recommendations depend on consultation and support from Creative Services. The Committee felt it had reached an impasse as to next steps in this process.

Agenda Item #3: Final Report to the Faculty Senate

Members of the Ad Hoc Committee directed Lindle to compose a final report to the Faculty Senate. They expect summaries of the recommendations from all minutes of this committee plus a final recommendation for an web-site implementation committee to be formed among representatives of all ranks of tenure-track faculty (assistant, associate and full), as well as from department and unit TPR chairs or designees across all colleges. The Committee noted that while resources for effective teaching are applicable for lecturers and teaching assistants, the sources and web design assumed the audiences for teaching effectiveness measure pertained to tenure-track evaluations for reappointment, promotion and tenure and for annual evaluations (Form-3s) aligned with the TPR process for tenure-track faculty. The members of the committee are aware of discussions about a promotion process for lecturers, but as that was a simultaneous discussion, this final report addresses only tenure track faculty among the ranks of assistant professor, associate professor, and full professor.

The Final Report will be circulated to committee members electronically for input and editing. If a difference of opinion emerges concerning substantive issues in the Final Report, then the remaining scheduled meetings will be held for face-to-face discussion and resolution. The remaining scheduled meetings are Tuesday, March 27, and Thursday, April 26 at 9:00 AM in room 420 Tillman Hall.

Respectfully submitted
Jane Clark Lindle, PhD, E.T. Moore Professor of Educational Leadership
Appendix C:

Materials on Student Comments
Student Evaluation of Teaching: What Value are Written Comments?

Amanda B. Werts
Clemson University
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Executive Summary

Most recent research on student evaluation of teaching (SET) noted little usefulness in written comments. This is partly due to the fact that most comments are not connected to specific survey items and thus, through the context of their presentation emerge as arbitrary statements about the classroom experience. Most research on written comments discussed the manner in which written comments become valuable rather than any merit of inherent value. Overall, most literature discussing SET's written comments fell within one of the following categories:

- recommendations on how to convert comments into quantifiable codes or categories or
- developmental heuristics for faculty's reflective use in interpreting written comments to improve teaching.

Overall, appropriate use of written comments included understanding and/or enhancement of quantified responses primarily within the context of specific survey items.

Three strategies were identified in the literature to code or categorize written comments: (a) pareto analysis, (b) a comparison of objective and subjective dimensions of ratings and comments, and (c) the identification of descriptors of effective teaching practice.

Most commonly, written comments are understood as a formative assessment of teaching practice so that instructors can improve. Overall, research on written comments acknowledged the difficulty and impossibility of deriving conclusions about instructors from written comments. In this review, scant studies found any application for summative use of comments. Two that did so both concluded that written comments can be useful in summative evaluation only if they are attached with specific student ratings and after comments have been analytically reduced from their raw form.
Literature dating back to the 1950s (Guthrie, 1949; Lovell & Haner, 1955) and 1960s (Costin, 1968; Gustad, 1961) discussed the relative merits and pitfalls of students’ evaluations of faculty teaching. In recent decades, inquiries into student evaluation of teaching (SET) commonly used in higher education focused on resulting ratings (Abrimi, 2002; Marsh & Roche, 1997; Pounder, 2007; Watchel, 1998) and the variables affecting them (Greenwald & Gillmore, 1997; McKeachie, 1997; Ryan & Harrison, 1995). In contrast, few studies explained the usefulness of written comments that often accompany these ratings (Alhija & Fesko, 2009; Caudill, 2002; Lewis, 2001). Authors, such as Pan, Tan, Ragupath, Booluck, Roop, and Ip (2009), acknowledged two obstacles in systematically using and analyzing written comments in that they “have no built-in structure and are usually presented as a series of random, unconnected statements about the teacher and the teaching” (p. 78). Overall, the scant studies focused on student’s written comments sought to understand what these comments tell us about effective teaching practice or how to use them to obtain meaningful information about improving teaching and learning (Algozzine et al., 2004).

In most cases, researchers explicitly or implicitly assumed that written comments must be analyzed in concert with the quantitative ratings that SET generate (Abd-Elrahman, Andreu & Abbot, 2010; Alhija & Fesko, 2009; Caudill, 2002; Lewis, 2001; Ory, Braskamp & Pieper, 1980). Typically, written comments were analyzed with a formative emphasis on improving teaching practice (e.g. Braskamp, Ory & Peiper, 1981; Caudill, 2002; Hodges & Stanton, 2007) rather than as a summative tool for personnel decisions such as reappointment, dismissal or tenure (e.g. Pan et al., 2009). Research on written comments discussed the manner in which such comments become valuable rather than any inherent value in any one single comment or the
raw data (e.g. listing of each comment a faculty member received). Overall, most literature discussing SET’s written comments fell within one of the following categories: (a) recommendations about how to convert comments into quantifiable codes or categories (Abdelrahman et al., 2010; Alhija & Fesko, 2009; Braskamp et al., 1981; Caudill, 2002; Lewis, 2001; Pan, et al., 2009) or (b) developmental heuristics for faculty reflections in interpreting written comments to improve their teaching (Hodge & Stanton, 2007; Lindahl & Unger, 2010; Wongsurawat, 2011).

Method

To begin this brief review of literature, academic databases, were searched for general research on students’ evaluation of teaching (e.g. Abrimi, 2002; Greenwald & Gillmore, 1997; Marsh & Roche, 1997; McKeachie, 1990, 1997; Watchel, 1998). This literature was then used to find more recent research (e.g. within the past 6 years) on SET (e.g. Pounder, 2007; Gravestock, Greenleaf & Boggs, 2009; Rogge, 2011). Then, early studies of the comments related to SET were found (Braskamp et al., 1981). Most of the research included in this report was found using the “cited by” feature of Google Scholar once early comment-related SET studies were found, and a more refined search of academic databases listed above using a combination of the terms comments, written, and student evaluation of teaching. Research was gathered until saturation (Patton, 2002) was reached with regard to the common themes found across articles.
Converting Written Comments into Quantifiable Codes or Categories

Among practices for reporting written comments on SET for tenure and promotion processes is the attachment of all comments as appendices in a faculty member’s review notebook (Segal, 2009), over which faculty members have some degree of control. Because this practice is unwieldy, overwhelming and unsystematic, researchers have attempted to find better ways to present and thus understand these written comments. These researchers often convert written comments into quantifiable codes and categories (Abd-Elrahman, et al., 2010; Braskamp et al., 1981; Caudill, 2002; Lewis, 2001; Pan et al., 2009). Further, these codes or categories were grouped according to negative or positive qualities of effective teaching. In some cases, the coding of comments sufficed (Caudill, 2002); however, other studies proceeded to compare the codes or categories to the measures generated from the ratings (Abd-Elrahman, et al., 2010; Braskamp et al., 1981; Lewis, 2001; Ory et al., 1980; Pan et al., 2009).

Three strategies were identified in the literature to code or categorize written comments: (1) pareto analysis (Caudill, 2002), (2) a comparison of objective and subjective dimensions of ratings and comments (Wongsurawat, 2011), and (3) the identification of descriptors of effective teaching practice (Abd-Elrahman et al., 2010; Braskamp et al., 1981; Lewis, 2001; Pan et al., 2009). The first strategy, pareto analysis, was employed solely as a descriptive technique for written comments (Caudill, 2002). This process led to the identification of students’ issues with the particular course, which fit within three categories: (a) hard test, (b) didn’t lecture on text material and (c) a particular instructional game which students deemed unhelpful.
Using comments as purely a descriptor of teaching practice was limited to Caudill’s (2002) study. In the following studies, some form of comparison between ratings and comments guided each study. For instance, Lewis (2001) made the simple suggestion of displaying the written comments attached to the respective student’s ratings of the professor. She goes on to suggest coding written responses according to literature on effective teaching practice.

In one of the earliest studies in this review, Braskamp et al. (1981) concluded that there is a positive correlation between positive ratings and positive comments. They divided ratings and comments according to whether they addressed the course or the instructor to conclude that written comments were more likely to be positively correlated to measures of the instructor instead of the course. Their conclusion supported the use of these findings for course improvement but not the evaluation of the instructor.

Pan et al. (2009) and Abd-Elrahman et al. (2010) also categorized written comments through a quantitative content analysis by using recurring words and phrases (N.B.: in the Pan et al., 2009 study, only 10% of comments were manually read, the rest were subjected to software designed for text). Pan et al. (2009) used students’ perceptions of effective teaching practice to create a profile of positive and negative descriptors of effective teaching practice. Abd-Elrahman et al. (2010) on the other hand, used descriptors to create the Teaching Evaluation Index (TEI), which is based on the occurrence of negative and positive comments found in the written comments. The TEI was strongly correlated with overall rating measures.
While Pan et al. (2009) did not directly correlate their categories to faculty ratings, they identified faculty who had won teaching awards from those who had not based on an overall measure (based on the ratings) of effective teaching practice. The descriptors (listed in Figure 1 below) from the effective teaching group were then used as a benchmark from which to identify the strengths and weaknesses of instructors. These descriptors of effective teaching practice differed from the ones used by Lewis (2001) because they were identified *In Vivo* (Saldaña, 2009) as opposed to being based in literature on effective practice. Finally, the researchers concluded that systematically analyzed written comments are useful for identifying effective teaching strategies and not solely for identifying desirable instructor qualities (e.g. humorous, friendly and entertaining); however to understand these results, these comments must be reduced from their rawly expressed forms and tied to specific and respective student ratings.
### Positive descriptors
- Interesting
- Approachable
- Clarity
- Ability to explain
- Effective teaching
- Knowledgeable
- Willing to help
- Aids understanding
- Friendly
- Patient
- Delivery of concepts
- Humorous
- Stimulates thinking
- Effective use of examples
- Encouraging
- Effective questioning
- Engaging
- Good lecture notes
- Concise
- Real-life applications

### Negative descriptors
- Ineffective lecturing
- Unclear
- Poor elocution
- Ineffective notes
- Page of teaching
- Time management
- Ineffective use of examples
- Not interesting
- Ineffective slides
- Poor explanation
- Difficulty in understanding
- Ineffective use of concepts
- Problems with tutorials
- Poor questioning
- Unhelpful
- Not detailed enough
- Not enough real-life applications
- Disorganized
- Unprepared
- Problem with assessments

*Figure 1.* Effective teaching descriptors identified through analysis of written comments. Adapted from Pan et al., 2009, p. 87.

**Written Comments as a Faculty Development Heuristic**

Written comments also were presented as a heuristic for faculty to understand and refine their teaching practice. Scholarship that fell within this category typically tried to determine why students wrote what they wrote in the written comments. For instance, Hodges and Stanton (2007) suggested applying Perry's (1999) taxonomy of intellectual development as a lens through which to understand student's written comments. In this way, written comments may be used to determine the level of students' intellectual growth.

Wongsurawat (2011) introduced a conceptual framework comprising four categories: (a) noise, (b) reliable and representative, (c) subjectivity representative (but not objectively reliable), and (d) objectively reliable (but not subjectively representative) to determine whether written comments were illustrative of majority or minority opinion. A comment's category was
determined by the level of correlation\(^1\) of the student's ratings with the class average rating on subjective and objective questions. He suggested that this method may provide “only negligible improvements from the status quo” but also that these correlations would help instructors “disregard valid, minority opinions” (p. 77).

Lindahl and Unger (2010) wanted to better understand students' cruel remarks within their written comments (e.g. “nice ass,” “his course ruined my senior year,” and “maybe you should just have this professor shot” p. 72). The authors suggested the concepts of deindividuation, moral disengagement and the student-as-consumer as reasons for such cruel responses. They concluded with a recommendation that universities provide support for faculty in dealing with such negative feedback.

Research on heuristics for understanding written comments on SET is primarily concerned with the student’s motivation for writing a particular comment. Lindahl and Unger (2010) and Wongsurawat (2011) illustrated the extreme range of comments from absurd to poignant. Negative comments hold inordinate attraction when taken out of context. As Bartlett (2009) explained there is a “human predisposition to focus on the bad. There are ... sound evolutionary reasons for this tendency, such as remembering which fruits are poisonous and which caves contain bears” (p. 2). Thus, faculty’s use of comments for improving their teaching practices requires developmental support for systematic analysis in order to promote appropriate interpretation and reflection.

\(^1\) Wongsurawat (2011) does not explicitly address which correlation statistic was used; however, it might be deduced from the references he makes to similar previous studies (e.g. Alhija & Fresko, 2009; Ory et al., 1980) that a Pearson Product Moment Correlation was used.
Conclusion

Even when it is suggested that written SET comments be interpreted separately from ratings (e.g. Caudill, 2002; Harper & Kuh, 2007), it is important to recognize the underlying interpretive purpose of faculty development rather than faculty evaluation. Most commonly, written comments are understood as a formative assessment of teaching practice leading to instructional improvement. Overall, research on written comments acknowledges the difficulty and impossibility of deriving summative and evaluative conclusions about instructors from written comments. Only two studies (Lewis, 2001; Pan et al., 2009) acknowledged the use of written comments in summative evaluations and both concluded that written comments can be useful in summative evaluation only if they are included in concert with some specific measure of student-level (that is, student-by-student) ratings and after comments have been systematically analyzed and reduced from their raw form.
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Completed Business

Clarification of Faculty with Administrative Appointments: This can be a murky classification. The policy committee determined that this classification should be determined on the basis of how a faculty member is reviewed. If a faculty member is reviewed by her chair/director using the Form-3 process then she is Regular Faculty.

Media Advisory Board: They unilaterally decided that faculty participation was not necessary. We met to discuss this and noted that changes to the Faculty Manual regarding committee composition must be approved by the Senate.

Social Media Guidelines: Passed concerns along to Jacob Barker. The guidelines were thoroughly revised along the lines suggested by the Faculty Senate. The Faculty Senate endorsed these guidelines. This interaction brought concerns about the tension between the desire to “protect the Clemson brand” on the part of the administration and Faculty concern with academic freedom. Cathy Sams met with the policy committee to discuss this. Faculty should remain aware about possible conflict in this area.

Interim Chairs: The faculty senate passed a policy capping the length of term of interim chairs and codifying the process by which departments provide candidates to their deans.

Intellectual Policy: The policy committee met with the IPC to voice concern over faculty ownership of class materials. The committee will consider these concerns as the IPC is revised.

Assessment Committee: The senate passed a revision to the description of this committee to clarify the role of faculty as one of oversight. This has not been approved by the provost due to concern expressed by Dr. Jackson. The policy committee met and discussed possible revisions. This will need to be taken up next year.

Textbook Policy: After considering proposed revisions to the policy on faculty authored textbooks, the policy committee elected to keep the current policy in place, but move the approval form to an appendix in the faculty manual.

Graduate Fellowships and Awards Committee: Committee revised so that the Graduate dean may designate a chair to the committee other than an associate dean of the graduate school.

Lecturers: Policy committee passed changes to the status of lecturers creating a promotion track from lecturer -> senior lecturer -> master lecturer. Departments are charged with establishing standards. Lecturers must be promoted by eighth year to remain at Clemson.

Student Evaluation: The policy committee passed the revision brought forward by the ad-hoc committee on the evaluation of teaching.

Extension of the probationary period: The senate passed a revision to this policy clarifying that any extension of the 7yr probationary period must originate with the faculty member if possible.
**Pending Business**

**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 ongoing hires. Establishing clear guidelines for the review of AA is also crucial given the demands for transparency as it pertains to raises.

**Library attendance at GCC meetings:** Policy passed a revision adding library participation. Consultation with the GAC is ongoing.

**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.

**Window for requesting extension to probationary period:** Policy recognized the arbitrariness of a 2mos window for requesting an extension to the probationary period. We do not know what a reasonable window should be. This is something the Welfare Committee may want to consider next year.

**IP policy:** Crucial that senate remain engaged on this issue. Revision of the policy is ongoing.

**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.

**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.

**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.
Proposed Faculty Manual Change
Part III, Section E, #6 (Lecturer)

Current Wording:

6. Lecturer. This rank is assigned in cases where the assignment of regular faculty ranks is not appropriate or possible. Individuals having initial lecturer appointments beginning after 15 May 2011 shall have no administrative duties inconsistent with those of regular faculty. These academic appointments are non-tenure track, shall be for one-year terms and may be renewed. For the purposes of academic appointment and reappointment, a one-year term begins August 15 and ends May 16 although lecturers may be extended benefits over the summer. Notice of renewal or non-renewal must be provided before July 15 for the following August 15-May 16 term. After May 16 following completion of four or more one-year terms of continuous appointment as a lecturer, one year’s notice of non-renewal must be provided. No notice of non-renewal shall be required if a Lecturer resigns, is terminated, or is dismissed for cause (Part IV, section K).

Proposed Wording:

6. Lecturer. This rank is assigned in cases where the assignment of regular faculty ranks is not appropriate or possible. Individuals having initial lecturer appointments beginning after 15 May 2011 shall have no administrative duties inconsistent with those of regular faculty. These academic appointments shall be for one-year terms and, beginning in Fall 2013, may be renewed for a maximum of 9 full academic years. For the purposes of academic appointment and reappointment, a one-year term begins August 15 and ends May 16 although lecturers may be extended benefits over the summer. Notice of renewal or non-renewal must be provided before July 15 for the following August 15-May 16 term. After May 16 following completion of four or more one-year terms of continuous appointment as a lecturer, one year’s notice of non-renewal must be provided. No notice of non-renewal shall be required if a Lecturer resigns, is terminated, or is dismissed for cause (Part IV, section K).

Beginning in Fall 2013, Lecturers shall be evaluated annually by their department chair/school director and by their unit tenure-promotion-(re)appointment committee following procedures and standards that shall be specified in the unit’s tenure-promotion-(re)appointment document. Beginning in Fall 2013, following a Lecturer’s fourth year of service, the department chair/school director and the unit tenure-promotion-(re)appointment committee shall conduct a comprehensive review of the Lecturer either in response to a request for promotion to Senior Lecturer or to advise the Lecturer of his/her progress towards promotion to Senior Lecturer.

Equivalent experience at Clemson may be counted towards this four year service requirement. If (a) a Lecturer fails to request promotion to Senior Lecturer by the Fall semester tenure-promotion-reappointment request deadline for regular faculty during the Lecturer’s eighth year of service, or b) a Lecturer requests promotion and is not promoted to Senior Lecturer during his or her eighth year of service, then the Lecturer shall not be reappointed following a final ninth year of service.
Rationale: The proposed changes follow the 2011-2012 Faculty Senate ad hoc Committee on Status of Lecturer recommendations regarding lecturers. There are two significant changes suggested by the Committee and proposed here for Lecturers. First, the changes would require that, beginning in Fall 2013, lecturers be annually evaluated by their Department Chairs and TPR committees, inasmuch as such a standard is that appropriate for a professional faculty. Second, the proposed changes recognize the importance of development and growth for a professional faculty and the beneficial nature of various professional activities for effective instruction by requiring that Lecturers achieve promotion to Senior Lecturer within or before their 8th year of service or else there would not be reappointment after a final 9th year of service (also beginning in Fall 2013). The specification of a beginning date provides time for units to make necessary changes to their tpr documents and bylaws.
Proposed Faculty Manual Change
Part III, Section E, #8 (Senior Lecturer)

Current Wording:
8. Senior Lecturer. After six years of satisfactory performance a lecturer may be reclassified as a senior lecturer. Equivalent experience at Clemson, such as that obtained in a visiting position, may be counted. A department chair, with the concurrence of the department’s tenure-promotion-(re)appointment committee, may recommend an individual to the college dean who makes the appointment. Senior lecturers may be offered contracts ranging from one to three years with the requirement of one year’s notice of non-renewal before July 15. Senior Lecturers cannot have administrative duties beyond those of regular faculty.

Proposed Wording:
8. Senior Lecturer. After four full academic years of service (beginning in Fall 2013), a lecturer may apply for promotion to Senior Lecturer; equivalent experience at Clemson may be counted towards the four year service requirement. A department chair/school director and the department/school tenure-promotion-(re)appointment committee make independent promotion recommendations to the college dean, who makes the promotion decision and appointment. Senior lecturers shall be offered three-year contracts with the requirement of one year’s notice of non-renewal before July 15. Beginning Fall 2013, Senior Lecturers shall be evaluated annually by their department chair/school director, and their department/school tenure-promotion-(re)appointment committee following procedures and standards that shall be specified in the unit’s tenure-promotion-(re)appointment document. Senior Lecturers cannot have administrative duties beyond those of regular faculty.

The Senior Lecturer appointment is intended to recognize the efforts, contributions, and performance of Lecturers who are not merely satisfactorily effective teachers, but who have also made (an) additional significant contribution(s) to the instructional mission of the University. Accordingly, beginning in Fall 2013, length of service as Lecturer is, itself, not a sufficient criterion for promotion to Senior Lecturer. Instead, the process and criteria for promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer are determined by departments/schools and shall be described in their tenure and promotion document.

Lecturers must document and provide evidence of their performance and additional contributions/activities to the department chair/school director and department/school tenure-promotion-(re)appointment committee for evaluation and consideration for promotion to Senior Lecturer.

During the 2012-2013 Academic Year, evaluation and promotion of/to Senior Lecturer(s) should follow the 2011-2012 Faculty Manual.

Rationale: The proposed changes follow the 2011-2012 Faculty Senate ad hoc Committee on Status of Lecturers recommendations. First, as the Committee recommends and is consistent
with a professional faculty, Senior Lecturers will be required to undergo annual evaluation by their Department Chair and evaluation at least every 2 years by the unit TPR committee. Second, as the Committee recommends in the context of a professional community of faculty, promotion to Senior Lecturer should not be based on criteria not only related to length of service and satisfactory instruction per se.

Rather, an identifiable significant contribution to the instructional reputation or mission of the Department/School/University that extends beyond ordinary instructional expectations of Lecturers in fulfillment of their responsibilities is required. Such a contribution might include, but are certainly not limited to: teaching an unusual breadth of courses, honors courses, or courses at a variety of levels; assisting in the development or assessment of courses or curricula; creation or implementation of beneficial pedagogical innovations or instructional materials; pedagogical scholarship; significant consulting activities related to instructional duties; mentoring colleagues in the instruction profession; advising or mentoring students in extracurricular activities, scholarly activities, theses, dissertations, independent study, capstone projects, etc; supervision of students engaged in instructional activities; contributions in recruiting/retaining students; significant professional development activities; service to the academy or relevant professional organizations; student advising or career counseling.

The changes are proposed to take effect in Fall 2013 to give units time to make updates to TPR documents and bylaws; it would be understood that the current guidelines in the Faculty Manual would be in effect for promotion to Senior Lecturer during the 2012-2013 AY.
Proposed Faculty Manual Change
Part III, Section E, new #9 (Master Lecturer)

Proposed Wording:
9. Master Lecturer. Beginning in Fall 2013, after a minimum of four full academic years of service, a Senior Lecturer may apply for promotion to Master Lecturer; equivalent experience at Clemson may be counted towards the 4 year service requirement. A department chair/school director and the department/school tenure-promotion-(re)appointment committee make independent promotion recommendations to the college dean, who reviews the recommendations and supporting materials and makes the promotion decision and appointment. Master Lecturers shall be offered 5-year contracts with the requirement of one year’s notice of non-renewal before July 15. Master Lecturers shall be evaluated annually by their department chair/school director and their department/school tenure-promotion-(re)appointment committee following procedures and standards that shall be specified in the unit’s tenure-promotion-(re)appointment document. Master Lecturers cannot have administrative duties beyond those of regular faculty.

The Master Lecturer appointment is intended to recognize the efforts, contributions, and performance of Senior Lecturers who are not merely dedicated effective classroom teachers having also made a significant contribution to the instructional mission of the University, but who are educators in the broadest context of the mission of the University. Accordingly, length of service as Senior Lecturer is, itself, not a sufficient criterion for promotion to Master Lecturer. Instead, the process and criteria for promotion from Senior Lecturer to Master Lecturer are determined by departments/schools and must be described in their bylaws tenure and promotion document.

Master Lecturers must document and provide evidence of their performance and additional contributions/activities to the department chair/school director and department/school tenure-promotion-(re)appointment committee for evaluation and consideration for promotion to Master Lecturer.

Rationale: The proposed changes follow the 2011-2012 Faculty Senate ad hoc Committee on Status of Lecturers recommendations regarding the establishment of a Master Lecturer special faculty rank. As the Committee recommends in the context of a professional community of faculty, promotion to Master Lecturer should not be based on criteria only related to length of service and satisfactory instruction.

Rather, Senior Lecturers who are educators in the broadest context of the mission of the University are eligible. Units might wish to consider criteria related to leadership roles in multiple identifiable and sustained significant contributions to the instructional mission of the Department/School/University that extend beyond ordinary instructional expectations of Senior Lecturers in fulfillment of their responsibilities, or contributions worthy of or having achieved regional, national, or international distinction that are exclusive of classroom instruction per se.
Such contributions might include, but are certainly not limited to: teaching an unusual breadth of courses, honors courses, or courses at a variety of levels; assisting in the development or assessment of courses or curricula; creation or implementation of beneficial pedagogical innovations or instructional materials; pedagogical scholarship; significant consulting activities related to instructional duties; mentoring colleagues in the instruction profession; advising or mentoring students in extracurricular activities, scholarly activities, theses, dissertations, independent study, capstone projects, etc; supervision of students engaged in instructional activities; contributions in recruiting/retaining students; significant professional development activities; service to the academy or relevant professional organizations; student advising or career counseling.

The proposed changes establish the Master Lecturer rank, general qualifications, and procedures for promotion that include faculty review consistent with a professional faculty. Master Lecturers will be subject to annual review by their department chairs and TPR committees. The changes are proposed to take effect in Fall 2013 to give units time to make updates to TPR documents and bylaws.
CONTENTS OF MANUAL WERE ADJUSTED TO COINCIDE WITH PRESIDENTAL TERMS INSTEAD OF A FULL CALENDAR YEAR.
MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
MAY 8, 2012

1. Call to Order: The Faculty Senate Meeting was called to order at 2:33 p.m. by Jeremy King, and guests were recognized and introduced.

2. Approval of Minutes: The Faculty Senate Minutes dated April 10, 2012 were approved as written.

3. "Free Speech": None

4. Special Orders of the Day: Beth Lacy, IRoar Student System, presented information regarding IRoar/Banner, the new student information system and its features. The floor was opened for questions and answers.

   Senator David Tonkyn, a member of the Quality Enhancement Plan Committee (QEP) presented an overview of the plan and how it would impact Clemson’s 2020 Plan. A question and answer period then followed.

5. Elections to University Committees/Commissions – Elections to University Committees/Commissions were held by secret ballot.

6. Committee Reports:
   a. Senate Committees:
      Policy – Chair Bill Pennington stated that this Committee has not met yet.

      Welfare – Chair Diane Perpich stated that this Committee will look at Chair system versus a department head system to see if changes can be made to enhance the system.

      Research – Chair Jim McCubbin and the Senate were informed by President King that the issue of “conflict of interest” will come to this committee to address.

      Finance – Chair Antonis Katsiyannis noted that there was nothing to report at this time but that the Committee is looking forward to an exciting year. Chair Katsiyannis also stated that this Committee will meet with the Budget Accountability Committee, noting that the administration has been sensitive to responding to questions that have arisen.
Scholastic Policies – Chair David Tonkyn submitted and explained the Committee Report dated May 3, 2012 and stated that the Committee has met with others regarding the Banner issue and its inability to monitor and restrict withdrawal and redemption hours. The Committee had much discussion about this and decided to treat the two issues separately (Attachment). The Committee was comfortable with removing the cap on withdrawal hours, to avoid costly custom software development and to bring Clemson in line with most other school. The Committee thought that students would not abuse this change, since excessive Ws can delay graduation and increase tuition costs, and the Ws will show on official transcripts. The Committee was also comfortable with maintaining the current limit on grade redemptions, implemented through the combination of Banner and one paper form, and enhanced by a change in the cap from 10 credit hours to 3 courses. We recognized that some details were unresolved, such as whether to count linked lecture/lab courses as one or two courses.

Senator Tonkyn made a motion to bring the two issues to the floor for discussion and endorsement. Vote was taken to bring to the floor and was unanimously passed with required two-thirds vote. Much discussion followed.

Senator Tonkyn then explained and made a motion to endorse doing away with the restriction on Withdrawal hours. Discussion followed. A vote to accept the motion was taken and it passed unanimously.

Senator Tonkyn then explained and made a motion to change the cap on redemptions from 10 credit hours to three courses (which might be the same course three times) and to encourage the administration to work with the Scholastic Policies Committee address implementation. Vote was taken on amended motion and passed unanimously.

b. University Commissions and Committees: None

7. Old Business: None

8. New Business:
   a. Senator Pennington, submitted for approval and explained the proposed Faculty Manual Change, Part VII. Section B, 2.b Graduate Admissions and Continuing Enrollment Appeals Committee. There was no discussion. Vote to approve change was taken and passed unanimously with required two-thirds vote (Attachment).

   b. Senator Pennington, submitted for approval and explained the proposed Faculty Manual Change, Voting Rights for Faculty with Special Rank. There was no discussion. Vote to approve change was taken and passed with required two-thirds vote (Attachment).
9. **President's Report:**
   a. President King noted three significant challenges for the Faculty Senate: the new role on campus of our Faculty Manual Editorial Consultant, Fran McGuire; the retirement of our Program Coordinator, Cathy Sturkie; and a new location for the Faculty Senate Office. He thanked Provost Helms for continuing Fran’s service for one year; hiring a new coordinator for the Senate and assisting with the search for a new location for the office.

   b. President King reported that he has been listening to, working with, and conversing with faculty and administrators about faculty involvement in campus decision making as well as the direction of the University after a year into the 2020 Plan. Last month, a small group consisting of King, Senate Vice-President Smith, Past Senate Presidents Fran McGuire and Bill Surver, Marketing Chair Mary Anne Raymond, Vice President for Finance and Operations Brett Dalton, and Provost Helms formalized these concerns, and presented them to President Barker, who was very receptive.

   c. President King indicated that a challenge for all of us this coming year may be freshman enrollment. The administration has shared the success of revised financial aid strategies in increasing the appeal of Clemson to quality students. It is anticipated that this success will lead to a higher yield of admitted students (projected 3,400) that will be noticed in the Fall. King ask that faculty stand ready to work together to accommodate a significant increase in first year students. King noted that he appreciated that the median faculty member has been doing more with the same or less for several years now, and shares the concerns expressed by many of that we need some relief in the trenches and that we need to be vigilant to maintain educational quality.

   d. King reported that Immediate Past President Dan Warner wants to spend this year working on initiatives to improve campus communication. He expressed gratitude for his ongoing service, and encouraged senators to share their thoughts on this subject with him (warner@clemson.edu).

   e. King reported that important milestones will likely be reached this summer related to the Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP), the new Banner system, and a compensation plan; therefore, he urged all senators to stay tuned to there-mail and stand ready to provide scrutiny and feedback. Vice-President Smith, Past President Warner, and King will continue to serve on the compensation study working group with Huron Consulting Group and President Barker’s Compensation Advisory Group.

10. **Announcements:**

    b. No Executive/Advisory Committee Meetings in June or July, 2012.

    c. Next Faculty Senate Meeting – June 12, 2012.
11. **Adjournment:** President King adjourned the meeting at 4:16 p.m.

Denise M. Anderson, Secretary

Cathy Toth Sturkie, Program Coordinator

Absent: F. Cheng, T. Dobbins, S. Chapman (V. Gallichio for), A. Grubb, G. Tissera (T. McDonald for), R. Hewitt, M. Mowrey (M. Denton for), J. Ochterbeck, N. Vyavahare (D. Warner for), S. Dutkiewicz (S. Rook Schilf for)
Common Interest

User Community - Group of individuals with a common interest

Planning Tool

Degree Works - Web-based academic degree planning tool

Luminis Portal - Gateway that offers a broad array of resources and services

Implemented in the ROAR project

Banner - The software system being student information system

Project Terms

Glossary
Integrate - Make whole by bringing all parts together

Redundant - Storing the same data in different computer systems
authentication, roles, and privileges across authentication, roles, and privileges across
management of individual identities, their management of individual identities, their
Identity Management - Term that deals with the
Identity Management - Term that deals with the
individual departments
individual departments

Distributed Reporting - Shift in responsibilities of
Distributed Reporting - Shift in responsibilities of

Integrate - Make whole by bringing all parts

Technical Terms

Glossary
Business Analyst - A person who analyzes the organization and design of business needs

Functional Tester - A person who validates an application based on required functions

Process Owner - Business person who has authority to oversee a business process

Project QA - Quality Assurance process to verify fit of software to business processes

Steering Committee - Group of individuals who have final authority over the project

Process Owner - Business person who has authority to oversee a business process

Business Analyst - A person who analyzes the organization and design of business needs

Role-Based Terms

Glossary
Best in Breed Software

- Vendor Supported Maintenance
- Common User Community
- Why the iROAR Software Package?
iROAR Implementation?

- Synchronization of Data
- Integrated Cashiering System
- Integrated Student Refunds
- Modern Technology
- Automated Tracking of:
  - Double Majors
  - Dual Degrees
  - Double Minors

!ROAR Implementation?
The iROAR portal is a gateway for all students, faculty, and staff to access Clemson information systems.

- Mobile Platform
- Improved Curriculum Management
- One Stop Shop
- Single sign-on into all systems
- What-If-Degree Progress Report
- Pre-Registration Course Planner

Student Portal
Most Significant Changes for Students

- Degree progress tracking
- Predominantly a paperless administrative process
- Automatic notifications upon sign-on
- Registration of classes
- Business Analyst for each Department
- Training in needed Timeframe
- Realignment of job of Responsibilities

Project Concerns
Centralized data location with real-time updates.

Distributed Reporting

- iROAR in combination with Data Warehousing efforts will make data more accessible to academic departments.

Project Reporting
What does IDM mean at Clemson?

- One (1) username per person
- One identifying number for each person whether that person is a student or employee
- Establish the CU Vault as the authoritative source for identity
- Respectively, each ERP will be the authoritative source for their data, NOT the identity
- One identifying number for each person

Identity Management
Goals of Identity Management

- Improve communication by consolidating usernames
- Have a single identity (Xid CT2345678)
- Eliminate redundancy
Person load.
Student and HR data loaded to Banner;
Reconciliation file sera to CUVault,
Xid generation in CUVault.
Common matching in CUVault
through webservice calls from both
Banner and HR record creations

Banner Admissions accepting students for Fall 2013
...MU1/2MZ..

Banner Banner Rejection Upright
Banner student Live
10/1/2012-6/30/2013 continues to work for mainframe feed of current students;
Username creatkm and notiTJcarRfof accepted students in Banner
will use new CUVault process with legacy restrictions;
CLEMSON UNIVERSITY
Availability of Degree Audit
Clear and Concise Reporting
Interactive "What-if" Planning
Additional Prerequisite Information
Online Course Schedule Planner
Addition of Graduate Information
Availability of Degree Audit
The iROAR portal is a gateway for all students, faculty and staff to access Clemson information systems and faculty portal access.

- Integration with Blackboard
- Contact Student through Portal
- View of Class Roster
- View of Advisees

iROAR
Faculty Portal Access
The iROAR portal is a gateway for all students, faculty, and staff to access Clemson information systems and staff to access Clemson information systems.

- Integration with Blackboard and access to Workgroups

Staff Portal Access
Impact to Faculty of Course Catalog & Degree Changes

Course Catalog Numbering will change

Non-Degree vs. Undeclared

Move and approve course curricula electronically

Course Catalog & Degree Changes

Impact to Faculty of
- Weekly Newsletter
- Implementation Team Website
- Social Networking Sites
- Mock Registration
- Focus Meetings

Communication Plan
Products

- (Workflow)
- Document Routing
- Tracker (Sunapris)
- International Student Address
- Address Checker (Clean)
- Cashiering (TouchNet)
- Banner Relationship

- (Workflow)
- Study Abroad (Studio)
- Job Scheduler (UC4)
- Schedule 25
- Room Scheduler
- (BDMS)
- Document Imaging
- Degree Works
- Degree Progress

CLEMSON UNIVERSITY
July, 2012 - Applicant portal live

December, 2012 - Course catalog and schedule

January, 2013 - Financial Aid live

March, 2013 - Registration live

December, 2012 - Course catalog and schedule

July, 2012 - Applicant portal live
Contact Information

- Facebook page for student audience
  - www.facebook.com/pages/iROAR-Clemson-University/254285094622287

- Faculty Blog
  - Blogs.clemson.edu/iroar/

- For questions or concerns
  - Email iroar@clemson.edu
FACULTY SENATE SCHOLASTIC POLICIES
Minutes from meeting on May 3, 2012, 3:00-4:15 pm
Nancy Thurmond Room of the Strom Thurmond Institute

SCHOLASTIC POLICIES COMMITTEE 2012-2013
Susannah Ashton (sashton) (AAH)
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: Goddard, Leininger, Tissera, Tonkyn
Guests: Jeff Appling (Associate Dean for Curriculum, Beth Lacy (Banner Project Manager), Ashton Lee (Undergraduate Student Government), Stan Smith (Registrar), Debra Sparacino (Associate Senior Registrar)

We were asked by outgoing Faculty Senate President Dan Warner to consider the perhaps unintended effects of the new Banner system for maintaining student records on the Clemson's redemption and withdrawal policies. I have copied his remarks below, along with a counterargument by Associate Dean Jeff Appling, both of which follow the summary of our own discussions.

The new Student Information System will replace and link information on recruitment and admissions, registration, financial aid, and billing for current and prospective students. It is an enormous undertaking employing about 75 people on campus and with a planned implementation in 2013. Banner has about 1800 clients, but has not developed an off-the-shelf option to restrict student withdrawal and redemption hours. Apparently, these restrictions are rare at other colleges. There is a way to limit redemption hours using Banner and an additional paper form that is signed by the student, academic advisor and appropriate administrators. This would allow us to maintain the current ban on redeeming credits received for academic dishonesty. Implementation would be greatly facilitated by changing the restriction from 10 credit hours to three times (which could be the same course). In contrast, there is no way to implement the current CU limit on withdrawal hours without custom software development and testing, which would take months and at a one-time cost of perhaps $500-600K. Each Banner update would have additional costs associated with these changes.

We voted unanimously to bring this discussion before the full Faculty Senate at its meeting on May 8. We did not formally vote on any remedies, but the faculty senators present agreed that the withdrawal and redemption issues should be handled separately. With regard to the redemption policy, we were comfortable with the proposed change to a limit of 3 occasions rather than 10 credit hours. We did not discuss how to count lecture/lab courses which may or may not be co-requisites, nor did we discuss how this limit might be pro-rated for transfer students. With regard to the withdrawal policy, we were comfortable with allowing unlimited withdrawal hours, in line with many and perhaps most institutions. Apparently few students currently use the maximum allowed, and abuses would be minimized by the following three factors: there are limits on the number of credit hours students can register for; excessive Ws can delay graduation and increase tuition costs; and Ws will still show on official transcripts. One Senator asked for verification of this last point.

The Undergraduate Student Senate representative was in agreement with these points, and will let us know before the Tuesday Faculty Senate meeting if there are any reservations from her colleagues.

Two other points came up during the discussion. First, if we change policies then we will need to make a concerted effort to inform students as well as faculty advisors. Second, there may be additional concerns that arise in the implementation of Banner over the next year, and the there should be a fast track for Faculty Senate consideration. The Senators present thought that the Scholastic Policies Committee was the appropriate one to consider such issues, and were agreeable to meeting during the summer as needed. We welcome full Senate discussion on all these issues.
Proposed Faculty Manual Revision
Part VII, Section B, 2.b, Graduate Admissions and Continuing Enrollment Appeals Committee

Current Wording:

Graduate Admissions and Continuing Enrollment Appeals Committee deals primarily with graduate admissions and continuing enrollment appeals. Its recommendations on policy and reports on general statistics are submitted to the Academic Council. Membership consists of one faculty representative from each college elected by the collegiate faculty for three-year terms. The associate Dean of the Graduate School serves as non-voting chair.

Proposed Wording:

Graduate Admissions and Continuing Enrollment Appeals Committee deals primarily with graduate admissions and continuing enrollment appeals. Its recommendations on policy and reports on general statistics are submitted to the Academic Council. Membership consists of one faculty representative from each college elected by the collegiate faculty for three-year terms. The associate Dean of the Graduate School serves as non-voting chair.

Rationale:
A significant part of this Committee’s operations involve 3-person hearing panels. Given increasing enrollments and increased faculty obligations, the current membership of 5 faculty members does not allow the Graduate School flexibility and fast response in scheduling; appropriate balance of workload has also become a concern. An increased pool of 10 faculty members would better serve students appellants and the faculty on the committee. The proposed change was endorsed by the Graduate Council on 15 December 2011 and the Academic Council on 29 March 2012.
Proposed Faculty Manual Change
for Voting Rights for Faculty with Special Rank

Current Wording
PART VII. FACULTY PARTICIPATION IN UNIVERSITY GOVERNANCE
L. Committees Restricted to Regular Faculty as Voting Members
Based on the description of the responsibilities shared by Faculty at Clemson University, voting
members on the following committees are limited to regular faculty: Departmental Tenure,
Promotion, and Reappointment Committee; Departmental Post-Tenure Review Committee;
Departmental, College and University Curriculum Committees; Departmental and College
Advisory Committees; Faculty Senate; and Grievance Board.

Proposed Wording
PART VII. FACULTY PARTICIPATION IN UNIVERSITY GOVERNANCE
L. Committees Restricted to Regular Faculty as Voting Members
Based on the description of the responsibilities shared by Faculty at Clemson University, voting
members on the following committees are limited to regular faculty: Departmental Tenure,
Promotion, and Reappointment Committee; Departmental Post-Tenure Review Committee;
Departmental, College and University Curriculum Committees; Departmental and College
Advisory Committees; Faculty Senate; and Grievance Board.

Rationale: The proposed change would allow Lecturers and Senior Lecturers to serve as voting
members on Department curriculum and advisory committees if relevant bylaws allow (see Part
III, Section E). This provision allows those units desiring to do so to take advantage of local
experience, expertise, and commitment of those holding the highest special faculty rank
educational mission if they believe it to be advantageous or desirable. Any special faculty rank
may still serve on curriculum committee as non-voting members. The change still retains the
restriction of voting membership on college and university curriculum (and advisory) committees
to regular faculty ranks named in the Constitution as being ultimately responsible for curriculum
at the University.

As stated in The Constitution of the Faculty of Clemson University, Article I, Section 2
Membership, paragraph 2:

On matters pertaining specifically to the individual colleges, these functions are
exercised by the collegiate faculties, with review at the university level as
specified by established university policies. Similarly, the collegiate faculties
recognize the primary authority of the faculty of each academic department on
academic matters pertaining to that department.

The outcome of any Departmental Curriculum Committee is reviewed and approved by a College
Curriculum Committee and University Curriculum Committee; therefore, the only place that
regular faculty need to be required to hold true to the Faculty Constitution is on the College and
University Curriculum Committees. The change would allow each department to decide what is
best for their membership knowing that many faculty with special faculty rank have significant
curriculum experience

There may be some academic units whose special faculty rank positions are transient and/or about
which there are other concerns. Such departments or schools can limit special faculty rank
participation on the curriculum and advisory committees as they deem appropriate.
MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
JUNE 12, 2012

1. Call to Order: The Faculty Senate Meeting was called to order at 2:37 p.m. by Vice President/President-Elect Kelly C. Smith.

2. Approval of Minutes: The Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes dated May 8, 2012 and the General Faculty Meeting Minutes dated May 10, 2012 were approved as written and distributed.

3. “Free Speech”: None

4. Special Order of the Day: Representatives from Ricoh, Managed Print Services, provided an overview of their document services by identifying savings opportunities in printing on campus; implementing a student print quota policy and evaluating proposals for managed print services to address non-student printing services on campus. The floor was opened for questions and answers.

5. Committee Reports:
   a. Senate Committees:
      Welfare – No report.

      Scholastic Policies – Chair David Tonkyn stated that Committee had not met.

      Research – Chair Jim McCubbin noted that the Committee is in the early stages of consolidating the agenda for the coming year and submitted Report dated May 17, 2012 (Attachment).

      Policy – Chair Bill Pennington stated that there was no report.

      Finance – Chair Antonis Katsiyannis stated that Committee had not met.

   b. Ad hoc Faculty Senate Committees
      1) Budget Accountability Committee – Chair Antonis Katsiyannis submitted Report dated June 5, 2012 (Attachment) and informed Vice President Smith that he would like to invite the Director of Financial Aid to address the Senate in the near future.

   c. University Commissions and Committees: None

6. Old Business:
a. Senator Pennington, submitted for approval and explained an amended proposed Faculty Manual Change, Part IX. Professional Practices Section D. Teaching Practices, #11 (Evaluation of Teaching by Students). Motion was seconded. Discussion followed. A friendly amendment was offered and accepted. Vote was taken on the friendly amendment and passed. Vote was then taken on original motion, as amended, and passed with required two-thirds vote (Attachment).

7. New Business: None

8. President’s Report: Vice President Smith stated that the:
   a. Next Executive/Advisory Committee Meeting will be held on August 7, 2012.

   b. Academic Convocation will be held on August 21, 2012 and encouraged Senators to process with the Faculty Senate.

   c. The Provost approved the Faculty Manual regarding allowing lecturers to serve on department curriculum and advisory committees. This change will be reflected in the 2012 Faculty Manual.

   d. Huron Group is completing its report. Both he and President King have been on the Committee and have heard some of the report. The Huron Group will meet with the Executive/Advisory Committee. Vice President Smith noted that he and President King expressed that they would recommend to the Board of Trustees that it be only informational and that no action be taken at the Board meeting.

   e. Human Resources is considering spreading summer deductions of paychecks throughout the academic year and would like faculty feedback.

   f. The mission statement has been modified based on feedback and will go to the Administrative Council and, if endorsed, to the Board of Trustees for approval.

   g. The Welfare Committee will examine faculty questions regarding the features and process of the low-emission vehicle (LEV) parking initiative. Feedback may be forwarded to Senator Perpich.

   h. The Scholastic Policies Committee will consider the value of contextualized transcripts with the Student Senate representative, Ben Winter.

   i. Next Faculty Senate Meeting will be August 21, 2012.

10. Adjournment: Vice President Smith adjourned the meeting at 4:02 p.m.
Managed Print Services Overview
June 12, 2012

Presented by:
Ricoh USA

Managed Document Services™
MPS and Beyond

- 2008-2009 Budget IT Task Force Identified Savings Opportunity in Printing on Campus
- 2010 – Student Print Quota Policy Implemented
- 2011 – Clemson Evaluated Proposals for Managed Print Services to Address Non-Student Printing
**What is Campus Managed Print**

1. Managed Print Services (MPS) offers Clemson tools to save money in your operating budget.
2. Ricoh will work with you so that you are able to pick your own solution that supports the uniqueness of your department and respects individual faculty & staff needs.
3. Encompasses a wide range of services including:
   a.) A single source contractor for handling break/fix
   b.) A consultative approach that focuses on a gradual shift in user adoption and technology transformation.

**Study Findings – Campus Print**

- Total of 3,453 Printers on Campus
- 2,665 local printers with 788 Networked Desktop Printers
- 478 Different Printer Models
- 350 Models have a quantity of 3 or less
- Clemson 1.3:1 Knowledge worker to device ratio
- Printer Fleet 42.87 million pages per year
**Future State – Campus Print**

Where we want to be:

- Less Money spent on printing so departments can redirect operating budget to higher and more important projects
- Accomplish goals at a lower cost point by utilizing new managed print technology and services
- A more "wired" print environment which expands access and improves security
- Optimized process that seek to remove print altogether

**Output Engine Cost Continuum**

- **Eliminating print: $0.00**
  - Average CPP = $0.04
- **Centralized Print @ reduced costs**
  - Average CPP = $0.02 BW, $0.15 Color
- **Print Migration to MFP's**
  - Average CPP = $0.08 BW, $0.21 Color
- **Network Laser (toner) based products**
- **Local printing (ink jets or Laser)**
How are we going to reach our future state: A Phased Approach to Savings

- **Assess**
  - Coordinated analysis to define the current state of document output and workflow
- **Design**
  - Recommendations to enhance efficiencies, productivity and cost effectiveness based on the customer's short and long-term objectives
- **Implement**
  - Align Clemson's print environment to the targeted future state
- **Manage & Rationalize**
  - Manage the solution. Identify potential for business process improvement to eliminate paper

What is Most Important to Know

- You have a voice in every decision
- Your solution is up to you
- Every department is unique as is every individual
- This program is about working together to help each department achieve its goals and objectives
- Money spent by your department on print can be saved and used on projects you believe to be more valuable/important than printing
The On Campus Print Shop

- Print Shop Coming Soon as it is under construction
- Retail Store Front with fast turn around time
- A place where we will service any print needs you may have
- We are working with users on campus and would welcome feedback.
- If you would like to be part of a group looking at processes for the print shop please contact: John Gilbert @864-616-8578, JohnGil@clemson.edu

Moving Ahead

- Continued site visits to upgrade MFP's
- Communication timeline for asset tagging
- Communication timeline for when service support starts
- A dedicated team of experts are on campus to help support your needs
Open Discussion

Ricoh Extends its Deepest Appreciation and Gratitude
There is no report at this time, as the Committee has not met. However, the Committee will work on new NIH policies regarding intellectual property and/or conflict of interest.
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.

The CFO will provide an overview of “trends” in pay increases...
- Percent of faculty at the university/college level getting merit pay increases; range of percent increases at the university/college levels
- Percent of administrators at the university/college level getting merit pay increases; range of percent increases at the university/college levels
- Likewise for bonuses
- Explanations to be included for over 6% raises...

Lab Fees Update

Lab fees will be 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.

The new recruitment model (scholarship structure and Admissions marketing initiatives) may be a possible presentation at a future Faculty Senate meeting.

Challenge - Satisfactory Academic Progress (for continuing enrollment and graduation) is a FED requirement that was significantly changed. The policy is not new but now is more heavily
regulated. Academic advisors may be called upon to help student craft an "academic plan" to meet the minimum cumulative GPR and maintain a satisfactory pace of completion of hours attempted.
Proposed Faculty Manual Change
Part IX. Professional Practices, Section D. Teaching Practices, #11 (Evaluation of Teaching by Students)

Current Wording

11. Evaluation of Teaching by Students. The university provides a standard form that meets the minimum requirements of best practices for student evaluation of teaching faculty. This form must be approved by the Scholastic Policies Committee of the Faculty Senate. Individual departments may develop questions supplemental to the university's minimum standard questions or employ comprehensive supplemental questions, but the standard questions are required. These forms will be distributed in every class near the end of the semester. The instructor will announce to the students that completed forms will not be examined until course grades have been submitted. It is required that instructors leave the room while forms are being completed by students. A student proctor will conduct the evaluation.

Student assessment of instruction is mandatory for all instructors at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. Summary of statistical ratings from student assessment of instruction will become part of the personnel review data for annual review, reappointment, tenure and promotion, and for post-tenure review consideration. The university will retain electronic copies of all summaries of statistical ratings for the purpose of verification that the evaluations have been carried out. Summary of statistical ratings from student assessment of instruction would be available to department chairs through the data warehouse but the actual responses from students (including comments) would not be available unless the faculty opted to submit them. Faculty may also opt to make available additional information regarding their teaching.

Other evaluation methods which must be given at least equal weight in the teaching evaluation process include one or more of the following:

- evaluation of course materials, learning objectives, and examinations by peers and/or supervisors,
- in-class visitation by peers and/or supervisors,
- a statement by the faculty member describing his/her methodology,
- exit interviews/surveys with current graduates and alumni,
- additional criteria as appropriate to the discipline, and
- any rejoinders or comments on student evaluations provided by the faculty member.

Proposed Final Wording Approved by the Senate (March 13, 2012):
11. Evidence of Learning in Evaluation of Teaching. The evaluation of faculty teaching and student learning is an important process requiring a multi-faceted approach. Research supports the use of multiple sources of evidence in evaluation, and effective evaluations should include several of the following:

- evidence-based measurements of student learning (such as pre and post testing or student work samples)
- 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

The university provides a standard form that meets the minimum requirements of current research-based practices for student rating of course experiences. This form must be approved by the Scholastic Policies Committee of the Faculty Senate. Individual departments and faculty may develop questions supplemental to the university’s minimum standard questions or employ comprehensive supplemental questions, but the standard questions are required.

Student rating of course experiences is mandatory for all instructors at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. Before the last two weeks of the semester, the instructor must activate the on-line evaluation and then inform the students that the evaluation should be completed by the end of the semester. The instructor will announce to the students that the completed evaluations will not be reviewed until course grades have been submitted. If instructors use class time for the on-line evaluation, then they must leave the room during the evaluation.

Summary of statistical ratings from student ratings of course experiences (except instructor-developed questions) will become part of the personnel review data for annual review, reappointment, tenure and promotion, and for post-tenure review consideration. Statistical rating summaries will be available to department chairs through the data warehouse. Comments are the property of faculty.

The university will retain (at least for six years) copies of summaries of all statistical ratings and student comments to verify that the evaluations have been carried out and provide an archive for individual faculty who may need them in the future.

Propose changes based on feedback from Provost Helms:

11. Evidence of Learning in Evaluation of Teaching. The evaluation of faculty teaching and student learning is an important process requiring a multi-faceted approach. Research supports
the use of multiple sources of evidence in evaluation, and effective evaluations should include, at least three of the following:

- 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
- 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 above were used to improve teaching and address deficiencies

The university provides a standard form that meets the minimum requirements of current research-based practices for student rating of course experiences. This form must be approved by the Scholastic Policies Committee of the Faculty Senate. Individual departments and faculty may develop questions supplemental to the university’s minimum standard questions or employ comprehensive supplemental questions, but the standard questions are required.

Student rating of course experiences is mandatory for all instructors at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. Before the last two weeks of the semester, the instructor must activate the on-line evaluation and then inform the students that the evaluation should be completed by the end of the semester. The instructor will announce to the students that the completed evaluations, cannot be reviewed until course grades have been submitted. If instructors use class time for the on-line evaluation, then they must leave the room during the evaluation.

Summary of statistical ratings from student ratings of course experiences (except instructor-developed questions) will become part of the personnel review data for annual review, reappointment, tenure and promotion, and for post-tenure review consideration. Statistical rating summaries will be available to department chairs through the data warehouse. Comments are the property of faculty.

The university will retain (at least for six years) copies of summaries of all statistical ratings and student comments to verify that the evaluations have been carried out and provide an archive for individual faculty who may need them in the future.
THERE WAS NO FACULTY SENATE MEETING IN JULY 2012.
1. Call to Order: The Faculty Senate Meeting was called to order at 2:33 p.m. by Jeremy King, and guests were recognized and introduced.

2. Approval of Minutes: The Faculty Senate Minutes dated June 12, 2012 were approved as written.

3. "Free Speech": None

4. Special Orders of the Day: Debra Sparacino, Senior Associate Registrar, presented information regarding access to student advising pin numbers. The Banner Implementation team will work with Departments to set parameters for how students can obtain their advising pin numbers for course registration. The floor was opened for questions and answers. Senator Grubb thanked Debra and her team for listening to Faculty Senate/Scholastic Policies concerns.

President Benjamin Winter, Undergraduate Student Government, presented an overview of the proposed Honor Creed created by predecessor Brian Jones and a committee of students, staff, and faculty who solicited value statements from the University community. The purpose was to provide a more concise value statement than what is found throughout the Student Affairs’ Student Handbook and Code of Conduct. A question and answer period then followed. Senator Denton, followed by others, applauded students for undertaking this daunting task. The Senate asked that concerns be addressed for Senate support.

5. Committee Reports:
   a. Senate Committees:

   Policy – Chair Bill Pennington submitted the Committee Report dated July 17, 2012. Chair Pennington announced three proposed Faculty Manual changes to be discussed under New Business and reviewed one editorial Faculty Manual change regarding Part IV. Section H. Post Tenure Review. 2. Coverage. This change clarifies that the period for post tenure review is after every five years, “and is coincident with the beginning of the next five year cycle”.

   Chair Pennington announced that he will form an ad hoc committee to review and revise policies regarding the hiring and review of academic administrators, specifically VI. The University’s Administrative Structure. Section I. Selection of Other Academic Administrators and Section J. Review of Academic Administrators. Policy feels this section is unclear, dated, and is pressing given the large number of such hires.
Welfare – Chair Diane Perpich stated that the Committee’s meeting schedule is finalized. Early in the semester, they will review Low Emission Vehicle (LEV) issues. The committee plans to meet with Human Resources later in the semester.

Research – Chair Jim McCubbin reported that the Committee will review a new University Disclosure and Conflict of Interest policy Chair McCubbin announced that as Research Chair he will also serve as the Senate representative on the University Research Council.

Finance – Chair Antonis Katsiyannis noted that both Finance and Budget Accountability Committees will meet in September and that the main focus will be addressing the Huron Consulting report on compensation.

Scholastic Policies – Chair David Tonkyn submitted and explained the Committee Report dated July 16, 2012. The Committee met in July with Barbara Speziale regarding Banner and advising. Chair Tonkyn reported that their discussion of advising included more than course registration.

Chair Tonkyn had requested a demonstration of the Banner Degree Works tool to the Senate. Debra Sparaciono responded that most likely it would be in November.

b. University Commissions and Committees: None

6. Old Business: None

7. New Business:
a. Senator Pennington, submitted for approval and explained the proposed Faculty Manual change. Part VI. Section I. Selection of Other Academic Administrators regarding interim Department Chairs. Vote to approve change was taken and passed with required two-thirds vote (Attachment). Vote for immediate inclusion in the Faculty Manual was taken and passed with required two-thirds vote.

b. Senator Pennington, submitted for approval and explained the proposed Faculty Manual change. Part III. Section E. 6. Lecturer regarding the evaluation and length of appointment term of Lecturers. There was discussion. Vote to approve change was taken and passed with required two-thirds vote (Attachment). Vote for immediate inclusion in the Faculty Manual was taken and passed with required two-thirds vote.

c. Senator Pennington, submitted for approval and explained the proposed Faculty Manual change. Part III. Section E. 8. Senior Lecturer regarding the length of appointment and requirements for promotion to Senior Lecturer. There was discussion. Vote to approve change was taken and passed with required two-
thirds vote (Attachment). Vote for immediate inclusion in the *Faculty Manual* was taken and passed with required two-thirds vote.

8. **President’s Report:**
   a. President King recognized Senator Pennington as one of five new Alumni Distinguished Professors announced at Convocation.
   
b. King announced that the provost-level summary of the independent COACHE survey has been provided to the University administration. The Senate’s Welfare Committee will work with Associate Provost Aziz to address issues of concern identified by COACHE. King found the results to be in line with the Faculty Senate’s own survey conducted several years ago by the Senate Welfare Committee under the leadership of Christina Wells (CAFLS).
   
c. King informed the Senate that the Board of Trustees moved to direct a joint BOT-faculty-administration task force to review and make recommendations concerning a revised University mission statement drafted by the Mission Statement committee appointed by President Barker and subsequently approved by the Administrative Council in early July. It is expected that the Board would consider the work of this task force at its October meeting.
   
d. King expects that faculty will be apprised of the Huron consulting group’s report on faculty compensation and related initiatives in September.
   
f. King directed faculty to review the report of a NCAA working group, chaired by President Barker, whose aim is to streamline NCAA rules. Specifically, King was concerned with the suggestion of allowing athletic boosters to more directly compensate university coaches.
   
g. King announced that a recent Bain & Co. report indicates that the University lands in the top 20% of all universities in financial sustainability as measured by placement in a financial merit matrix composed of equity and expense rations.

10. **Announcements:**
   a. Nominations for the Faculty Representative to the Board of Trustees are due on September 3, 2012 to the Faculty Senate Office or mpatte2@clemson.edu.
   
b. Nominations for the Class of ’39 Award for Excellence are due on October 23, 2012 to the Faculty Senate Office or mpatte2@clemson.edu.
   
c. Next Executive/Advisory Committee Meeting – August 28, 2012
   
d. Next Faculty Senate Meeting – September 11, 2012

11. **Adjournment:** President King adjourned the meeting at 4:50 p.m.
A Resolution
To Create and Support the Clemson University Honor Creed

Resolution No.
2012/2013 Clemson University Undergraduate Senate
Committee: Finance and Procedures

Date Submitted: 
Date Approved: 
Author: Holly McKissick
Austin Mall
Sponsor: Brian Jones
Ryan Gillespie

1. Purpose: To create and support the Clemson University Honor Creed.

2. Whereas, The Clemson community has, as a result of tradition and historical conduct,
3. developed an intrinsic set of core values by which its members live, and

4. Whereas, a committee of undergraduates, graduates, faculty, and staff solicited value
5. statements from all aforementioned groups and from these statements created an Honor
6. Creed representative of the values and beliefs of members of the Clemson community,

7. and

8. Whereas, the proposed creed represents values and tenets held by generations of those
9. connected to Clemson University.

10. Therefore, be it resolved by the Clemson University Faculty Senate
11. assembled in regular session the following:

12. That, the Faculty Senate supports the creation of a Clemson University Honor
13. Creed.

14. That, the Faculty Senate supports the Clemson University Honor Creed suggested
15. by the Honor Creed Committee, which reads:

16. As a member of the Clemson University community, I vow to uphold the university’s
17. core values of honesty, integrity, and respect. I promise to demonstrate these core values
18. daily during my time at Clemson and throughout life:

19. I will engage in authentic and honest dialogue
20. I will treat others with respect and learn from their ideas and opinions
21. I will display integrity by doing what is right and addressing wrongs in my community
22. I will refrain from lying, stealing, and cheating
23. I will make responsible decisions regarding the health and safety of myself and others.

24. By adhering to this creed, I represent Clemson with dignity and integrity; I hold myself
25. accountable to the students, faculty, staff, and alumni of Clemson University.

26. That, the Faculty Senate supports the distribution of this creed to members of the
27. Clemson University community including undergraduates, graduates, faculty, staff, and alumni so that they may voluntarily pledge themselves to the tenets of the creed.

29. **That,** under no circumstances should one’s vow to follow the creed result in official university punishment or sanctions.

31. **That,** upon passage of similar resolutions of support from the Undergraduate, Graduate, and Staff Senates and approval by needed authorities including the University Administrative Council and Board of Trustees, this body will support the launch of the honor creed and will add the honor creed to necessary documents of governance as deemed appropriate.

---

**Senate President**

**Date**

**Senator**

**Date**

**Cc:**  
James Barker (jbarker)  
Doris Helms (drhelms)  
Joy Smith (joy)  
BOT  
Clemson Alumni Center  
WSBF (wsbf)  
The Tiger (editor@thetigernews.com)  
Gail DiSabatino (gaild)  
Terry Don Phillips (pterry)  
Administrative Council  
Board of Visitors  
Clemson World  
CTV (ccn)
Policy Committee Report, July 17th, 2012

Present (Patterson, Kurz, McGuire, Laurence, Dutkiewicz, and Pennington)

The committee discussed pending and anticipated policy issues.

Three Faculty Manual changes which passed the Senate were returned by the Provost for additional revision.

1. Part VI. I. – Policy for hiring interim chairs
2. Part III E 6 – Changes in description of the lecturer rank
3. Part III E. 8 - Changes in the description of the senior lecturer rank

An additional clarification of wording for PTR review was also discussed.

4. Part IV H 2 (2) Post Tenure Review Coverage

Ad hoc committee for FM revision for VI. I. 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. Previous work done by Scott Dutkiewicz will serve as an effective starting point for the ad hoc committee.
We were asked to meet again by Beth Lacy to discuss three more issues that have arisen in the implementation of Banner.

The first issue was about academic advising. We were told that Banner has the ability to assign pin numbers for registration for classes, but these numbers could only be given directly to the students. Academic advisors could ask for these pin numbers, but there would seem to be no way to require the students to release them and, in any case, the students would already have what they need to register for classes. The instructor of each class could block registration for his or her class until the student meets some requirement such as to consult with an advisor, but that seems unworkable. As a result, there seems to be no way in Banner to require students to meet with their academic advisors before or even after registering for classes each semester. This would constitute a significant change to current practices.

When we questioned the desirability of allowing students to move through their college years without being forced to meet with their academic advisors, we were told a number of points: that students would still be free to meet with their advisors, that many departments and advisors already just release the pin numbers; that students should take more responsibility for their academic decisions, and that Banner would make it very easy for students to do so. Banner should represent a major improvement over the current system and will show students and advisors alike what courses are needed, when they will be offered, and so on. In addition, it may automate some things that advisors now do, such as to screen students from classes for which they have not met the pre-requisites. In support of this, the Registrar's Office is auditing the pre-requisites of all classes and, in the next year, will submit those to the various departments to see that they still hold.

The Faculty Senators expressed some concerns, including that the fact that some departments do not follow current advising policy is hardly a reason to change that policy. These decisions should be made on their own merits. Also, it seems likely that the students most likely to avoid optional meetings with their advisors are the ones who would need them the
most, and we could expect more and more students finding out in their final semesters that they will not graduate in time. These students will place enormous pressures on their advisors, departments, and the university to approve course substitutions and make other accommodations for them to graduate. Finally, advising is about more than just picking classes; it is a valuable interaction between students and faculty.

Beth offered to give a demonstration of DegreeWorks in Banner at a Faculty Senate meeting this fall so we could see what improvements it offers over the current system. We encouraged her to do this, and as soon as possible. I think we were in agreement that the current system is not desirable, and we should be thankful for this proposed change has brought advising reform to the forefront. We look forward to seeing how Banner will change this interaction between students and faculty, and working with them to make sure these changes are as beneficial as possible to students.

The two other issues arising from Banner were more straightforward, and quickly addressed. First, it will allow an automation of purchasing services, reducing demands on individual departments. We did not discuss this much. Finally, Banner will offer a Room Scheduler that will try to optimize the allocation of university classrooms each semester, according to the instructors' needs. Departments will still retain control of their teaching labs and conference rooms, but the others will now be allocated centrally rather than in the current scramble across departments and colleges described by one as a "mad melee". In Room Scheduler, instructors will assign attributes to each course such as classroom size, configuration, technology needs, proximity to instructor's office, and Banner will allocate classrooms accordingly. These attributes will roll over from semester to semester. The only responses from Faculty Senators were positive ones, especially given that we will be consulted on additional course attributes to consider, and that classrooms can be switched if needed.
Part IV. B. (2) Affirmative Action Policies and Procedures for the Recruitment and Appointment of Faculty and Administrators

There may be instances in which a person is recommended for a position by a search-and-screening committee without widespread recruitment efforts having been undertaken. Such cases may be justified when a qualified individual may be promoted from within the institution, when time is of the essence, when university operations would suffer as a result of an interim appointment, or when a person is available who is uniquely qualified for a position. By their very nature, such cases are rare. The acceptability of such cases shall be measured not only against the urgency of those particular appointments but also against past efforts to employ members of minority groups and women in the unit(s) recommending those appointments. Though the language does not address interim appointments, it’s instructive regarding the intent of the faculty manual to address unusual circumstances.

If there such level of flexibility regarding searches, it makes sense to keep the appointment of interim chairs simple and flexible...

Proposed Language

Under exceptional circumstances which do not allow departments/programs to search for a chair per the guidelines stated on Part VI (1) of the Faculty Manual, Departments (or equivalent units) will provide their dean with a list of all acceptable candidates for the Interim Department Chair position following the procedure described in their by-laws. Deans shall appoint an interim chair from this list for no more than a calendar year. The interim chair may be reappointed for one additional year under exceptional circumstances. After two years, the process must be repeated if a Department Chair is not hired.

In the rare event when none of the candidates provided by the department are acceptable to the Dean, the Provost will suggest alternative candidates to be considered. An appointment from this list must meet the approval of the Dean and pass a majority vote of the departmental faculty. This appointment would be for one calendar year, and the interim chair would be expected to work with the Dean and the department toward appointment of a permanent Department Chair.

Rationale- It is to the best interests of departments to have qualified permanent chairs. Unusual circumstances, however, dictate the need for interim appointments to ensure continuity of department/program operations. These appointments are intended to be for a specified time until a permanent chair is appointed through established procedures. The proposed language is intended to ensure faculty input to the selection of their Interim Chair.
Part III. E. (6) Lecturer

Proposed Wording:

6. Lecturer. This rank is assigned in cases where the assignment of regular faculty ranks is not appropriate or possible. Individuals having initial lecturer appointments beginning after 15 May 2011 shall have no administrative duties inconsistent with those of regular faculty. These academic appointments shall be for one-year terms and, beginning in Fall 2013, may be renewed for a maximum of 9 full academic years. For the purposes of academic appointment and reappointment, a one-year term begins August 15 and ends May 16 although lecturers may be extended benefits over the summer. Notice of renewal or non-renewal must be provided before July 15 for the following August 15-May 16 term. After May 16 following completion of four or more one-year terms of continuous appointment as a lecturer, one year’s notice of non-renewal must be provided. No notice of non-renewal shall be required if a lecturer resigns, is terminated, or is dismissed for cause (Part IV, section K).

Beginning in Fall 2013, lecturers shall be evaluated annually by their department chair/school director and by their unit tenure-promotion-(re)appointment committee following procedures and standards that shall be specified in the unit’s tenure-promotion-(re)appointment document. Beginning in Fall 2013, following a lecturer’s fourth year of service, the department chair/school director and the unit tenure-promotion-(re)appointment committee shall conduct a comprehensive review of the lecturer either in response to a request for promotion to senior lecturer or to advise the lecturer of his/her progress towards promotion to senior lecturer. Equivalent experience at Clemson may be counted towards this four year service requirement. If (a) a lecturer fails to request promotion to senior lecturer by the Fall semester tenure-promotion-reappointment request deadline for regular faculty during the lecturer’s eighth year of service, or b) a lecturer requests promotion and is not promoted to senior lecturer during his or her the eighth year of service, then the lecturer shall not be reappointed following a final ninth year of service.

In cases in which there is nonreappointment or in which there is a discrepancy in the recommendation for retention or promotion to senior lecturer between the tenure-promotion-(re)appointment committee and that of the department chair, the department chair shall make the dean aware of the situation. The dean, after meeting with the chair and with the committee to discuss the situation, will render a decision. In all cases of non-reappointment, the file shall be forwarded to the Provost for final decision.
Proposed Wording:

8. Senior Lecturer. After four full academic years of service (beginning in Fall 2013), a lecturer may apply for promotion to senior lecturer; equivalent experience at Clemson may be counted towards the four year service requirement. A department chair/school director and the department/school tenure-promotion-(re)appointment committee make independent promotion recommendations to the college dean, who makes the promotion decision and appointment. Senior lecturers shall be offered three-year contracts with the requirement of one year’s notice of non-renewal before July 15. Beginning Fall 2013, Senior lecturers shall be evaluated annually by their department chair/school director. Senior lecturers shall be evaluated by their department/school tenure-promotion-(re) appointment committee, following procedures and standards that shall be specified in the unit’s tenure-promotion-(re)appointment document, at least once every three years as determined by the faculty. Senior lecturers cannot have administrative duties beyond those of regular faculty. Senior lecturers shall have no administrative duties inconsistent with those of regular faculty.

The senior lecturer appointment is intended to recognize the efforts, contributions, and performance of lecturers who are not merely satisfactorily effective teachers, but who have also made (an) additional significant contribution(s) to the instructional mission of the University. Accordingly, beginning in Fall 2013, length of service as lecturer is, itself, not a sufficient criterion for promotion to senior lecturer. Instead, the process and criteria for promotion from lecturer to senior lecturer are determined by departments/schools and shall be described in their tenure and promotion document.

Lecturers must document and provide evidence of their teaching performance and additional contributions/activities to the department chair/school director and department/school tenure-promotion-(re)appointment committee for evaluation and consideration for promotion to senior lecturer.

During the 2012-2013 Academic Year, evaluation and promotion of/to senior lecturer(s) should follow the 2011-2012 Faculty Manual.
MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
September, 11 2012

1. Call to Order: The Faculty Senate Meeting was called to order at 2:35 p.m. by Jeremy King, and guests were recognized and introduced.

2. Approval of Minutes: The Faculty Senate Minutes dated August, 21 2012 were approved as written.

3. "Free Speech": None

4. Special Orders of the Day: Lisa S. Powers, Director of TigerOne Card Services; Steve Robbins, Associate VP for Student Affairs; and, Kevin McKenzie, Chief Security Officer of CCIT provided information on the design, features, and timeline of the new official University TigerOne identity card. Photos can be taken and/or uploaded by September 21st. New cards will be distributed December 2012.

Arlene C. Stewart, Ed.D, Director, Student Disability Services provided a presentation of services offered to students with disabilities at Clemson. Regan Schroer, Clemson senior, provided testimonial of her expectations and experiences as related to the Office of Disability Services. Approximately 700 Clemson students are registered with the office; however, this may only be half of the campus student population with disabilities. Stewart informed faculty that the majority of registered students have “hidden” disabilities and that the best practice of “Universal Design” (NC State), if incorporated into the classroom could eliminate the need for accommodations.

5. Committee Reports:
   a. Senate Committees:

   Policy – Chair Bill Pennington submitted the Committee Report regarding the Public Health Service (PHS) Financial Conflict of Interest Policy, an information change to the Faculty Manual, which was discussed under New Business. Chair Pennington reported that the Committee is working to draft changes to the Post Tenure Review process that would move faculty to Phase 2 upon two unsatisfactory evaluations rather than waiting until the end of the five-year cycle. The Committee is also evaluating FAS Forms 1, 2 and 3.

   Welfare – Chair Diane Perpich stated that the Welfare Committee meets on the first Tuesday of each month in Academic Success Center 301 from 2:00-3:30. Chair Perpich submitted and outlined the Committee Report dated September 2, 2012. The COACHE faculty satisfaction survey results will help set priorities and
President King acknowledged Associate Provost Nadim Aziz who was present and can assist in these efforts. In some areas (e.g., tenure review), faculty expressed a surprising amount of satisfaction. In other areas – related to benefits, leadership, faculty recognition, etc. – respondents expressed mild to strong dissatisfaction.

The Committee also met with Angela Nixon, Vice President of Staff Senate, and Wendy Howard of the Staff Senate Policy and Welfare Committee to collaborate in approaching a variety of issues stemming from new parking policies and initiatives, including the increased number of special spaces (LEV, carpool, etc.), the need for increased flexibility in the way parking permits can be used (moving them from one car to another), and the need for improved consultation and customer service as new policies are decided on and implemented.

Research – Chair Jim McCubbin reported that the Committee had not met. The research committee chair will represent the Faculty Senate on the University Research Counsel.

Finance – Chair Antonis Katsiyannis reported that the Committee is scheduled to meet next week.

Scholastic Policies – Chair David Tonkyn submitted and outlined the Committee Report dated September 10, 2012. Several unresolved issues from last academic year were discussed at their first fall meeting.

Endorsed by the Scholastic Policies Committee, there was a vote to discuss the elimination of the Freshman-Sophomore Retention Committee. It was discussed and voted on as per Retention Committee Chair and Vice Provost and Dean of Academic Studies Jan Murdoch’s request (April 11, 2012 memo). The vote to discuss passed with required two-thirds vote. Vote to eliminate it was taken and passed with required two-thirds vote.

The new Director of Online Education, DeWitt Salley, has asked President King to form an Online Education Faculty Advisory Board. Witt has already met with Perry Austen who coordinates a new Student Advisory Board.

Bob Horton has volunteered to remain our representative on the Ad Hoc Committee on Application of Graduate Credits to an Undergraduate Degree.

Wayne Goddard volunteered to be the Scholastic Policies Committee representative to the University Scholarship and Awards Committee. Two points of interest from the August 29, 2012 meeting are: University Counsel is exploring the question of targeting financial aid to children of university faculty and staff and the budget for minority recruitment had been considerably increased last year.
The University has raised the Latin Honors requirements to 3.7, 3.85 and 3.95, (from 3.4, 3.85 and 3.95) and these will go into effect January 2013. Perry Austen brought two concerns of the Student Senate: students considered the new standards to be too high and the 2009/2010 Undergraduate Announcements under which most current Seniors arrived at Clemson listed the old criteria. Some Senators noted that students were provided notice and a deferment had already taken place. Chair Tonkyn said he would gather more information to determine if a Senate endorsement for a one-year deferment was still needed.

The Committee is discussing the following two items: the proposal provided in a Memorandum from Stan Smith to Jan Murdoch and Bob Horton, dated March 16, 2012, to simplify and clarify the Pass-Fail option, and possible revisions of the Evaluation of Instruction Form. The Committee has been asked to explore three additional items regarding the: Bridge Program (what is the Clemson policy toward violations of academic integrity while at Tri-County Technical College, and how do Bridge students fare academically when compared with non-Bridge students?), contextualized grades (should faculty provide rankings of students in addition to their letter grades?), and Student Senate petition of the Provost to explore General Education requirements (how does Faculty Senate want to proceed on this?).

b.  ad hoc Faculty Senate Committees

Budget Accountability Committee – Chair Antonis Katsiyannis reported that the Committee is scheduled to meet next week.

c. University Commissions and Committees: President King announced that a task force of two members of the Senate, Board, and Academic Council provided a unanimous recommendation to President Barker and hopes that the revised University mission statement will be considered at the October Board of Trustees meeting.

6. Old Business: None

7. New Business:
   a. Chair Bill Pennington of the Faculty Senate Policy Committee proposed an informational addition to Section X of the Faculty Manual. Endorsed by the Senate Executive/Advisory Committee one vote to approve the addition was taken and passed with required two-thirds vote.

1. Public Health Service (PHS) Financial Conflict of Interest Policy. Clemson University has adopted a new PHS Financial Conflict of Interest Policy in order to fully comply with the U.S. PHS's revised regulations (amended August 24, 2012). Researchers planning to apply for funding from a PHS agency, or who have current PHS funding or plan to ask for a no cost extension of an existing PHS award must comply with the FCOI
Regulations (Phase I SBIR and SSTR applicants are exempt). The New PHS FCOI Policy and new PHS FCOI Disclosures and Supplement Forms may be found at: http://www.clemson.edu/research/sponsored/coi.html

8. President's Report:
   a. President King recognized new Faculty Representative to the Board of Trustees, David Blakesley.
   b. King announced that this fall, new faculty members were invited to visit the University President’s Office to receive free tickets to the Ball State football game. New faculty are also able to attend a Brook’s Center event of their choice subject to space availability. Thanks to Marvin Carmichael, University President’s Office, Athletic Director Terry Don Phillips and Brook’s Center Director Mickey Harder for their support of these initiatives.

10. Announcements:
   a. Faculty Senate will have a booth at the Benefits Fair on Tuesday, October 9th from 9 a.m. - 1 p.m. at Littlejohn Coliseum.
   b. Two non-senator, faculty members from different Colleges are needed to serve on the President’s Commission for Sustainability. AAH is already represented.
   c. Next Executive/Advisory Committee meeting – September 25, 2012
   d. Next Faculty Senate meeting – October 9, 2012

11. Adjournment: President King adjourned the meeting at 4:30 p.m.

Denise M. Anderson, Secretary

Monica A. Patterson, Program Coordinator

New TigerOne Card
Lisa Powers
TigerOne Card Services
Wednesday, October 31, 2012

Topics of Discussion

- Project Overview
- New Card Design
- HID Multi-Technology Card
- Track Information
- Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)
- Testing
- New Card Distribution
- Conversion Date
- Temporary Call Center
Project Overview

Why are we re-carding the campus?

- iRoar – Identity Management Phase

- The TigerOne Card is the largest visual representation of identity at Clemson University
- Issuing 25,000+ new cards in December

New Card Design

- One card design w/ horizontal orientation

- Modern, eye-catching design to represent Clemson’s heritage & academic quality

- Larger photo with white background

- Custom holographic laminate for enhanced durability & security

- Primary Affiliations; Student, Employee, and Affiliate

- Barcode
  - Includes a 2 digit Lost Card Count (LCC)
HID Multi-Technology Cards

- Hi-Co Magnetic Stripe
  - Magnetic Stripe is more durable
- SIO Enable HID Proximity chip
  - Multi-layered security providing added protection to identity data
- HID iClass SE 2k bits contactless smart chip
  - 13.56MHz contactless smart card technology for higher security

Magnetic Stripe Changes

Track 1 – XID plus a two digit Lost Card Count (LCC)
  Example: C1234567801
  *TigerOne Card Services is the data steward for LCC.

Track 2 – A 16 digit ISO number. ONLY for the use of
  TigerOne Card Services Financial and privilege transactions
  *TigerOne Card Services is the data steward for ISO number.
  No entity other than TigerOne is allowed to read or store Track 2 data.

Track 3 – Access Control Offline locks ONLY; i.e. Housing offline locks

When programming application readers for attendance, a MOU may be required
from the data steward of the information you are requesting and storing.
Prox & iCLASS Technology

- Primarily used for Access Control
- Dual technology allows for backwards & forwards reader compatibility
  - Sets our path for future campus-wide access control solutions
- Current cards use proximity chip today
  - Future use of proximity will be phased out
- The iCLASS contactless smart card technology offers enhanced security through encryption and mutual authentication.

Testing

- Currently in progress for TigerOne system and equipment, Kronos, & on-campus Access Control
  - Test cards have been provided the other end users; i.e. Library, Campus Recreation, Post Office, Redfern, CCIT, etc.
- All other application readers that use the TigerOne Card should be programmed to read Track 1 & tested by the end user.
- All testing should be completed by the first of December.
- Should you have questions or concerns, contact TigerOne at: tigerone-card@lists.clemson.edu
New Card Distribution

- New Cards will return to campus the last week of November
- Distribution is set for:
  8a-6p
  Hendrix Center Ballroom
- The TigerOne Card Services office will be closed at Fike & will be on-site at the Hendrix Center Ballroom during this 2 week period.
- Normal TigerOne Card Services Office hours will resume at Fike the week of Dec. 17, 2012.

New Card Conversion

- The conversion from old card to new card will occur on:
  Wednesday, Dec. 19, 2012
- After Tuesday, Dec. 18, 2012, the current card will not work & is not to be accepted at any entity on or off campus.
- On Wednesday, Dec. 19, 2012, the new card will be activated for use & is the only TigerOne Card to be accepted on this day & going forward.
Temporary Call Center

- Requested number: 656-CARD (2273)
- Monday – Friday 8a-4:30p
- TigerOne staff will answer questions & troubleshoot the individuals issue(s). Only after ensuring that there is not an issue with the actual Card, the staff member will direct the individual to the appropriate contact for the area in which the issue was encountered.

** Please provide TigerOne Card Services with accurate contact information for an individual that can assist with issues in your area.

TigerOne Card Services will be open on Sunday, January 6, 2013 from 1p-5p

Q & A

For inquiries regarding TigerOne Card Services:

Visit us online at clemson.edu/tigerone
Email us at: tigerone-card@lists.clemson.edu
Office: (864) 656-0763
New TIGER®ONE Card Distribution FAQs

Who is eligible for a new ID?
All enrolled Clemson students and active employees and affiliates hired through the CUHR system will be eligible to receive a new ID.

When and where will I pick up my new ID card?
All eligible students, employees and affiliates will pick up their new ID card beginning Monday, Dec. 3, 2012, through Friday, Dec. 14, 2012, in the Hendrix Student Center Ballroom. TigerOne Card Services will be at this on-site location Monday-Friday from 8 a.m.-6 p.m. during this two-week period of time.

* If you were hired as an employee after Sept. 21, 2012, or have never had a TigerOne Card and are eligible, you cannot pick up a new ID until Wednesday, Dec. 19, 2012. Beginning on Dec. 19, please come to the TigerOne Card Services office at Fike Monday–Friday, 8 a.m.–4:30 p.m.

What do I need in order to pick up my new ID?
You must present a valid government-issued photo ID or your current CUID card in order to receive your new ID card. At the time of distribution, you will be required to acknowledge you are taking possession of your new ID card.

Can someone pick up my new ID for me or can I have it mailed to me?
No. For security purposes you must pick up your new ID card in person and provide a valid government-issued photo ID or your current University ID card.

Will my old ID work once I receive my new ID?
Both cards will not work at the same time. The old ID card must be used until Tuesday, Dec. 18, 2012. The new ID card will be activated and must be used beginning Wednesday, Dec. 19, 2012, at 7 a.m.

What happens if I do not pick up my new ID card prior to Dec. 14, 2012?
From Dec. 17–Dec. 21, 2012, the TigerOne Card Services office will be open at its Fike Recreation Center location from 8 a.m.–4:30 p.m. The office will be closed for Holiday Break from Monday, Dec. 24, 2012–Wednesday, Jan. 2, 2013. Old cards will not work when students and employees return to campus in Jan. 2013.
I am graduating on Dec. 20, if the old ID card does not work after Tuesday, Dec. 18, how do I access my residence hall or eat in the dining facilities?

In order to make arrangements through dinner on Thursday, Dec. 20, please contact the TigerOne Card Services office directly at tigerone-card@lists.clemson.edu. If you are graduating and have a TigerStripe balance of $50 or more, please request a refund prior to noon on Tuesday, Dec. 18, 2012.

May I keep my old ID card?
Yes. You may keep your old ID card; however, it will not work once the new ID card is activated on Wednesday, Dec. 19, 2012.

INFORMATION ON YOUR NEW CARD

Card Technology:
Your new TigerOne Card is embedded with multiple technologies; a magnetic stripe, a proximity chip and an iCLASS contactless smart chip. This contactless smart card technology offers enhanced security through encryption and mutual authentication.

Do's and Don'ts
Carry your TigerOne Card with you at all times while on campus and present it upon request to any University official. The TigerOne Card is the property of Clemson University and is your official identification (ID) card.

DO NOT lend your TigerOne Card to others. It is non-transferable. Violation of this may result in loss of all card privileges and disciplinary action.

DO NOT leave your TigerOne Card with any individual or department as collateral for goods or services. Please notify TigerOne Card Services if you are asked to leave your card with anyone.

How to Protect your TigerOne Card
- DO NOT bend card,
- DO NOT punch key ring hole in card,
- DO NOT affix any labels or stickers to your TigerOne Card,
- Avoid scratching magnetic stripe with keys,
- Avoid using card as an ice scraper, and
- Avoid placing in washing machine, dryer, dishwasher or on car dashboard.

Clemson University is not responsible for any loss or expense resulting from the loss, theft or misuse of your TigerOne Card.
Your new TigerOne Card — COMING THIS FALL

For distribution details, visit clemson.edu/tigerone.
New TigerOne IDs will be distributed in December 2012.

**NEW ID CARD DISTRIBUTION**

Available locations: Your current ID photo will be used. Your new TigerOne ID photo will be taken at the locations below.

1. Keep your current ID photo
2. Submit your new ID photo online Sept. 3-21, 2012 (visit clemson.edu/tigerone for guidelines and requirements)
3. On-site ID photo capturing

- **9:30 a.m.-4:30 p.m.**
  - Sept. 17-21, 2012
  - TigerOne Card Office
- **8 a.m.-6 p.m.**
  - Sept. 14, 19, 23, 28
  - Univeristy Bookstore
  - Hendrix Student Center
- **9:30 a.m.-6 p.m.**
  - Sept. 10-14, 2012
  - On-site ID photo capturing (located in Hendrix Student Center)

All photos must be taken or submitted no later than 4:30 p.m. on Sept. 21, 2012. If a new ID photo is not submitted or taken at the above locations, your current ID photo will be used.

**NEW ID CARD FEATURES**

- Official University ID
- TigerStripe account
- Meal plan access
- Library access
- Building access
- Athletic events access
- Fike Recreational Center access
- Official University ID

Manage your TigerStripe account online at: clemson.edu/tigerone

**TigerOne Card Services**

- Fike Recreation Center Lobby, Mon.-Fri. 8 a.m.-4:30 p.m.
- Questions: tigerone-card@lists.clemson.edu, 864-656-0763

**TIGER* ONE**

NEW ID PHOTO OPTIONS

1. Keep your current ID photo
2. Submit your new ID photo online Sept. 3-21, 2012 (visit clemson.edu/tigerone for guidelines and requirements)
3. On-site ID photo capturing

- **9:30 a.m.-4:30 p.m.**
  - Sept. 10-14, 2012
  - University Bookstore
  - Hendrix Student Center

All photos must be taken or submitted no later than 4:30 p.m. on Sept. 21, 2012. If a new ID photo is not submitted or taken at the available locations, your current ID photo will be used.

**NEW ID CARD DISTRIBUTION**

New TigerOne ID cards will be distributed in December 2012. For distribution details, visit clemson.edu/tigerone.
Student Disability Services at Clemson University

Arlene C. Stewart, Ed.D.
Regan Schroer, Senior; Psych and Bio Sci

• Documentation
  - Rigorous
  - Vetted
  - Some reviewed annually

Academic Accommodation Letters

• Designed to support faculty/student interaction
• Reflects only instructional concerns
• Items listed are faculty led and supported

Student Disability Services Stats
Spring 2012

• Total students: 729
  • ADHD 339
  • Deaf/HOH 8
  • LD 137
  • Medical 119
  • Mobility 12
  • Other (sleep, speech, temp) 3
  • Psychological 96
  • TBI 8
  • Blind/VI 7

• 700+ Clemson Students with documented disabilities served each semester

• 50,000 million Americans = pwd = one in five

Universal Design

• Universal Design is the design of products and environments to be usable by all people, to the greatest extent possible, without the need for adaptation or specialized design.

The Center for Universal Design, NC State University
Clemson Position on Universal Design and Disability at Clemson

- It is the practice of Undergraduate Studies at Clemson University to create inclusive learning environments. Having a student with a disability in your class will give you the opportunity to evaluate your course design in terms of inclusiveness of student diversity. Some strategies that can move your course toward Universal Design and that could eliminate the need for accommodations/modifications are:

- Use teaching techniques that appeal to both visual and auditory learners.
- Incorporate hands-on activities for kinesthetic and active learners.
- Emphasize active listening and participation.
- Provide a balance between theory and application.
- Allow time for formulating questions and responses.
- Organize class time in a predictable format.

• A Student’s Perspective

• Expectations
• Experiences
• Goals
Policy Committee
September 11, 2012 Report
Bill Pennington, Chair

Proposed informational change to the Faculty Manual related to the new Public Health Service conflict of interest policy that was discussed in the FS Policy Committee EAC August 2012 meetings.

1. Public Health Service (PHS) Financial Conflict of Interest Policy. Clemson University has adopted a new PHS Financial Conflict of Interest Policy in order to fully comply with the U.S. PHS’s revised regulations (amended August 24, 2012). Researchers planning to apply for funding from a PHS agency, or who have current PHS funding or plan to ask for a no cost extension of an existing PHS award must comply with the FCOI Regulations (Phase I SBIR and SSTR applicants are exempt). The New PHS FCOI Policy and new PHS FCOI Disclosure and Supplement Forms may be found at:
http://www.clemson.edu/research/sponsored/coi.html.

Rationale: The U.S. Public health Service amended its Financial Conflict of Interest Regulation effective August 24, 2012. The entry above briefly describes the change and directs researchers to a website housing required forms and documentation.
Welfare Committee Report
September 4, 2012
Prepared by Diane Perpich, WC Chair

The Welfare Committee meets on the first Tuesday of each month in ASC 301 from 2:00-3:30. Attending: Perpich (Chair), Robbins, Winters, Layfield, Ochterbeck, Ashton, Vyavahare.

We discussed the faculty satisfaction survey prepared by COACHE and are using the results of the survey to set our priorities for the coming year. In some areas (e.g., tenure review), faculty expressed a surprising amount of satisfaction. In other areas – related to benefits, leadership, faculty recognition, etc. – respondents expressed mild to strong dissatisfaction.

We also met with Angela Nixon, Vice President of Staff Senate, and Wendy Howard of their Policy and Welfare Committee. We will collaborate with Staff Senate in approaching a variety of issues stemming from new parking policies and initiatives, including the increased number of special spaces (LEV, carpool, etc.), the need for increased flexibility in the way parking permits can be used (moving them from one car to another), and the need for improved consultation and customer service as new policies are decided on and implemented.
Minutes from meeting on Monday, September 10, 2012, from 1:00-2:00 p.m.
Room 301 of the Academic Success Center

SCHOLASTIC POLICIES COMMITTEE 2012-2013

Susannah Ashton (sashton) (AAH)
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: Ashton, Goddard, Marinescu, Tonkyn
Guests: Perry Austen (Chair, Academic Affairs Committee, Undergraduate Student Senate)

This was our first meeting of the fall semester, and we discussed several issues that have been carried over from last year or brought to us this summer.

Pass-Fail option: One unfinished item from last year was a proposed change to the Pass-Fail Policy Option, to simplify and clarify the policy. This proposal was in a Memorandum from Stan Smith to Jan Murdoch and Bob Horton, dated March 16, 2012. We will seek input from colleagues on this and discuss it at the next SP meeting.

Application of Graduate Credits: Also from last year, Bob Horton has volunteered to remain our representative on the Ad Hoc Committee on Application of Graduate Credits to an Undergraduate Degree. This committee will meet on Wednesday, Sept. 12.

Evaluation of Instruction Form: This was a major issue last year, and we will need to keep working on it.

Retention Committee: In a memo dated April 11, 2012, Jan Murdoch requested of Jeremy King that the Faculty Senate consider eliminating the Freshman-Sophomore Retention Committee that she chairs. She said in recent years it had served only in an advisory capacity. The Scholastic Policies endorsed this proposal and wishes it to now come before the full Senate.

Scholarship and Awards Committee: Wayne Goddard volunteered to be the Scholastic Policies Committee representative to the University Scholarship and Awards Committee. David Tonkyn attended the first meeting on August 29, where two points of interest to the Faculty Senate were brought up. First, the University Counsel and perhaps others are exploring the question of targeting financial aid to children of university faculty and staff. Second, the budget for minority recruitment had been considerably increased last year.

Online education: The new Director of Online Education, Witt Salley, has asked Jeremy King to form a Faculty Advisory Board, and David Tonkyn and John Leininger will
represent Scholastic Policies at a planning meeting on Thursday, Sept. 13. Witt has already met with Perry Austen about a Student Advisory Board, and Perry told us today that this was a high priority for Student Senate. Since Perry will be invited to all our meetings, we should be able to coordinate our efforts here well.

**Latin Honors requirement:** Up until now, the GPR cutoffs for the three levels of honors at graduation were 3.4, 3.7 and 3.9. Evidently, this meant that as many as 40% of all students graduated with honors. The university has raised the requirements to 3.7, 3.85 and 3.95, and these will go in force in January 2013. Perry Austen brought two concerns of the Student Senate about this. First, the students considered the new standards to be too high. We elected not to get involved in the specific criteria, though in light of the student concerns they might be revisited. Second, the 2009/2010 Undergraduate Announcements under which most current Seniors arrived at Clemson listed the old criteria. We see the Announcements as a kind of contract, just as a 2009-2010 curriculum is, to which students are grandfathered in, and voted to allow students to earn honors according to the standards set when they first arrived on campus. The 2010-2011 Undergraduate Announcements had the new standards, so if endorsed by the full Senate, this would be asking for a one-year deferment.

**Others:** We have been asked to explore three additional issues, and welcome Faculty Senate input on whether these are priorities. First, Jeremy King has suggested we might address two questions on the Bridge Program: what is the Clemson policy toward violations of academic integrity while at Tri-County Technical College, and how do Bridge students fare academically when compared with non-Bridge students? Second, should faculty provide contextualization in their grading, i.e., provide rankings of students in addition to their letter grades? Third, the Student Senate has petitioned the Provost to explore changes to the General Education requirements at Clemson. She referred them to the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee. This is not the only voice on campus for change, and the question is, how does Faculty Senate want to proceed on this?
2. **Public Health Service (PHS) Financial Conflict of Interest Policy.** Clemson University has adopted a new PHS Financial Conflict of Interest Policy in order to fully comply with the U.S. PHS's revised regulations (amended August 24, 2012). Researchers planning to apply for funding from a PHS agency, or who have current PHS funding or plan to ask for a no cost extension of an existing PHS award must comply with the FCOI Regulations (Phase I SBIR and SSTR applicants are exempt). The New PHS FCOI Policy and new PHS FCOI Disclosure and Supplement Forms may be found at: [http://www.clemson.edu/research/sponsored/coi.html](http://www.clemson.edu/research/sponsored/coi.html)

Rationale: This is not a new policy. It provides a link to the existing PHS policy.

---

**Faculty Manual Change #5 (2012-2013), Part X, Section C. #2 A link to an existing PHS policy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>yes</th>
<th>no</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doris R. Helms</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost</td>
<td>9/17/12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_____yes _____no
Need Board of Trustees Approval

_____yes _____no
Approval of Board of Trustees

_____yes _____no
Immediate inclusion in Faculty Manual

Change effective July 1, 2013
1. Call to Order: The Faculty Senate Meeting was called to order at 2:32 p.m. by President Jeremy King.

2. Approval of Minutes: The Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes dated September 11, 2012 were approved as written and distributed.

3. “Free Speech”: None

4. Special Order of the Day: Rumame Samuels, Director of Recruitment and Compensation, Human Resources provided a Compensation Update. As part of the University’s 2020 Road Map plan, Huron recommendations will help Clemson create a more competitive compensation plan to attract, recruit, retain, and reward top performers. Seven recommendations presented include: (1) develop market-based compensation philosophy; (2) develop market-based compensation strategy; (3) develop a meaningful performance rating scale with planned distribution; (4) maintain all faculty performance data in HRIS; (5) develop merit-based performance matrix; (6) establish “University” professorship; and, (7) establish faculty mentorship program. The floor was opened for questions and answers.

Chuck Knepfle, Director, Student Financial Aid discussed six topics of interest provided to him by Finance and Budget and Accountability Committees Chair Antonis Katsiyannis and President King. They included: (1) recent initiatives of the Financial Aid office that have increased yield; (2) information and statistics on the numbers and type of aid that students receive; (3) Satisfactory Academic Progress requirements and their relationship with/impact on faculty; (4) if the University will adopt the Department of Education’s suggested Financial Aid Shopping Sheet; (5) current status and future plans for financial aid for minority transfer students; and, (6) Director’s perceptions about the impact of Banner/iROAR on the Financial Aid enterprise at Clemson. The floor was opened for questions and answers.

5. Committee Reports:
   a. Senate Committees:

Finance – Chair Antonis Katsiyannis submitted and outlined the Committee Report dated September 18, 2012. Chair Katsiyannis reported that Matthew Watkins of the Annual Giving Office provided 2012 data on faculty and staff giving (faculty at 23.71% and faculty alumni at 38.44%). Chair Katsiyannis reported on the Huron recommendations that have shaped the University’s plan to
maintain all faculty performance data in HRIS; (5) develop merit-based performance matrix; (6) establish “University” professorship; and, (7) establish faculty mentorship program. Upon request, Provost Helms reported that Huron will continue to help the University analyze compensation data for next year, but that administration is considering whether peer data collection by department, which is difficult, should continue.

c. University Commissions and Committees: None

6. Old Business: None

7. New Business: A proposed Resolution from the Executive/Advisory Committee recognizing Cathy Sturkie, former Program Coordinator of Faculty Senate, was unanimously approved and titled FS12-10-1 P. It will be presented at Cathy Sturkie at her retirement party on October 30, 2012.

8. President’s Report:
   a. President King said he would provide an article about international travel in the next President’s Newsletter.
   b. Reiterating a lab safety notice in the September President’s Newsletter, President King acknowledged Senator Bill Pennington for ensuring laboratory compliance. Senator Pennington reported that he had a very positive experience having Naomi Kelly, Chemical Hygienist and June Brock, Environmental Compliance Officer (both of Research Safety) and Tracy Arwood, Assistant Vice President for Research Compliance, help evaluate his lab.
   c. President King also noted two potential faculty hiring opportunities for Departments: one based on ability to meet student needs, and another to achieve strategic scholarly goals. Faculty may hear more about the former from their Chair, and should have received an email regarding the latter from Provost Helms today, October 9, 2012.

10. Announcements:
   a. Flu Shots will continue to be provided at the Joseph F. Sullivan Center
   b. Board of Trustees & Faculty Senate Reception and Dinner Honoring New Faculty Thursday, October 18th beginning at 6:30p.m., Kresge Hall, Clemson Outdoor Lab
   c. Nominations for the Class of ’39 Award for Excellence due Tuesday, October 23rd
   d. Support your Faculty Senate Oars in “Team Up for Clemson Regatta”, Saturday, October 27th estimated timeframe is 10:00a.m. – 3:30p.m at Clemson University Rowing Facility on campus at Lake Hartwell (rain date, Sunday, October 28th)
e. Retirement Party for Cathy Sturkie, Tuesday, October 30th 3:30p.m. – 5:00p.m., Clemson Alumni Center

f. Staff Senate's 1st annual “Sprint for Success 5K” to support Staff Senate Scholarship Fund Saturday, November 3rd

g. Next Executive/Advisory Committee meeting – October 30, 2012 beginning at 2:00 p.m.

h. Next Faculty Senate meeting – November 13, 2012

11. Adjournment: President King adjourned the meeting at 4:02 p.m.

Denise M. Anderson, Secretary

Monica A. Patterson, Program Coordinator

Absent: J. Northcutt, S. Ashton (T. McDonald), R. Hewitt, M. Mowrey (Z. Taydas for), M. Ellison, N. Vyarahare
Special Order: Rumame Samuels  
Director of Recruitment and Compensation, Human Resources  

Mrs. Samuels provided a Compensation Update to the Faculty Senate.  

No presentation was submitted.
1) The recent initiatives you've taken that have increased yield this coming year.

**Scholarship Successes – Yield Rates**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New scholarship programs were focused in the following areas:</th>
<th>Fall 2011</th>
<th>Fall 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Palmetto Fellows with 1350+</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-State students with need</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-State scholarship students (1250 SAT / Top 10%)</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-state top 10% students</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-state 10% students</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2) Information/statistics on the numbers and type of aid that CU students receive (I'm sure Life and Palmetto will be of special interest.
85% got something, 48% graduate with a loan

**2010-11 Financial Aid for Clemson Students ($202,630,679)**

- Employment: 6%
- Tuition Waivers: 9%
- University Scholarships/Grants: 9%
- Federal Grants: 5%
- Private Sources (outside of Clemson): 5%
- Student and Parent Loans: 43%
3) Satisfactory Academic Progress requirements and their relationship with impact on faculty

- Minimum GPR – same as University Requirements
- Earn 67% of all courses attempted
- Complete in less than 150% (189 hours)
- Transfer, AP and IB count in maximum hours
- Evaluation after every term of enrollment, regardless if they are on aid or not
- Financial Aid Warning – still OK
- Unsatisfactory – ineligible, pending appeal – will include Academic Plan
- Financial Aid Probation – accepted appeal

4) Will the University be adopting the Dept of Education’s suggested Financial Aid Shopping Sheet?

Yes, but not for 2012-13.

5) The current status and future plans for financial aid for minority transfer students

Minority - increase from $50,000 to $400,000
Transfer – yield already 70%+. I’d support need-based aid for Bridge

6) Your perceptions about the impact of Banner/iROAR on the FA enterprise at Clemson

- Faster aid
- Quicker reporting
- Improved student interface
- Better funds management
- Better communication with students
- DEFINITE learning curve for FA staff
FACULTY SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE

MEETING MINUTES
ANTONIS KATSIIANNIS, CHAIR
September 18, 2012; 3:00-4:00 (420 Tillman Hall)

Chair Antonis Katsiyannis
Susan Chapman
Feng Chen
Tom Dobbins
Pradip Srimani

Present: King, Watkins, Sruimani, Katsiyannis

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.
Allan Schaeffer fund-benefits the faculty senate.

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.

Goals for 2012-13
• Discuss 2012-13 budget priorities; focus on financial health and sustainability across the university, particularly on the instructional side.
• Ensure the availability of the salary report by January. Critically examine trends and issues regarding faculty/administrator compensation.
• Active engagement with administration in implementing the “Huron” report.
• Promote the need for state of the art instructional facilities; also infrastructure (dormitories, commons, and recreational facilities where the overwhelming majority of students learn and live)
• Clarify and establish policies regarding benefit rates applied/assessed to grants having foreign personnel on J1 visas?
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:

1. Develop a market-based compensation philosophy.
2. Develop a market-based compensation strategy.
3. Develop a meaningful performance rating scale with planned distribution.
4. Maintain all faculty performance data in HRIS.
5. Develop a merit-based performance matrix.
6. Establish "University" professorship.
7. 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.

2012 Market-Based Special Adjustment Increases-To be reflected on October 26 pay check

2012 Salary Report- 2012 pay increases to be market based and performance driven

The office of the CFO will present highlights of the Huron Report during the October meeting.
Representatives of the Faculty Senate Welfare Committee and Staff Senate Welfare and Policy Committee had a joint meeting with Dan Hofmann and Cat Moreland of Parking Services (PS). Staff and Faculty Senate had received diverse questions and concerns about parking. Rather than inundate PS with specific complaints, we brought them under three headings, as follows:

1. **Flexibility.** Both staff and faculty raised issues about whether parking permits must be tied to individual vehicles or whether they might not be tied to the individual who purchases the pass. People who drive different cars to campus on different days would like the flexibility to move their pass to the car they are currently driving.

2. **Customer Service.** Faculty and staff alike felt that the overall delivery of information about new policies and the solicitation of faculty and staff input before changes are made would be desirable.

3. **Specialty parking spaces** (LEV, carpool, designated spots). How are these allocated and is the proliferation of specialty spots a good idea on a campus where parking is generally agreed to be in too short supply. Again, this is a case where fuller input from faculty and staff as well as better delivery of information about new policies would be welcome.

PS answers to questions about flexibility assured us that a) there was more flexibility in the system than most people on campus believe. Up to 3 cars, for example, can be assigned to any one parking permit, and even more are permitted if necessary. In general, people who have unique needs are urged to go to PS in person and work with them directly. Additionally, PS apologized that the roll-out on their new system of renewing passes was not as smooth as they expected and wanted it to be. Problems with the system have been addressed and should go more smoothly in the future.

With respect to customer service, PS is already looking at ways to get out information on the good things they’ve done (such as creating over 200 new parking spaces by reconfiguring existing lots). A “Know Parking” column in the student newspaper, a newsletter that could be distributed once or twice a semester, use of “Inside Clemson” etc. are being considered. We urged them to be mindful that faculty, staff, and students may prefer or need different media to get this information. PS acknowledged that it needs to do a better job of soliciting campus input on what’s working and what’s not. A live chat once or twice a month is being considered as are open forums.

Regarding specialty spaces, PS wants to align itself with the university’s sustainability goals and believes the LEV and carpool spaces help incentivize green car purchases. Some on the committee disagreed. PS noted that these spaces have a 91% occupancy rate compared to an 84% occupancy rate for green spaces generally. Spaces are created in lots close to buildings where those with LEV or carpool permits work. We can likely expect more of these spaces in the future.

Staff and Faculty Senate Welfare Committees were invited to have a representative that would meet with PS on a more regular basis. We will set that up beginning next semester.
FACULTY SENATE POLICY COMMITTEE
Bill Pennington, Chair

September 27, 2012, Room 107-Cooper Library
The Policy Committee met on Thursday September 27th, and made good progress on three topics.

   We were asked to look at the current PTR policy, which requires Phase II review for any faculty member receiving two annual performance reviews of “fair” or worse during a given five-year review cycle. Problems with this process include situations such as: 1) the problem of a faculty member receiving poor ratings in the first two years not being addressed until the end of the five year cycle. 2) the problem of a faculty member receiving a “poor” during the last year of one cycle, and another “poor” during the first year of the next cycle not being addressed at all (i.e. the slate is wiped clean every five years).
   Our intent is to require Phase I review of every tenured faculty member on an annual basis, with Phase II review triggered for any faculty member receiving two poor annual performance reviews during the most recent five annual reviews. Suggested modifications to several sections of the Faculty Manual are in progress.

2. Many problems have been noted in the section of the manual dealing with the Annual Performance Review process, mainly stemming from disconnects between the old Form 1-3 hard copy system and the current FAS system. A major problem with this is the loss of a “signing off” of negotiated goals. A revamping of this section of the manual by John Meriwether is underway.

3. President’s Commission on Sustainability: Jeremy King, Scott Dutkiewicz, and Leidy Klotz have been working together to include this commission within the Faculty Manual. Scott has completed a draft which is currently under review by PC.

1. University Professors: The Board of Trustees has expressed an interest in creating a University Professor position. I am not sure whether they intended this to be a new rank, or more of an endowed position like Alumni Distinquished Professorships. But, since the former would be a much more complex and involved process, I’m assuming that they mean the latter.
   Jeremy has asked that we look at this question and provide input, hopefully before the October BOT meeting or maybe the January meeting at least. Pardon the pun, but a big question will be, “What will distinguish these positions from the Alumni Distinguished Professorships?” I have looked at similar positions at several peer and aspirational schools, and in general they are quite similar to our ADPs, with differences being in the amount and/or nature of the “stipend”, and the emphasis placed on teaching, service, and research. It seems to me that the ADPs might be a good place to start in the conversation, and I am asking Jeremy for his opinion of this.

I welcome any comments/suggestions, and if anyone is especially interested in looking into this, let me know.

2. PTR Question from Antonis Katsiyannis

As discussed last meeting, Antonis has asked that we consider a faculty manual change regarding the
procedure for triggering Part II of Post Tenure Review. Currently, PTR Part I occurs on a five year cycle with the PTR committee looking at annual performance reviews for the five most recent years. If two or more of these annual reviews assign a faculty member as "fair" or worse, PTR Part II is pursued. Part II involves additional review and development of a remediation plan to address problem areas. Antonis’s concern is that this process can lead to students being exposed to inferior teaching for a relatively long period of time, and he has asked that we change the policy so that Part II is triggered as soon as the second inadequate rating is received. At first glance this seems like a relatively easy change, and in the last meeting I promised to draft new wording for this section. But in the process of doing this, I realized that it is a more complicated issue than first thought. At present, the annual performance reviews for a given faculty member are examined by the PTR committee every five years. In order to recognize the second occurrence of a bad rating these reviews will need to be done on an annual basis. Given the cursory nature of this examination, this is really not asking for much from the committee. All that is needed is simply monitoring the rating, if it is better than fair there is no action needed. If “fair” or worse, then they will need to check to see if this is a second occurrence within five years, in which case Part II is immediately begun. If not, then the faculty member would be flagged for future evaluations. My recommendation would be that the five year cycle be changed from the current static model to a rolling five year cycle. That is, instead of two occurrences within a set five year period, we would look for two occurrences within the past five years, reevaluated on a yearly basis. That being said, this would be a fairly drastic change in the way PTR review is done.

Faculty Manual, pages 26-27.

Current Wording

5. Part I, Post Tenure Review. The PTR committee will review the ratings received on the most recent available series of five years of annual performance reviews, as specified in the Best Practices for Post-Tenure Review (#3). Merit salary increments are based on these annual performance reviews, as is consistent with the Best Practices for Post-Tenure Review (#9). All tenured faculty members receiving no more than one (of five) annual performance rating of “fair,” “marginal,” or “unsatisfactory” in Part I of the Post Tenure Review process receive a Post Tenure Review rating of “satisfactory.” These faculty members are thereby exempt from Part II of Post Tenure Review.

New Wording

5. Part I, Post Tenure Review. The PTR committee will review the rating received for the most recent annual performance review of each tenured faculty member, as specified in the Best Practices for Post-Tenure Review (#3). Merit salary increments are based on these annual performance reviews, as is consistent with the Best Practices for Post-Tenure Review (#9). Any tenured faculty member receiving a second annual performance rating of “fair,” “marginal,” or “unsatisfactory” within the last five years, will be subjected to additional review under Part II of the Post Tenure Review process (section 6 below). All others will receive a Post Tenure Review rating of “satisfactory,” and are thereby exempt from Part II of Post Tenure Review.

6. Part II, Post Tenure Review. Part II consists of additional review by the Post Tenure Review Committee and the department chair of those identified in Part I as subject to further review. All tenured
faculty members receiving two or more annual performance ratings of "fair," "marginal," or "unsatisfactory" will be reviewed under Part II of Post Tenure Review.

a. In order to ensure adequate external representation in the Part II Post Tenure Review process, departments must choose ONE of these options in drafting departmental personnel policy procedures.
   • utilize reference letters submitted from outside the department on each individual under review,
   • add to the PTR committee a faculty member or professional equivalent from outside the department nominated and elected according to departmental bylaws,
   • allow each faculty member under review the option of either having external letters solicited or incorporating the external committee member in the review process.

b. The faculty member undergoing Part II of PTR must provide, at a minimum, the following documents to the PTR committee and the department chair.
   • a recent copy of the curriculum vita (paper or electronic);
   • a summary of student assessment of instruction for the last 5 years including a summary of statistical ratings from student assessments of instruction (if appropriate to the individual’s duties).
   • a plan for continued professional growth;
   • detailed information about the outcomes of any sabbatical leave awarded during the preceding five years; and
   • if required by departmental personnel policy procedures, the names of six referees outside the department whom the PTR committee could contact for references.

c. The chair of the academic unit must provide the PTR committee with copies of the faculty member’s annual performance reviews covering the preceding five years.

d. The role and function of each faculty member, as well as the strength of the overall record, will be examined by the PTR committee. If provided in departmental bylaws, the PTR committee is required to obtain a minimum of four reference letters of which at least two must come from the list of six submitted by the faculty member.

e. The PTR committee will provide a written report to the faculty member. The faculty member the academic unit. The department chair will submit an independent written report to the faculty member who will then have two weeks to provide a response. The chair’s original report and the faculty member’s response will be forwarded to the college dean. The ratings of either Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory will be used in all stages of the review by the PTR committee and the chair.

f. If both the PTR Committee and the chair, or either the PTR Committee or the chair, rates the candidate as satisfactory, the candidate’s final rating shall be satisfactory. If both the PTR Committee and the Chair rate the candidate as unsatisfactory, the candidate’s final rating shall be unsatisfactory.

g. If the candidate’s final rating is satisfactory, the dean will forward that information to the Provost in summary form without appending any candidate materials. If the candidate’s final rating is unsatisfactory, the dean will forward all materials to the Provost.

7. Remediation. Individuals who receive a rating of Unsatisfactory must be given a period of remediation to correct deficiencies detailed in the PTR reports. The chair in consultation with the PTR committee and the faculty member will provide a list of specific goals and measurable outcomes the faculty member should achieve in each of the next three calendar years following the date of formal notification of the unsatisfactory outcome. The university will provide reasonable resources (as identified in the PTR reports and as approved by the chair and the dean) to meet the deficiencies. The chair will meet at least twice annually with the faculty member to review progress. The faculty member will be reviewed each year by the PTR committee and the chair, both of whom shall supply written evaluations. At the end of the three-year period, another post-tenure review will be conducted. If the outcome is again Unsatisfactory, the faculty member will be subject to dismissal for unsatisfactory
8. Dismissal for Unsatisfactory Professional Performance. If dismissal for unsatisfactory professional performance is recommended, the case will be subject to the rules and regulations outlined in the Faculty Manual Section K.

3. FM-FAS disconnect from Scott Dutkiewicz - As discussed last meeting, we should probably try to come up with a check box or electronic signature to allow “signing off” on goals. There is also a wording change needed in Part IV, E.1., shown below in red. John Meriwether has expressed some interest in revamping this whole section, and I agree (John, Are you willing to take the lead on this?). One of the library faculty discovered a disconnect between the FM and FAS when it comes to a signed Form 1. I append the complete discussion here. I would suggest that we get this on Committee’s agenda for this year.


“...are established by the chair or director faculty member in consultation with the faculty member chair or director; 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” (p. 20). I checked all the FMs online, and this has been a requirement since at least 2004.

The closest one can get in FAS to what’s contained in the “Professional Goals and Duties”/Form 1 document in Appendix F is generated by going to the “Report” link and choosing the “MS Word Download Goals Report.” When you print this “Goals Report,” there are no signature lines at all, yet the FM clearly states that “A signed, printed copy of Form 1 will be placed in each faculty member’s personnel file.” I haven’t signed a Form 1 in years, if ever, so technically, the Libraries are in violation of the FM in this instance. I suspect that since FAS was instituted, many other departments on campus don’t use (and aren’t even aware of) Form 1.

If the same signature lines that are on the “Professional Goals and Duties” form in Appendix F were added to FAS so that they appeared on the “Goals Report,” everyone would be aware of the FM requirement that goals should be signed off on by both parties and that disclaimers on the goals can indeed be filed.

4. The President’s Commission on Sustainability – Scott, Can you take the lead on this?

I am reviving the effort to get the President’s Commission on Sustainability in the Faculty Manual. First, because the other two President’s commissions are in the Manual, and, secondly, the Senate, according to the Commission’s charter, must appoint 3 faculty representatives. Another factor is that the Clemson University Environmental Committee (CUEC) was recently discontinued by the President. The Chair of record is Leidy Klotz. - Scott
This matter, as you can read, below, was active in September 2011, and we did meet and discussed the "organization" part of the Commission's charter with two representatives of the Commission. I'm not sure of the outcome other than a proposed FM addition did not go forward.

My concern about this Commission being in the FM is not merely procedural. The Commission oversees a critical initiative for the University and deserves broader campus awareness.

The draft looked approximately like this:

(Note: "Appointed" in the Charter is consistently replaced be "recommended" in the draft)

Part VII, Section C. 6. President's Commission on Sustainability.

The purpose of the commission is to be the coordinating body for Clemson's efforts to become a model of affordable, fiscally responsible, environmental sustainability for public institutions of higher education. To creatively address sustainability, the PCS will facilitate collaboration among students, faculty, staff and the community by integrating education, research, and public service with supporting social, economic and environmental infrastructure.

All members of PCS are appointed by the President after consultation with the chairperson. At a minimum, the PCS will be composed of faculty, staff and students, and shall include the following:

a. Chair of the PCS, to be named by the President.
b. One representative from each of the following operational areas:
   i. Student Affairs, to be recommended by the Vice President for Student Affairs;
   ii. Public Service Activities, to be recommended by the Vice President for PSA;
   iii. Clemson Experimental Forest, to be recommended by the President; and
   iv. Environmental Committee Representative, to be appointed by the Committee.
   (committee now defunct)
c. Faculty representatives as follows (three):
   i. Faculty representatives shall be recommended 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. *I remember debate about this point (SMD)*
d. Student representatives as follows:
   i. One Junior and one Senior undergraduate student recommended by the Undergraduate Student Government.
   ii. One Graduate student recommended by the Graduate Student Government.
e. President's Chief of Staff
f. Ex Officio Members
   i. Staff member from the University Planning & Design Office
   ii. Staff member from the Public Affairs Office
   iii. Others as needed.
Sean (and Cathy)

The President’s Commission on Sustainability is absent from the Faculty Manual, despite the fact that their charter includes 3 faculty to be appointed by the Senate.

Faculty representatives as follows (three):

i. 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.

See http://www.clemson.edu/administration/commissions/sustainability/about/

I recall working on this issue last year in the Policy Committee, but it never made it into the Manual.

I have also been made aware that the CU Environmental Committee (CUEC) also has bylaws that call for a member and alternate from the Faculty Senate, but it absent from the manual. Its bylaws are at: http://www.clemson.edu/cuec/files/CUEC_Bylaws_May_08.pdf

Have we identified the FS representative? Is this a possible Faculty Manual inclusion, too?

5. Departmental Guidelines/Merging or Splitting Departments

Dear Jeremy,

In a spirit of being proactive, Dean Goodstein wanted me to give you heads-up and ask your advice on an evolving situation in the school of Planning, Development, Preservation and Landscape Architecture (PDLPA) in our college, since it will have ramifications on the tenure and promotion case of Dr. Matthew Powers, a faculty member in the Landscape Architecture program.

In a few words as background, it is probable that PDPLA will split up into two separate LA vs. PDP departments effective as early as this fall. The faculty in the school voted this morning to have this split go forward, and assuming it is approved by the university administration and the BoT, the following complication will arise therefrom: As two new departments neither one will have bylaws in place immediately to guide the tenure-promotion application for 2012-2013.

The immediate concern is over the application of Dr. Matthew Powers for tenure and promotion, which is already in the works. Dr. Powers is a faculty member in the LA program.

As a solution, we would like to propose that the faculty senate endorse the arrangement to allow the existing bylaws of PDPLA to apply to Dr. Powers' tenure/promotion request.
The research committee is now collecting input from the faculty on pressing research issues to be addressed this year. A meeting is scheduled to establish priorities and implement action plans. The current committee chair has met with the former chair to facilitate continuity of long term goals.
FACULTY SENATE SCHOLASTIC POLICIES
Report on meeting held Tuesday, October 02, 2012.
11:30 am – 1:00 pm
Room 316 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: Goddard, Grubb, Leininger, Marinescu, Tissera, Tonkyn
Guest: Perry Austin (Chair, Academic Affairs Committee, Undergraduate Student Senate)

Completed

Retention Committee: At our last meeting, we considered a request from Jan Murdoch to Jeremy King (dated April 11, 2012) to eliminate the Freshman-Sophomore Retention Committee that she chairs. The Scholastic Policies endorsed this proposal and brought it to the full Senate, which approved it.

Latin Honors requirement: Also at our last meeting, 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. When we brought this to the full Senate, we were asked to look into it further, and in fact it was a major point of discussion at the Friday, Sept. 14 meeting of the Council on Undergraduate Studies, which Perry Austin and David Tonkyn attended. There we learned that the Undergraduate Announcements are explicitly NOT a contract (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, I did not support a further delay at that meeting. Provost Helms will have the final decision.

Continuing

University Scholarship and Awards Committee: Wayne Goddard is the SP representative to the University Scholarship and Awards Committee. It did not meet.

Faculty Advisory Board on Online Education: John Leininger, David Tonkyn, Jeremy King and Kelly Smith all met with the new Director of Online Education, DeWitt Salley, on Thursday, Sept, 13 about using the Faculty Senate to help form a Faculty Advisory Board. This has been done and John Leininger will be the SP representative to this Board. This is an ad hoc committee, and one of its recommendations may be to create a permanent committee, authorize it in the Faculty Manual, and hold new elections. The Board has not met yet.
Changes in International Student Travel  We were asked to comment by email on proposed changes to policy on travel to safe regions of countries listed as unsafe by the State Department or WHO. Our comments focused on the need for clarity on who makes this determination, the faculty or the Study Abroad Office, and when, and who monitors for changes in status. They were forwarded to Jeremy King for his meeting with Sharon Nagy, the new Vice Provost for International Programs. David Tonkyn will try to meet with her to discuss the role of Scholastic Policies and the Faculty Senate in her work.

Evaluation of Instruction Form:  This was a major issue last year, and some progress was made, but we identified a number of recurring questions. What is the best way to evaluate teachers? Can we improve the current online surveys that appear to measure “customer satisfaction” more than actual learning or value added? What information do Chairs use in evaluating teaching, do they use it on all faculty or just untenured ones, and how do they use it? For example, is a high score from students a sign that an instructor is excellent or too easy? How are different sources of information weighted? And finally, what do students want to achieve in these evaluations? We discussed the possibility that Faculty Senate survey Chairs on these issues. Graciela Tissera volunteered to lead this effort.

Banner Subcommittee on CUGS  Jan Murdoch is forming a subcommittee of CUGS to review Banner issues that arise. David Tonkyn has volunteered to represent SP on this, as he is already the representative to CUGS.

Bridge Program  Jeremy King had asked us earlier to address two questions on the Bridge Program: what is the Clemson policy toward violations of academic integrity while at Tri-County Technical College, and how do Bridge students fare academically once they arrive at Clemson University? Alan Grubb has volunteered to lead this discussion.

Contextualization in grading  Last year there was some discussion on whether faculty should provide rankings of students in addition to letter grades, as a possible response to grade inflation. Since no one is currently promoting this change, we have shelved the issue.

General Education changes  Perry Austin reported that the Student Senate has been meeting to discuss improvements that students would like to see in the General Education requirements. He will bring the results of those meeting to the Scholastic Policies Committee, for our input. This was the last issue that we discussed at the meeting.

Ad hoc Committee on Application of Graduate Credits to an Undergraduate Degree:  Bob Horton, past Chair of Scholastic Policies, has volunteered to remain our representative on this committee. Yesterday he sent me the following text which will be carried forward to the CUGS (italics mine). Note, we did not discuss this as a committee.

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.
Whereas Cathy Sturkie has provided stability to the Clemson University Faculty Senate and played a critical role in allowing the Senate to accomplish its mission since 1990.

And

Whereas Cathy Sturkie has worked tirelessly to establish the importance of the Faculty Senate to the faculty and to the broader Clemson Community

And

Whereas the Senate would not have been able to conduct its business without the devoted efforts of Cathy Sturkie

And

Whereas the leadership of the Senate has relied on Cathy Sturkie for logistical, emotional, organizational and institutional support

And

Whereas Cathy Sturkie has served the Senate in a spirit of selflessness and dedication and provided unflagging support to the Senate and Senators

AND

Whereas Cathy Sturkie has worked tirelessly to keep the Senate in the forefront when major decisions regarding faculty are being made

AND

Whereas Cathy Sturkie has continually worked to maintain a dialogue between the Faculty Senate and the the University administration, and the Board of Trustees

THEREFORE

Be it resolved that the Senate recognizes Cathy Sturkie's importance to the Senate and acknowledges her fundamental role in its success

And

Be it further resolved that the Senate confers the status of Honorary Faculty Senator on Cathy Sturkie
MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
November 13, 2012

1. Call to Order: The Faculty Senate Meeting was called to order at 2:35 p.m. by President Jeremy King.

2. Approval of Minutes: The Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes dated October 9, 2012 and Victor Hurst Academic Convocation dated August 21, 2012 were approved as written and distributed.

3. Selection of Class of '39 Award for Excellence: Gordon Halfacre, Ombudsman for Faculty and Students, selected as the Provost’s designee and Chair Bill Pennington, selected as the Faculty Senate representative by President King, counted the ballots.

4. “Free Speech”: None

5. Special Order of the Day: Krissy Kaylor, Human Resources Director, informed Faculty Senate that there will be a change to insurance deduction policy. Nine-month Faculty, who are eligible for state insurance coverage and are scheduled to return for another academic year, will see these changes starting in January 2013. Monthly premiums for state insurance will be deducted for the current month of coverage and equally split between the first and second paycheck each month. This will result in more money in the December 2012 paycheck. For nine-month Faculty, the first check in May will be triple deducted for May, June and July insurance premiums. The total premium for the month of August will be deducted out of the August paycheck. This information will be provided to all faculty in an Inside Clemson announcement. The floor was opened for questions and answers.

Clemson University Police Department (CUPD) Chief Johnson Link provided an overview of the draft Video Surveillance Policy (attached). The policy is designed to outline the governance structure and guidelines for continued operational use of video surveillance at Clemson University, and all members of its community will be expected to adhere to the policy.

Currently, there is no single point of contact for any system and no centralized database of where and what kind of video surveillance is available to the campus public safety. It is not the intent of this policy to restrict departments from using video surveillance technologies or intercede in video surveillance for research purposes, such as IRB protocols. Recording to monitor lab safety could fall under this policy. The other portion of the plan is to help keep the campus community safe. The public safety department will be able to assess trends and foresee
problems in an effort to increase their response time and cover a larger portion of the campus and therefore better utilize already limited resources. This policy will also systematically protect the privacy of the members of the campus community. The floor was opened for questions and answers. Once the policy becomes effective, unregistered cameras will be removed. The floor was opened for questions and answers.

Chief Johnson hopes to meet with all campus Senates and provide the draft policy to Administrative Council in early 2013. Chief Johnson welcomes faculty input and representation at their meetings (jwl@clemson.edu).

Representatives from Clemson University (Beth Lacy, CIO Office; Kiera Bonner, CIO Office; Debra Sparacino, Records/Registration; and, Julia Pennebaker, Records/Registration) and vendor, Ellucian (Jim Druckenmiller, Christine Warnquist, Patrick Sherman) provided an overview of the DegreeWorks, student-advising tool within the University’s new Banner system. Ellucian highlighted three groups of student-advising features: (1) advising auditing and efficiency; (2) student education planning (roadmap); and, (3) reporting and business intelligence (projections for student needs). Certain student advising permissions can be set and changed by the advisor. The floor was opened for questions and answers.

6. Committee Reports:
   a. Senate Committees:

   Scholastic Policies – Chair David Tonkyn submitted and outlined the Committee Reports dated October 18, 2012 and November 8, 2012. A proposed Faculty Manual change to the Calhoun Honors College Committee was approved by the required 2/3 vote.

   Finished business as listed under October 18th Old Business provides that the: exploration of whether faculty should contextualize/provide rank grading as a possible response to grade inflation was dropped, and the University Ad hoc Committee on Application of Graduate Credits to an Undergraduate Degree submitted their proposal to the Council on Undergraduate Studies. New business included: Undergraduate Student Senate is preparing a proposal for new General Education requirements to present to the November 7 meeting of Undergraduate Curriculum Committee, and the Subcommittee to Review Policies re:iROAR (of the Council of Undergraduate Studies) reviewed the Undergraduate Catalog and identified areas of potential concern with Banner.

   In Old Business of November 8th, the Scholastic Policies Standing Committee is finalizing a questionnaire for Chairs on how they using teaching evaluations, and may follow with recommendations. Dr. Linda Nilson, founding director of the Office of Teaching Effectiveness and Innovation was an invited guest to the SP meeting. Barbara Speziale asked SP to revisit the issue of allowing 200 level technical school courses to substitute for 200 level Clemson courses as part of
articulation agreements; this is be discussed under New Business at the next SP meeting.

Finance – Chair Antonis Katsiyannis submitted the Committee Report dated October 11, 2012. Chair Katsiyannis outlined some concerns regarding the draft Video Surveillance Policy (also reviewed under Special Order). These include oversight authority, the permission process, associated disciplinary actions, access, and possibility of recordings becoming public record subject to freedom of information requests. Lastly, Chair Katsiyannis commended administration for commitment to compensation plan and investment in new Union building.

Research – Chair Jim McCubbin submitted and outlined the Committee Report dated October 25, 2012. Chair McCubbin met with the past Chair to discuss continuity of agenda items for multi-year initiatives. The Committee has been soliciting faculty input to identify the most pressing campus-wide issues that impact faculty research and scholarly success at Clemson. Senators were asked to poll their constituents for input. These data were consolidated into a list of challenges, barriers, and suggestions for improvement. Several themes emerged for development of targeted action items: (1) research infrastructure, (2) University teaching load policies, and (3) graduate student quality. Provost Helms offered that she was very much looking forward to having these discussions about where the institution is and where it needs to go.

Welfare – Chair Diane Perpich submitted and outlined the Committee Report dated November 6, 2012. Based on the results of the Provost’s COACHE report, the Committee will focus on benefits, especially those related to parental leave for faculty and health and retirement benefits as they impact lecturers. Discussions with Human Resources representatives will begin at the December 4th committee meeting. Upon the request of Redfern’s Health Promotions Office, a Committee representative will assist with the development of faculty resources for student welfare concerns to be posted on a “Faculty Care and Concern Resource” webpage. Lastly, Chair Perpich mentioned that the Faculty Senate might consider including Lecturers as a participating/voting member in processes that relate to their position at the University.

Policy – Chair Bill Pennington submitted and outlined the Committee Report dated October 16, 2012. The Committee is continuing work on four projects, the first regarding a proposed University Professorship. The other three are proposed Faculty Manual changes to: (1) Post Tenure Review; (2) Goals, Accomplishments, and Evaluation (Forms 1-3 with modifications to FAS); and, (3) President’s Commission on Sustainability charter regarding faculty membership. Chair Pennington plans to meet with Wickes Wescott of Institutional Research and Vice Provost for Faculty Development, Nadim Aziz on proposed FAS changes.
b. **ad hoc** Faculty Senate Committees

**Budget Accountability Committee** – Chair Antonis Katsiyannis - None

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

7. **Old Business**: None

8. **New Business**: The proposed Faculty Manual change to Calhoun Honors College Committee was discussed and voted on during the Scholastic Policies Committee Report.

9. **President’s Report**:
   a. President King presented “The South’s Best Tailgate” trophy at the Senate meeting. It was provided to President Barker, Athletics Director Phillips and incoming Athletics Director Dan Radakovich by Southern Living editors in an on-field ceremony at the Homecoming game against Maryland.

   b. President King thanked everyone for their involvement in the October 30th retirement party for Cathy Sturkie. She served as Program Coordinator of Faculty Senate for 22 years.

   c. President King provided several updates from his meeting with the four Senate Presidents and President Barker: (1) President Barker seeks input from faculty regarding online education; (2) President King asked Administrative Council for improved communication and inclusiveness in policy making; (3) recognized necessary revisions to the intellectual property policy are planned by the IPC after the committee description/structure is redefined in the Faculty Manual; at present, the IPC is weighed down in the patent application evaluation process and believes this process should be altered; (4) approved adjustment hires should have been announced by Department Chairs; and, (5) the number and detail of pre-proposals for the strategic hire initiative is keeping evaluating administrators and faculty busy, but decisions are expected to be communicated in the next few days. Provost Helms offered that 53 pre-proposals were submitted, but that she believes more collaboration among colleagues across campus must occur in these efforts since there was much overlap.

10. **Announcements**:
   a. Next and last 2012 Executive/Advisory Committee meeting – November 27, 2012
   b. Next and last 2012 Faculty Senate meeting – December 11, 2012
   c. General Faculty meeting – Wednesday, December 19, 2012 at 1:00pm, Brooks Center for the Performing Arts, Theatre
   d. Celebration of the Great Class of ’39 hosted by Faculty Senate – Monday evening, January 7, 2013 (invitations forthcoming)
Bell Tower Ceremony for the 2012 '39 Award of Excellence recipient – Tuesday morning, January 8, 2013 (invitations forthcoming)

11. Adjournment: President King adjourned the meeting at 4:21 p.m.

Denise M. Anderson, Secretary

Monica A. Patterson, Program Coordinator

Also present: Vice Provost for Faculty Development Aziz, David Blakesley (Faculty Representative to the Board of Trustees), Gordon Halfacre (Ombudsman for Faculty and Students), Provost Helms, Fran McGuire (Editorial Consultant of the Faculty Manual), John Mueller (HR Director of Customer Service), Monica Patterson (Faculty Senate Program Coordinator), Alternate Suzanne Rook Shilf, Jackie Todd (Public Information Director, Internal Communications)

MINUTES
VICTOR HURST ACADEMIC CONVOCATION
AUGUST 21, 2012

1. Call to Order: Glenn P. Birrenkott, University Marshal and Professor of Animal and Veterinary Sciences, called to order the One Hundred Twentieth Academic Year of Clemson University and introduced Doris R. Helms, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs.

The Provost explained the process of the election of the University Marshal and welcomed all faculty, staff, and visitors. The Provost then provided a brief biography of Victor Hurst for whom the Convocation is named. Richard Goodstein, Dean of the College of Architecture, Arts and Humanities was this year's Convocation coordinator. Thanks and appreciation for the musical talents of Linda Dzuris, University Carillonneur and Eric J. Lapin, Professor of Performing Arts were offered. Members of the Board of Trustees were then introduced: Louis B. Lynn, Robert L. Peeler, Allen Wood (Trustee Emeriti) as was Philip H. Prince, former President of Clemson University.

2. Provost Helms called the General Faculty meeting to order at 9:15 a.m. There was no Old or New Business. Vote was taken and the General Faculty Meeting Minutes dated May 10, 2012 were approved as amended. The General Faculty Meeting was adjourned at 9:18 a.m.

3. Presentation of the Philip Prince Award for Innovation in Teaching: This award was presented to Ashley Cowden, senior lecturer of English, by McKee Thomason, Undergraduate Student Body President.

4. Keynote Address: Provost Helms introduced Richard Goodstein, Dean of the College of Architecture, Arts and Humanities and this year's Convocation coordinator, who introduced Harvey B. Gantt, FAIA, Partner, Gantt Huberman Architects.

Fifty Years Has Made a Difference – Let's Keep Building

I dare say that this audience would not have looked like this 50 years ago, when I stepped from a black Buick sedan, waded through a crowd of media people, ascended the steps of Tillman Hall and registered for classes. I knew before I registered that there was something special and different about this place - and that going to school here would be a positive life-changing experience.

In the months leading up to my arrival I had read daily, the Tiger, and came to the conclusion that my arrival as the first black student to attend an all-white school in S.C., would be, of course, historic but relatively peaceful and uneventful – especially when compared to the social unrest that other black students had met in neighboring Southern states.

I had gained great insight from the articles, editorials, and letters to the editor from students, faculty, and university leaders. There was rigorous public discussion and debate covering a range of topics. There was debate over whether I had a right to attend Clemson. There was debate over whether my entrance would impact Clemson’s great tradition. And there was debate over how South Carolina, and indeed the South, would accommodate to the demise of segregation.

But the prevailing opinion of student leaders and the President of Clemson, Dr. R.C. Edwards – was that
if nothing else — the proud tradition of Clemson would be maintained, the laws would be obeyed, and I would be treated like any other student.

So — I sensed on that cold day in January that I was coming into an environment where I might indeed have a chance to succeed as a student, and to get an education that would allow me the opportunity to go out and fulfill my hopes and aspirations of becoming a good architect — building not only buildings, but perhaps working with others to build better communities. I believe to this very day, that I got that great education on this campus. I gained much as a student from some pretty sharp teachers, design critics, and talented visiting lecturers who came to the campus.

But my greatest education really came from the many relationships developed between me and other students on the campus.

Back then, some politicians, and ardent segregationists, who opposed my entry — hoped that if students would ignore my presence and isolate me socially, that I might soon be discouraged — and decide to leave. Of course, that did not happen. I had the opportunity to meet and make many friends who I continue to know even to this day. And back then, we talked about not only the current social events going on on the campus — but we also talked hours on end about the most salient issue of the day, Civil Rights, and the wide spread social change then sweeping the South.

How would Clemson change with my entry? How would South Carolina change? What would the leading politicians at the state and national levels do to impact positive outcomes for white and black South Carolinians?

What I found most hopeful in my years here as a student, was that a good many of us 18 to 22 year olds — had a positive belief that our state, and indeed our nation, would undergo some struggle — but better days were ahead for them and me and others who looked like me. And a lot of us left Clemson with the belief that we could make a difference.

I graduated from Clemson in 1965, confident that I could be successful in my new career, in a new city. In October of this year, the firm I started in Charlotte with Jeff Huberman in 1971 will be 41 years old. We started the firm, and intentionally focused on finding creative designers who were diverse in race, gender, geography, and experience, and willing to blend their diversity into a collegial spirit of collaboration across professional disciplines to solve problems for our varied clientele.

Indeed our diversity — i.e. our willingness to engage all parties and all viewpoints, allowed us to accommodate to, and to promote change and innovation, not just in our buildings, but also through positive social uplift in the lives of the people who used those buildings. We were about the challenge of making a difference.

Our experiences as architects carried over for some of our team into the political area. I was fortunate to serve for a time in elective office and saw first hand the importance of solving problems and building a stronger community — by engaging as much diversity as possible — then blending neighborhood leaders, with business leaders, academics with politicians, Democrats with Republicans, and conservatives with liberals, to find that elusive common ground needed to bring progress. It's the story of my life — indeed it's my DNA — and what has defined me.

Our city has changed dramatically over the years. And I think most would say that Charlotte is one of those new American cities on the cutting edge of change. We are learning how to become a stronger city by engaging our diverse population of citizens. We have become experts at collaborative public/private ventures and initiatives, building facilities and infrastructure, but also making substantial improvements
in social services and public education. We are continually learning lessons about building trust and engaging as many citizens as possible in the messy pursuit of democratic government.

I'd like to believe that the Democratic Party's choice of Charlotte for its National Convention has much to do with the city's strong embrace of progressive change and innovative policies. I am delighted that in just fourteen days - our city, our region, will be in the spotlight for the world to see. And I believe, that, on balance, they will see and witness a community at work on building for tomorrow.

So as I look back to 50 years ago, our generation did make a difference. The changes are most noticeable and notable. The changes have been transformative, uplifting, pervasive, and for the most part, they have raised the quality of life. Fifty years ago, we had no cell phones, no internet, no social media, nor any of the high tech advances that have dramatically changed how we communicate. Fifty years ago, we could not have envisioned the social and political prominence of women and minorities in this state or nation. Fifty years ago, we could not imagine the tremendous growth on this campus in research or academic programs. And fifty years ago, we could not foresee the depth of the diversity in all aspects of life at Clemson, and I am pleased to see you continue to reach for even more changes.

I know that many of my classmates from the Class of '65 had a lot to do with the changes we have witnessed. A lot of them, through personal and public initiatives, large and small, changed minds, changed attitudes, and influenced behavior. That's what an educated corps of good students do... they change minds, they change attitudes, and they influence behavior. I have seen my classmates work in the political, social and philanthropic communities, across the Carolinas. And I'm proud of their collective impact and to be able to say that today... fifty years after my entrance. We really have made a difference!

So as you sit here today listening to me... what do you see as your challenge? I ask this faculty and students here today... what is your equivalent of the Civil Rights issue of my student years? This new year will bring new goals, new priorities, and new obstacles. I can see... with the perspective of fifty years - that you are blessed, as faculty and as students, by the privilege you have in working in an environment like this University. The work and education you gain here can and will move the quality of life upward for many people in this region.

You, as a faculty, have so much more in the way of resources to draw upon - and you are working with students who are perhaps much smarter as freshmen, than we were as seniors! I would hope that you will take advantage of that, and push your students to do well, and reach for excellence in their coursework - making both family and community stronger and proud.

But I would also hope that you will encourage your students to reach beyond their studies and their personal goals to make Clemson an even stronger community of citizens. I would hope you would encourage them to reach beyond their comfort zones, and intentionally embrace folk from different backgrounds and places.

I would hope you will not let your students treat this "seminary of learning" like an ivory tower, but rather encourage them to pay close attention to what is going on in the urban areas of Charleston, Greenville, and Columbia, as well as the many rural places in this state that is the home of so much poverty.

And then I hope you will ask your students to pay attention over the next two months to the very important presidential election campaign - which will substantially impact us for generations to come. Encourage them to engage in debate, volunteer, and listen carefully - but most of all to get involved! Finally, I would hope you would encourage your students to leave Clemson one day. As wonderful as
Clemson is, they must commit to leaving – and leaving to make a difference in society. The highest calling of a faculty is to teach, and to influence the collective minds and behavior of the young people who will be our leaders of tomorrow. Have a great year and may God continue to bless you and this great institution.

5. Provost Helms introduced the Fourteenth President of Clemson University, Dr. James F. Barker, who made the following remarks:

“Congratulations to all who were honored today – the Prince Award winner, our new Alumni Distinguished Professors, and our newly-promoted and tenured faculty members. Welcome to the new faculty members who join us today. This is a day of real celebration for you and for Clemson.

Thank you also to Harvey Gantt for being here and for sharing your wisdom with us today.

I must tell this group a story. Some years ago, I had the chance to hear Harvey speak to a group of architectural educators. He had graduated by the time I arrived at Clemson, but I had followed his story and his career with great interest. Though he did not know it, he was a hero of mine.

I knew he had gone on to graduate school at MIT, and that we shared a professional interest not only in architecture but in building communities. His presentation that day was inspiring. One of his key points was about how a Clemson architecture education prepares students for more than just a profession, but for a life of service.

Harvey’s admission to Clemson is an event worth recognizing, but it is just one of the significant milestones we are commemorating this year. The other is the 150th anniversary of the Morrill Act, which established our national system of public Land Grant universities.

Along with the GI Bill, it was, in my opinion, the best idea America ever had. It opened the doors of the nation’s colleges and universities to the children of farmers and working people.

The result was an unprecedented, historic expansion of higher education, research and innovation, individual opportunity, and economic vitality. The Land Grant college was the very opposite of an elitist idea. It democratized higher education.

As my colleague Gordon Gee, president of Ohio State University, has written: “When President Abraham Lincoln signed the Morrill Act in 1862, higher education was still very much the exclusive domain of the few, the white, the male, the wealthy, and, by and large, those living in cities.”

But the reach of the Morrill Act was limited, especially in the South. The sons of white farmers and working people could be admitted to institutions like Clemson, but black citizens were excluded.

In recognition of the harsh reality of life in the Jim Crow South, a second Morrill Act was passed in 1890 to require states to either establish or designate an existing black college as a land grant institution. South Carolina State University in Orangeburg, founded in 1872, is an 1890 Land Grant University and our partner in numerous research and extension programs.

When Harvey Gantt was in high school and planning for college, S.C. State was one of the few options open to him. But it did not offer the career preparation he wanted. Like me, he wanted to be an architect. And, as a South Carolina citizen, he wanted to study architecture at the only public university in his state that offered that curriculum – Clemson.
His admission in 1963 was one of 4 critical milestones in a decade in which Clemson evolved from an all-male, all-white military institution ... into a civilian, co-educational, diverse public university. But his story and his enrollment at Clemson was even more important than that.

The story of the Civil Rights Movement in the South, as it moved from Ole Miss to Alabama to Georgia, was a story of riots, death and injury. When Harvey Gantt and his attorney, Matthew Perry, arrived at what is now called Gantt Circle in front of Tillman Hall, Harvey and Clemson were the focus of world attention.

The world watched and wondered if America was still the beacon of freedom for the world. Harvey and Clemson showed it could be, and the tide changed at that moment. Clemson was a vital part of this chapter in our nation’s history.

Our university is better and stronger today because of that – because of you, Harvey and your wife Lucinda, Clemson’s first black female student.

But we must never forget that your victory in de-segregating Clemson came only after a long and historic legal struggle. You had to bring a lawsuit to win your right — as a South Carolina citizen — to even be considered for admission at one of your state’s public colleges.

I’m glad that the full schedule of events planned to mark this anniversary will include several programs and exhibits that look both to the past and the future. It began yesterday with our freshman reading discussion of Wading Home: A Novel of New Orleans.

In October, there will be a lecture and exhibit by photographer Cecil Williams, who was an eyewitness to history in January 1963. A lecture by Dr. Joyce Baugh will address the significance of the Civil Rights movement yesterday and today. Perhaps most importantly — a panel discussion of the student experience at Clemson through the decades will take place.

We will use this anniversary to help educate this generation of students on the full story behind the headline we like to remember as “Integration with Dignity.” We recognize that the individual who acted with the most dignity that day in 1963 — and to this day — is Harvey Gantt himself.

As Dean Goodstein said, you have gone on to distinguish yourself as a professional and public servant in the Charlotte community. We are blessed to have you and Lucinda as members of the Clemson family.

The transition that the two of you began at Clemson in 1963 is still incomplete, though. Our University must continue to work to increase the diversity of our student body and faculty to reflect more closely the diversity of our state. We get stronger with every step we take in that direction. This is a university priority and an ongoing commitment.

We are encouraged that minority enrollment increased 10 percent this fall. But we cannot be satisfied with 12.6 percent minority enrollment – 6.5 percent African-American – in a state where 28 percent of our people are African-American.

Because of efforts like the 25-year-old PEER program, Clemson today ranks 8th among all the universities in America in graduating African-American students in engineering. We are one of only 5 non-historically Black universities in the top 10.

These are numbers to take pride in ... along with the Call Me MISTER program, which is succeeding at placing Black male teachers and role models in the elementary school classroom across the state and nation ... and the Emerging Scholars program ... the FIRST Generation Success program ... and, of course, the Gantt Scholars.
These programs are succeeding, but we know we must do more. Clemson simply must be able to compete financially with the top universities in America to enroll students like the Gantt Scholars.

That's why a top priority for our Will to Lead capital campaign is student support — scholarships and fellowships — including support to grow programs like the Gantt Scholars. Indeed, private support is increasingly important for public universities like Clemson, which have seen steep declines in state funding.

You know my motto is “no whining” — but I must point out a recent report from the State Higher Education Executive Officers association which shows that higher education funding per student in South Carolina was cut 32 percent over the last five years. This is the steepest decline of any state in the nation.

These occasions when we look back over the broad sweep of history — to 1862 and the passage of the Morrill Act and, a century later, to the day when Clemson finally admitted its first black student — these occasions give us a chance to pause and reflect on our commitment to public higher education — to inclusion, access and affordability — to our mission of teaching, research and service to others.

This is the conversation we expect to be having on-campus and across the state in the academic year we begin today. In my recent message to the South Carolina Commission on Higher Education earlier this month, I said that the “state” of Clemson University is very strong.

We've just completed year one of our 10-year strategic plan implementation, and we're carefully assessing results and working on priorities for the coming year. This weekend, we welcomed our largest and brightest freshman class ever.

And just a few weeks ago, we announced that we had surpassed our Campaign goal by raising more than $608 million in private gifts and pledges to support students, faculty, facilities, economic development and other university priorities.

But the good news is — we have decided to keep the campaign going with a new goal of $1 billion. No public university with an alumni base the size of Clemson’s has ever raised $1 billion. We plan to be the first.

As a proud Land Grant university, Clemson has educated generations of talented and capable graduates who helped our state grow from its 19th century economic base in agriculture, cotton and textiles ... to include, today, some of the most advanced automotive and aviation facilities you’ll find anywhere in the world. Today, we have a global vision for our University’s place in an inter-connected world and a global economy.

I can tell you there is broad and deep support for the work that you — our faculty and staff — are doing to continue this legacy of achievement and service.

Thank you for being here, and for all you do for Clemson. Have a great semester and a great year. 

6. Adjournment: Five new Alumni Distinguished Professors were recognized: David Allison, William R. Dougan, J. Drew Lanham, William T. Pennington, and Lesly A. Temesvari. Newly-promoted and tenured professors were thanked and appreciated for their work and were each presented a book by Rebekah Nathan entitled, “My Freshman Year: What a Professor Learned by Becoming a Student” and a lapel pin by President Barker and Faculty Senate President Jeremy King. Provost Helms extended an invitation to all to attend the reception in the lobby of the Brooks Center. The Convocation was adjourned.
Clemson University is making couple of changes that impact insurance deductions

Currently state insurance premiums are deducted one month in advance from the second paycheck each month. Effective January 2013, state insurance premiums will be deducted for the current month of coverage split over the first and second paycheck each month.

Why is the University making this change?
• It provides more consistent net pay with deductions split equally over each paycheck.
• It will reduce staff time to reconcile as deductions and refunds will be processed timely.
• There is no cost to the employee or university, no loss of coverage, no negative impact.

Another positive impact is that state insurance premiums will not be deducted in December 2012, as we transition to deducting current month from deducting a month in advance. MoneyPlus deductions (health savings account, medical, and dependent care spending contributions) and non-state insurance premiums (MetLife and AFLAC) will still be deducted in December 2012.

January premiums for state insurance will be collected over the first and second check date of January 2013 and will reflect annual enrollment changes made during October 2012. Employees need to review their paychecks in January to ensure any changes made during annual enrollment are reflected.

Academic 9 month employees eligible for state insurance and returning for the following academic year will continue to be triple deducted the first check of May. Since we are deducting current month starting in January, their May check will be deducted to collect May, June and July insurance premiums. The total premiums for August will be deducted from their August paycheck.
INSIDE NOW SPECIAL: Insurance deduction changes beginning January 2013

Employees enrolled in state insurance will see more money in their Dec. 21 paycheck. That's because Clemson University is changing the way that it deducts insurance premiums.

Currently state insurance premiums are deducted one month in advance from the second paycheck each month. In January, all insurance premiums will be equally split between the first and second paycheck each month. State insurance premiums will now be deducted for the current month of coverage, instead of a month in advance.

Because we are moving to this new process in January, we will not deduct state insurance premiums from your pay in December 2012. However, MoneyPlus deductions (health savings account, medical, and dependent care spending contributions) and non-state insurance premiums (MetLife and AFLAC) will still be deducted in December 2012.

This change:

1. Will mean no interruptions of state insurance coverage,
2. Provides more consistent take-home pay,
3. Allows timely deductions for changes,
4. Means higher net pay in your December 2012 paycheck if you are enrolled in state insurance,
5. Provides an opportunity to improve the monthly state insurance reconciliation process.

Employees may want to consider how this change might affect any automatic payroll and bank account deductions and adjust accordingly.

A list of Frequently Asked Questions is available here.

For additional questions, click here, or call 864-656-2000.

Issued by Clemson University Media Relations

If you have questions about email content, contact the information source named in the email above.
Executive Summary

Clemson University is obligated to provide a safety conscious and enriched environment for its faculty, staff, students and those visiting the campus at all times. A portion of the plan to keep the campus community safe is by using video surveillance technologies. This allows the public safety department to assess trends and foresee problems in an effort to increase their response time and to cover a larger portion of the campus and therefore better utilizing already limited resources. Likewise there is a need to systematically protect the privacy of the members of the campus community when using technologies associated with video surveillance. A unified approach to where, when and what types of video surveillance are deployed along with a proactive approach concerning how the system is to be used and by who is the only way to effective use this technology on a campus our size.

Advances in technology coupled with the lower cost of ownership have prompted many departments across the campus to invest in their own video surveillance systems causing a distributed and non-congruent variance in established systems. There is no single point of contact for any system and no centralized database of where and what kind of video surveillance is available to the campus public safety. This has grown to be ineffective, create a feeling of big-brother among the campus members and in some cases created large duplication of efforts with no overall governance in the event of crisis.

This policy is designed to outline the governance structure of video surveillance at Clemson University and all members of its community will be expected to adhere to the policy.

Policy

Any video surveillance device installed, used, monitored, or recorded on or within premises otherwise considered to be Clemson University property must have the approval of the Director of Law Enforcement and Safety, his/her designee, or any committee/council designated by the Executive Director of Public Safety and charged with the governance of video surveillance for Clemson University. It is the responsibility of the Executive Director of Public Safety to establish and maintain approval and operational guidelines concerning the installation and continued use of video surveillance technologies.
The Executive Director of Public Safety, designee or designee committee/council assumes no financial responsibility to the installation or maintenance of any video surveillance system installed on Clemson University property. Departments that desire to install, use, or monitor video surveillance equipment must first seek and be granted the appropriate approval by the Executive Director of Public Safety, be financially responsible for all costs associated with installation and maintenance and adhere to all guidelines established by the Executive Director of Public Safety, designee or designee committee/council. In addition to any specific operational guidelines overseen by the Executive Director of Public Safety, all video surveillance equipment will follow these general principles.

**General Principles**

A. Clemson University is committed to the development and perpetuation of programs designed to provide a safe and healthy campus. Integral to this commitment is the use of video equipment to deter crime, to assist in response to security issues and to provide leads whenever possible for criminal investigations. Safety and security purposes include, but are not limited to:
   - Protection of individuals, including students, faculty, staff, and visitors;
   - Protection of property, both university owned and privately owned;
   - Patrol common areas and areas accessible to the public;
   - Investigation of criminal activity and/or disciplinary issues.

B. Any video recorded, collected or preserved in any manner is the property of Clemson University and cannot be released to external entities without the proper approval process established by the Executive Director of Public Safety and/or Clemson University’s Chief Public Information Officer.

C. Any diversion of video technology for other purposes (e.g. monitoring of political or religious activities, personal gain, employee performance, or any reason other than safety or security concerns) would tend to undermine the acceptability of these resources for their intended purpose and is therefore prohibited by this policy. No video surveillance equipment will be installed for the sole purpose of covertly monitoring employee behavior in the absence of evidence pointing to criminal behavior involving a particular employee(s). Capturing conduct on camera incident to monitoring for safety and security purposes, however, does not prevent Clemson University from taking appropriate action (e.g., disciplinary action, criminal complaint).

D. Video monitoring for security purposes will be conducted in a professional, ethical and legal manner and will not violate anyone’s reasonable expectation of privacy. Personnel involved in video monitoring will be appropriately trained and regularly supervised in the responsible use of this technology.

E. Video monitoring of public areas for security purposes at Clemson University is limited to uses that do not violate the reasonable expectation to privacy as defined by law. Cameras will NOT be installed in an area where there is an "expectation of privacy". Individual’s or groups’ behavior may warrant specific monitoring with
community safety in mind. However, no one will be selected for monitoring based on discriminatory criteria such as gender, race, sexual orientation, national origin or disability.

F. Covert video surveillance equipment that complies with other areas of this policy and used within the legal bounds and process may be used. Covert cameras will only be used to aid in criminal investigations and require approval of the Executive Director of Public Safety.

G. Video surveillance equipment found to be illegal, installed without approval, or used in such a manner that violates any portion of this policy can and/or will be removed and/or confiscated under authority of the Executive Director of Public Safety and at a cost to be billed to the violating department or individuals.

H. For purposes of this policy, webcams in scope are ones intended for use on official Clemson University websites, not ones used for personal video uses such as chat, experimental lab observation or video conferencing capabilities. Webcams personally owned and operated by individuals are not in scope, but still may subject the owner to statutory privacy and workplace laws when being used. Privately owned cameras will be the sole responsibility of the user. Employees are to check with their supervisor before using personally owned or operated webcams in their workspace.

Specific guidelines and the approval process for video surveillance installations are maintained by the Executive Director of Public Safety and are included as attachments.

Purpose

This policy is to serve as the governing document covering the installation, use and monitoring of any video surveillance device installed and under the control of Clemson University, its employees, or any business affiliated partner using such technologies on Clemson University property. It is not the intent of this policy to restrict departments from using video surveillance technologies either for safety or for novelty reasons within their respective areas but to establish a governance structure and guidelines for continued operational use. The intent is to promote the use of these technologies, but in a consistent, ethical and appropriate manner.

This policy does not in any way imply or guarantee that video surveillance devices will be indefinitely operational or actively monitored at any time. The presence of physical video surveillance does not in any way imply that activity is recorded or monitored. Public areas will be defined as any portion of Clemson University’s buildings or facilities that are accessible to the general public and where no expectation of privacy is granted by statutory law. Additionally, public area monitoring may extend to common areas of the campus where typically only members of the campus are reasonably expected to gather and no expectation of privacy is granted by statutory law (e.g. hallways, building entrances and lobbies, etc). All privacy protections granted by law will be adhered to.
Definitions

CCTV – Closed Circuit Televisions are video camera technologies used to transmit a signal to a specific place for viewing or recording that is not broadcast to the general public for consumption. Typically these specific locations have a limited set of monitoring devices or recording devices designed for the sole purpose of observing or retrieving these images.

Video Surveillance Device – Camera or camera equipment used in the collection and/or monitoring of video imagery for the purposes of observing persons, places or things. These may include CCTV systems or web based cameras known as webcams, and some may have the capability to store images in an electronic format for later viewing.

Webcams - are video cameras designed to feed images in real time to a computer or computer network via USB, wired ethernet or through Wi-Fi enabled connections, some many feed real time imagery to webpages for viewing.

Communications (who needs to know, who does it affect or apply to)

All members of the Clemson University community (faculty, staff, students, and visitors) and any affected business associated partners of Clemson University.

Disciplinary Sanctions

The University will impose disciplinary sanctions on employees who violate the above policy. The severity of the imposed sanctions will be appropriate to the violation and/or any prior discipline issued to that employee.

All suspected violations of this policy should be reported to the Executive Director of Public Safety. In certain situations other university, state, or federal representatives might be included in those investigations.

References and Related Documents

Revisions

Current:
Next Revision:
Administrative Update:

Approvals
Guidelines for Completing
Clemson University Police Department’s
Video Security System Application/Permit

Enter department name and number requesting and responsible for the proposed system. 
ie. Police Department # 4012

Provide contact information for three individuals, one of whom can be contacted for information and or access to your system at all times.

Prior to presenting this form, please review the Clemson University Video Surveillance Policy. Briefly describe the proposed camera location(s) and the areas intended to be monitored with this (these) camera(s) as well as the security concern prompting the placement.

If this placement is covert and being placed pursuant to a criminal investigation provide case number, purpose and location of proposed placement, proceed to signature line and present form directly to the Executive Director of Public Safety.

Let us know of your intentions regarding monitoring.

Storage device refers to devices such as digital video recorders (DVR) or computer servers (local or remote)

Several factors affect the length of time that systems can store video. What is the minimum time that you intend for this system to retain recordings?

Many systems provide their own viewing platforms. Two commonly in use on campus are Integral’s Remote View Client Genetec’s live viewer.

Prior to signing and submitting this form, be sure you fully understand the university’s entire policy. Pay particular attention to portions of the policy regarding ownership of, and access to, video. Also familiarize yourself with proper and improper placement and use of video surveillance along with consequences of improper use. This form should only be signed and submitted by someone who is in a position of sufficient responsibility for and control of the proposed system to ensure compliance with policy.

The portion of the Application/Permit below the bold line near the bottom of the page is for use by the Executive Director of Public Safety or their designee.
### Clemson University Police Department

**Video Security System**

**Application/ Permit**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University department requesting new video placement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names of Contacts</th>
<th>phone number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Is this a covert system being placed pursuant to a criminal investigation? **Yes**  **No**

If yes case number

Purpose and location of system:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Will this system be monitored? <strong>Yes</strong>  <strong>No</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, by whom will it be monitored?  Ph. #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Will this system be recorded? <strong>Yes</strong>  <strong>No</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes what kind of storage device will be employed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For how long, if known will recordings be stored?

If law enforcement should require access to specific recording(s) by what remote viewing platform will that be achieved?

I have read, understand, and agree to abide by the Clemson University Video Surveillance Policy and take full responsibility for operation of the above described system and its continued compliance with this policy.

Name (print)  Signature  Date

---

### Clemson University Police Department

**Approved**  **Disapproved**  Reason for disapproval

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (print)</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Objectives for Improving Student Success

- Clearly Define Academic Expectations for Learners & Advisors
- Provide Roadmaps & Plans to Keep Students Informed & On track
- Improve Efficiency with Modern Tools to Match Changing Expectations

Help Students Succeed

1. Improve Advising, Auditing & Efficiency
2. Reporting & Business Intelligence
3. Student Educational Planning
Help Students Succeed

Improve Auditing, Advising & Efficiency

Provide Clearly Defined Academic Expectations
Improve Advising & Self Advising Tools
Enable Administrative Efficiency
Help Students Succeed

Improve Advising, Auditing & Efficiency

1

Assign Plans
Personalize Plans
Check for Accuracy

Student Educational Planning

2
Help Students Succeed

1. Improve Advising, Auditing & Efficiency

2. Create Roadmaps for Student Success

3. Discuss Opportunities
   View Sample Reports

Student Educational Planning

Help Students Succeed
Help Students Succeed

Improve Advising, Auditing & Efficiency

1

Improve Individual & Institutional Success

2

Create Roadmap for Student Success

3

Reporting & Business Intelligence

Student Educational Planning

Sample report names

- **Summary Reports**
  - SAMPLE-SUM01 Credits Remaining to graduate
  - SAMPLE-SUM02 Credits Applied as Electives
  - SAMPLE-SUM03 Block GPA
  - SAMPLE-SUM04 How close are selected students to graduation, by percentage
  - SAMPLE-SUM05 Show the selected students’ financial aid eligibility

- **Course Reports**
  - SAMPLE-CRS01 Courses Taken
  - SAMPLE-CRS02 Courses Needed
  - SAMPLE-CRS03 Courses Applied as Electives
  - SAMPLE-CRS04 Courses Applied Over the Limit
  - SAMPLE-CRS05 Courses Applied to Rules
  - SAMPLE-CRS06 Courses Applied to Specific Rules
  - SAMPLE-CRS07 Who has taken this prerequisite and needs this class

- **Planner Reports**
  - SAMPLE-PLN01 Planned Courses
  - SAMPLE-PLN02 Courses Planned and Needed
  - SAMPLE-PLN03 Courses Planned

- **Student Reports**
  - SAMPLE-STU01 What students have credits remaining to graduate
  - SAMPLE-STU02 What students have requirements remaining to graduate
Example Reports

SUNGAARD
HIGHER EDUCATION

DegreeWorks Strategic Reporting

ellucian

DegreeWorks Strategic Reporting

ellucian
DegreeWorks Strategic Reporting

Help Students Succeed

1. Improve Advising, Auditing & Efficiency
2. Reporting & Business Intelligence
3. Student Educational Planning

Create Roadmaps for Student Success
Improve Individual & Institutional Success
Improve Advising & Academic Support
When I began GameWorks in 1980, the idea was to change the way students were taught. My book, A Tale of Two Cities, and I believe in what I call the "revolutions" that take place in education. The goal is not to simply change what students learn, but to change what they need to learn.

----

The mission is to provide a platform for increased academic performance. Improving teaching and learning is an important component of our work. GameWorks and General Motors have contributed to this goal. The mission asserts that education is both a personal and academic enterprise and can combine both in an environment that maximizes potential.
Lauren Greene @laurengreene29
DegreeWorks has my expected graduation date as summer 2013. Can we please make that reality?

Christina Miller @C_SMiller1
Even my DegreeWorks is like "Why haven't you graduated???
#135Credits #BSReqs

Melia Grace Farlow @Ayee_MF
Without #DegreeWorks I'd be LOST.

Lauren Greene @laurengreene29
DegreeWorks has my expected graduation date as summer 2013. Can we please make that reality?

Christina Miller @C_SMiller1
Even my DegreeWorks is like "Why haven't you graduated???
#135Credits #BSReqs

Lauren @Solodeaudeaux
DegreeWorks is the best thing Auburn could have ever done!
Help Your Students Succeed

- Clearly Define Academic Expectation & Improve Advising
- Provide Roadmaps & Plans to Keep Students On track
- Improve Efficiency with Modern Tools to Meet Changing Expectations

ellucian
FACULTY SENATE SCHOLASTIC POLICIES
Agenda for meeting held Thursday, November 8, 2012.
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: Goddard, Grubb, Leininger, Marinescu, Tonkyn
Invited guests: Perry Austin (Chair, Academic Affairs Committee, Undergraduate Student Senate), Linda Nilson (Director, OTEI), Stan Smith (Registrar),

Old business
Faculty Advisory Board on Online Education: John Leininger reported that the Board met for the first time on Thursday, Oct. 25. It was an opportunity for the members to meet one another, and John said that the faculty members were impressive, experienced and concerned about maintaining quality. There was discussion of training for instructors and monitoring of their courses to ensure that the courses meet set standards. A representative from the Summer School office was present, and there was an open discussion of ways to improve summer school attendance and profits.

Changes in International Student Travel David Tonkyn met with the Vice Provost for International Affairs, Sharon Nagy, about the changes to allow study abroad programs in selected regions of countries on that are otherwise considered unsafe by the US State Department, CDC or WHO. She said that the changes had been proposed before she arrived, and that she made some modifications before sending them forward to CUGS and others. She said that both her office and the instructors should be responsible for monitoring such programs for changes in status.

Council on Undergraduate Studies, including Subcommittee to review academic policies re:iROAR The next meeting of this committee is on Friday, Nov. 9. David Tonkyn is the SP representative.

Undergraduate Admissions Committee This committee will meet on Monday, Nov. 12 at 3:30. David Tonkyn is the SP representative.

Bridge Program Alan Grubb has been obtaining admissions, GPR and graduation rate data on students who enter Clemson University through the Bridge Program, compared with those who enter as Freshmen. We discussed what he had found so far, and he is continuing to work on this.
Evaluation of Instruction Form:  SP is currently exploring how Chairs use student evaluations to evaluate teaching. Graciela Tissera is taking the lead but, unfortunately, could not attend this meeting. Linda Nilson was our invited guest, and gave us her 2012 peer-reviewed chapter to read, “Time to raise questions about student ratings” (pp. 213-227 in J. Groccia & L. Cruz, Eds., To Improve the Academy, Vol. 31, Wiley). Her paper is clear that cultural changes in both students and colleges have diminished the value of student ratings to the point where, “in a recent meta-analysis, Clayson (2009) could not locate a single study documenting a positive relationship between student learning and student ratings that was published after 1990.” Sometimes, the relationship is in the opposite direction, with course rigor, required student effort, and student learning being negatively correlated with evaluations. She concludes, “It is ironic that these ratings have acquired increasing importance in tenure, promotion, and reappointment decisions over the same time period that their validity has waned.” This is why we are considering this issue.

Linda explained that teaching evaluations are correlated with many factors besides teaching, such as class size, course level, discipline, charisma of instructor, etc. Scores are often bimodal, indicating mixture of majors or student levels. Response rates are variable and often low, forcing instructors to offer extra points to students to complete the evaluations. Students don’t generally know how their evaluations can be used, and will sometimes check off all 4s for the credit. Finally, with team taught courses, students may use the single evaluation form to review any one or all of the instructors.

The use of these evaluations by Chairs can be equally variable and sometimes inappropriate. They sometime use summary scores, confuse standard errors with confidence limits, average scores across class types or average or rank scores across faculty. In general higher scores are considered good, but in at least one case they were considered a sign of easy grading.

We had a spirited discussion for most of our 90 minutes but did not make recommendations. We still need to finalize our questionnaire for Chairs on how they use teaching evaluations, and may follow with recommendations that for training, altering the evaluation forms, limiting their weight in faculty evaluation, and/or encouraging other forms of evaluation.

General Education changes  Perry Austin reported on the Student Senate discussions for revising the General Education requirements. They are exploring many of the same ideas that faculty have raised. He offered to share their plan with us when it is done.

University Scholarship and Awards Committee:  Wayne Goddard was unable to attend the last meeting.

New Business

New articulation agreements  Barbara Speziale has asked us to revisit the issue of allowing 200 level technical school courses to substitute for 300 level Clemson courses as part of articulation agreements. We ran out of time to address this, but there was a long and spirited debate on Friday in the Undergraduate Council. In brief, it is complicated, there are precedents, and people feel strongly about it. We will discuss this at the next SP meeting.
FACULTY SENATE SCHOLASTIC POLICIES
Report on meeting held Tuesday, October 18, 2012.
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: Leininger, Tissera, Tonkyn
Invited guests: Perry Austin (Chair, Academic Affairs Committee, Undergraduate Student Senate), Bobby Ley (Freshman Council)

Old business
Contextualization in grading We had been asked last year to explore whether faculty should provide rankings of students in addition to letter grades, as a possible response to grade inflation. At the last Faculty 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 is the SP representative to this committee. Previously he had sent us the following text which was going to the Council on Undergraduate Studies. We reported this to the full Faculty Senate at its Oct. 9th meeting without comment, so I assume we are done with this.

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.
New Business

Calhoun Honors College Committee – Proposed Faculty Manual change. On Feb. 24, 2012, then President of the Faculty Senate Dan Warner received the following request from Bill Lasser, Director of the Calhoun Honors College:

Dan,

Attached please find proposed changes to the Faculty Manual provision regarding the make-up of the Calhoun Honors Committee. The proposed changes are modest, but they are important since they reflect changes in the Honors College personnel and programs. (For example, the Calhoun Honors Society no longer exists but we do have an active Student Advisory Committee). These changes have been approved by the Calhoun Honors Committee. Please let me know how best to proceed.

Thanks,
Bill

The proposed changes are included in a separate attachment, since I can’t seem to copy it into this document without losing the ability to track and show changes.

All three Senators present plus one Senator by email voted to accept these changes, to be forwarded to the full Senate for final action.

General Education changes Perry Austin reported that the Student Senate is preparing a proposal for new General Education requirements to present to the November 7 meeting of the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee. He hopes to bring that proposal to Scholastic Policies Committee at least a week in advance. We had a lively and positive debate about the General Education requirements, and it is clear that both faculty and students care greatly about this issue.

University Scholarship and Awards Committee: There was no report.

Faculty Advisory Board on Online Education: This Board will meet for the first time on Thursday, Oct. 25. John Leininger is the SP representative.

Changes in International Student Travel There was no report.

Council on Undergraduate Studies, including Subcommittee to review academic policies re:iROAR David Tonkyn is the SP representative but was unable to attend either meeting due to conflicts with other meetings. He did talk with Jeff Appling immediately after the Subcommittee meeting, which Perry Austin attended, and we learned some details. The group went through the Undergraduate Catalog and identified areas of potential concern with Banner. Here is Jeff’s synopsis of the meeting, which is not necessarily an official report.
Thanks everyone, I think our meeting went well. Here is a synopsis of what we covered. Feel free to add to it if I missed something.

p. 25, Credit Load: discuss with CUGS about credit limit, students can register for 19 but advisors will need to allow more, up to a max; discuss with CUGS the implementation of an excess hour fee (like they have at USC); Debra is looking into how the max credits in the summer will be managed.

p. 25, Grading System: Debra is working with editors to make sure definition of NP (no pass) is included; RD and RF will be used for redeemed grades (include or not?); Jeff will review wording in W section as it applies to university withdrawal.

p. 26, Grade Point Ratio: ratio changes to average; include NP in the list.

p. 26, Pass/Fail Option: already changed and approved.

p. 26, Academic Eligibility Standards: Total Credit Hour Level changed to Total Attempted Hours (also in note)

p. 27, Academic Eligibility Evaluation: committee is exploring change to checking status each semester instead of only in spring semester, will align with financial aid requirements.

p. 27, Repeating Courses Passed: already changed and approved.

p. 27, Academic Redemption Policy: now Forgiveness, already changed and approved.

p. 27, Course Substitutions: will remain manual until we can determine how to automate in DegreeWorks.

p. 28, Auditing Policies: Audits will not appear on transcripts.

p. 29, Preprofessional Studies: will remain manual.

p. 30, Change of Major: deadline for change in current semester under consideration, recommendation coming.

p. 30, Withdrawal from the University: Jeff will check to make sure wording aligns with policy and any change to W description on p. 25-26.

p. 30, Academic Integrity: Julia Lusk will make sure reference to redemption is changed to forgiveness.

There were no other areas that were connected to Banner policy issues.

Let me know how this looks, I will report at next CUGS. I will work with Debra on a CUGS proposal about the credit load issue.

Jeffrey R. Appling, PhD
Undergraduate Admissions Committee  This committee will meet on Monday, Nov. 12 at 3:30. David Tonkyn is the SP representative

Bridge Program  Alan Grubb could not attend but wrote that he has been collecting information about students who enter Clemson through the Bridge Program from Debbie Jackson (graduation rates, etc.) and Robert Barkley (admission standards), and is writing to Sue Horton, Director of the Bridge Program for other relevant information.

Evaluation of Instruction Form:  Graciela Tissera met with Linda Nilsen on this, and has drafted an initial set of questions. We added this list and plan to invite Linda to our November meeting to settle on a final list, which we would then present to the Faculty Senate and submit to the Chairs through Debbie Jackson’s office soon after.

Next meeting:  November 8, 2012 from 12:30—2:00. Room to be determined.
e. Calhoun Honors College Committee formulates and recommends policies and procedures for the Calhoun Honors College to the Council on Undergraduate Studies. The faculty members on the committee serve as the curriculum committee for the Honors College. Membership consists of six faculty members, one from each college and one representative from the Library, elected for three-year terms. Colleges shall elect from their ranks faculty with experience and interest in the Honors College as indicated by such activities as teaching Honors courses, directing Honors theses and research projects, and serving on Honors committees at the department and college level. Other voting members are: one member of the Faculty Senate elected for a one-year term; two faculty members, each serving two-year terms and appointed by the director of the Honors College from the combined constituencies of the Dixon Senior Fellows, Calhoun Honors seminar and colloquium instructors, and Bradbury Award recipients; two student members elected by the Calhoun Honors College Student Advisory Board; and one Honors student appointed by the director of the Honors College. All student members shall serve one-year terms. Non-voting members are the director, who shall serve as chair; the associate and assistant directors of the Honors College; and one representative from the office of undergraduate admissions.
FACULTY SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES
ANTONIS KATSIYANNIS, CHAIR
October 11, 2012 3:00-4:00 (420 Tillman Hall)

Chair Antonis Katsiyannis HEHD 407E Tillman 5114 antonis
Susan Chapman AFLS 340 Long 5432 schapm2
Feng Chen AFLS 215 P&A 5702 fchen
Calvin Sawyer AFLS 210 McAdams 4072 calvins
Pradip Srimani E&S 121 McAdams 5886 psriman

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; limited information on who will have access to the footage and acceptable reasons for requests to review footage; potentially conflicting info between section H and definitions (i.e., web cams); and the possibility of footage becoming "public" record subject to freedom of information requests.

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

Senator Chapman will work on clarifying and establishing policies regarding benefit rates applied/assessed to grants having foreign personnel on J1 visas.
Faculty Senate Research Committee
Report on meeting held Thursday, October 25, 2012.
2:30pm-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

Old Business:

The current and past research committee chair met to discuss continuity of agenda items for multi-year initiatives. These initiatives are now part of the current committee agenda items to identify and address challenges to Clemson faculty research success.

New Business:

New non-senate committee member Julia Frugoli of CAFLS was welcomed to the committee and thanked for her commitment to helping address research support needs campus-wide.

The 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 want to know Clemson’s research infrastructure needs and other challenges to faculty research productivity. We will use faculty input to develop an agenda of high priority research concerns that could be addressed by the Faculty Senate. We will then work with university administration to maximize the research infrastructure, culture and climate here at Clemson.

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 (see Appendix A). 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.
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 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. Much of the individualized support for 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.

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- See Appendix A for raw data
Appendix A. Raw data: Detailed faculty input on research challenges, barriers and suggestions to facilitate Clemson faculty research and scholarly productivity and success.

- Review of limited submission proposals-
  - Cross-disciplinary issues in review
  - Limited lead time on announcements

- Conflict of interest

This is a great question. For me, the biggest barriers to research are the following:

1. Lack of graduate assistants (we are a terminal masters program and need all of our students for teaching assistance).
2. Lack of an infrastructure to support larger scale research. Most top-25 public universities have a research institute with staff who are skilled at things like on-going project management, IRB proposal preparation, recruiting and managing cohorts of research participants, data management, data security, etc. Projects can then write the center into their proposals and can pay for the proportion of the resources they use. I did my post doc at university of Georgia which has a multilevel center - -a larger “umbrella” center (the institute for behavioral research) and then a set of smaller centers that managed subsets of funded projects. The idea was that this freed the scientists to focus on the science while professional project managers focused on the nuts and bolts of executing the research studies.
3. Unclear teaching loads. If we are serious about being a very high productivity research institution we need all research active faculty on 2-2 loads. Instability and lack of clarify about workload is very burdensome.

I am speaking mainly about funded research. I would say one of the main obstacles at the current time is the lack of a central office taking the responsibility and time to focus on, support and promote research. I had great hopes that when the new VPR took over that this would occur. However, it has not. This affects research in many ways. It slows the rate at which a proposal can get out the door. Good research across campus goes un-promoted at a national level. Incentive funds are not returned in a timely fashion (still waiting on last years.....). Pre and post-award are still 2 different entities, etc. Ultimately the responsibility for all of these things is pushed down to the PI. This ends up creating a climate in which only the most internally motivated faculty (or externally pressured faculty) continue to pursue research funding (which is a tough proposition to begin with).

- We need professional grant writers like other major research institutions ... we need copyeditors like other major research institutions ... We don’t need more stuff ... we need human capital to make grants possible ...
• One barrier to my research productivity is the quality of graduate students, particularly doctoral students, whom we are able to recruit. If we can provide higher stipends—up to a point—to graduate students, we probably can attract some of them who would otherwise go to more prestigious programs. We get students who don’t write well, don’t think creatively or question conventional wisdom too much, or who don’t know English well, even if they are bright.

The university should institute +– grading for graduate (and undergraduate) students because doing so would help us accurately reward learning accomplishment and send a message that we’re raising the standards here. There’s a huge difference between a B+ and a B– in a graduate course, just as there is a huge difference between a C+ and C– in a graduate course. The same differences apply to undergraduate courses but perhaps not quite as much.

Another barrier to my research productivity is my time management. I need to improve it. The university want us to pitch in and provide service for numerous things. Yet, providing services takes time. We get requests, such as yours, for feedback, yet I wonder if, given our top leadership in the university, whether any feedback is used.

1. One of the biggest things is that for some of the bigger labs like mine equipment maintenance, upkeep and service contracts and paying for expensive repairs is a burden on the individual researcher. And it is tough to put these types of things into grant proposals.

2. One potential barrier to research productivity is lack of support to absorb the cost for substantial, unanticipated repairs to major equipment. We have had two instruments (AFM, ellipsometer) that required such repairs (in excess of $5K each). In both cases, the cost for repair was not budgeted in a grant. In one case (AFM), the instrument sat idle for almost a year until we were able financially to fix it. This delay could have been avoided if the University had a fund to cover unanticipated repairs to major equipment. This seems like an appropriate use of some of the indirect that the university receives.

3. One possible concern relates to the overall climate at Clemson. There is what seems to be an odd resentment on the part of the functional upper administration regarding faculty research, almost as if they regard attempts by faculty to garner outside funding as some burden on them. Proposals in sponsored programs are routed through multiple people in succession, each of whom always has some "concerns" about the proposal, as if the faculty member is trying to pull something by them. It is an intangible but it becomes wearisome in a very, very tough funding climate. If other faculty feel that there are morale problems that they can't put their finger on, this may be part of it.

4. One thing that would be helpful is to receive feedback from CoESPRO on why internal pre-proposals were not selected for external submission, and if CU has a particular policy for calls such as the NSF MRI.

5. The first item that comes to mind is a standard obstacle from Procurement. [Deleted a diatribe...] I have a good grasp of what is available and how much it should cost. I asked my dep't purchaser to buy computers from a supplier whose products I know to be of much greater value than PCs on the State Contract. She was told "No!". Since the total of the 3 exceeded $2500, I had to have 2 more quotes. It took me a couple hours to find "custom component" build sites and configure identical machines to
those that I wanted. One was $600 more (per machine) and one was $1,000 more (per machine). So, I wasted a couple hours. So, why can't the basic assumption here be: "he's in the business, he knows what he's doing, it's his money, and he won't waste it"?

6. I'm getting ready to retire next year, but here are my observations over the years.

1. This place is too top-down. By this, I mean that ideas come from Deans and above and not the active researchers. Things start with great fanfare, then they quietly die.
2. We are so far behind in cyber/computer technology it's deplorable. I came here in 1980 with the hopes of seeing an NCSA style organism. It's still not in place five years after the second in command at NCSA came here.
3. We're too durn silo'd. Everything in this place is predicated on account numbers - there is no interdisciplinarity here.
4. We talk education but we reward dollars --- in a word, the University culture is "greed is good".

7. Thanks for your request. In brief, my response to your question of what I need to improve my scholarly and research productivity is: "more and better graduate students."

I can write proposals and get them funded. I can procure good equipment. I can attend conferences and write articles. But the extent to which I can do these things is limited by the number and quality of the researchers in my group. When I have truly superb students working with me, my productivity jumps. When I have graduate students who struggle, everything moves at a snail's pace. I have been successful at recruiting our best rising seniors, but that is, of course, a limited cohort.

What I would encourage the Research Committee of the Faculty Senate to do is develop a plan, not for recruiting graduate students, but rather just to increase the visibility of our college. In other words, perhaps the committee could develop a plan for increasing the chance that a rising senior at Purdue, or U of Michigan, etc., would know (1) that there is a place called Clemson University, and (2) that we do great research.

8. I think that the small amount and poor condition of on-campus research space for faculty-led research groups is a major problem. Despite the growth of facilities like CU-ICAR and AMRL, most student learning and research at Clemson occurs on campus and most faculty hires will be for people who will be located on campus. Labs are increasingly of such poor quality that we have trouble passing safety inspections and prospective faculty candidates have to decide whether to move into old crowded space at Clemson or nice new labs at other universities. We have lately been losing that battle and it's going to get worse. Many of our existing buildings are in need of major renovation (e.g., like we did with Harden Hall), and we are also in need of new space (e.g. Like we did with Rhodes). Many of our research-intensive graduate programs are limited by the amount and quality of our space. We cannot move much further up the ranking ladder without new and renovated space.
9. I have one suggestion at this time: I am finding that the accounting services, while staffed with excellent people, are very fragmented across campus. It would be helpful to have a better coordinated accounting system that deals uniformly with grants, contracts, gifts, and internal funds.

10. In response to your e-mail below, please find attached [appended at the end] a document that I prepared when the administration was planning the strategic hires RFP. From my perspective, I did not believe that it was wise to hire new/top notch faculty, without addressing current short falls. I still submitted a pre-proposal in response to the RFP. However, I strongly believe that we need to fix what is not working now. I am very glad to hear that the Senate is thinking that way.

11. While the GAD may generate revenue for the institution, it is a tax on the research enterprise. Consider, investigators at Clemson and my former school the University of Utah receive NIH R21 grants. It's reasonable to budget about $60,000 per year for grad support. My former advisor can hire 3 grad students at ~$20K/year (because Utah waives grad tuition), while I hire 2 at the same salary+GAD. That my former advisor will generate more experimental data leading to more publications and a higher probability of successful grant applications should be obvious.

Another aspect of this is the requirement that students remain enrolled “full-time” while on assistantship. Given that most PhD candidates in our program complete the majority of their coursework within two years and need another 2-3 years to graduate, they end accumulating vastly more “Doctoral research” credit than is required to graduate. I don’t see any rational basis for forcing students to pay for credits above the requirements for their degree. This policy is exacerbated by the requirement that these students be enrolled full-time during the summer. This is not a requirement of many Universities that we are competing with. Reality is that because of the GAD, it is actually the PI that is being forced to pay for these useless credits. I have 2 PhD candidates enrolled entirely in research, both of whom I would bet have already exceeded the level required for their degree. Via the GAD, this is effectively transferring close to $20 from my research efforts to other activities. Since “root causes” are such a common parlance today, in the University’s defense, these policies originate in the overall lack of state support for the institution, resulting in a continual effort by the administration to raise revenue in every possible manner.

12. One of the issues that seems to be an obstacle is the way Clemson attempts to claim all IP in agreements with industrial sponsors. Some of our faculty have received large grants from industry. Under these agreements there is often no or very little IP that really belongs to Clemson U, however CURF (or a lawyer) ultimately determines if there is or isn't any potential IP for Clemson with no real expert input. As a result we loose funding opportunity.

Hiring processes
Misunderstanding of specific search procedures inhibits timely search completion. Some searches can take six months or more.
Staff in university HR are not generally involved and therefore cannot answer questions about goals in recruiting or interview processes. For example, is skype an acceptable alternative for some pre-
interview or interview candidates at points along the process? Are reference letters required to be sent in paper copy through postal mail? At what point does Access & Equity review candidates? Are salary offers subject to review in HR compensation?

It is not possible to use the automated job posting and application system through university HR without requiring candidates to fill in lengthy forms about previous positions. There is no version of the posting that allows brief creation of profile and attachment of documents. Instead, the job ad directs applicants to submit via email to the search committee chair. Efficiencies are lost in being unable to use the university system which (a) captures and archives application materials (b) automatically screens for required experience and education (c) provides electronic management of applicants and (d) simplifies and reduces paperwork generated in the procedure.

Why is it that there is no job description for a faculty position? Apparently the offer letter serves as the elaboration of 'duties' but this provides for neither proper oversight nor accountability in accomplishing duties. This may be more of an issue specific to libraries where work expected by faculty has changed significantly over the past two decades but with no real documentation available to track responsibility or accountability.

It would be very helpful to develop a process that incorporates "expert input", and not leave it in the hands of folks that have very limited knowledge either in the topic area or in the nature of industrial collaborations.

The list is long but basically boils down to institutional support at Clemson lagging badly behind that available at Georgia, NC, Texas A&M and other peer institutions.

The last item on the list may be college specific-In CAFLS there is a serious problem with Grant Support-not enough people-so that grants need to be complete at least a week ahead of submission and many times there is only one support person servicing 15 or 20 grant proposals that go in on a single day. In several cases, grants involving more than one institution have been run through the second institution because of this, causing indirect revenue loss for Clemson. We've had cases of the wrong grant being submitted through grants.gov for a faculty member, pieces missing, etc. This is a serious problem, and while the person responsible has left, she has not been replaced, making the work overload situation worse.

Desired but not apparently high priority elements that are missing or inadequate compared to peer institutions:
1. permanent technical support personnel for managing lab (support technicians as a career path)
2. competent, engaged accounting support (includes simplified, unified budgeting and purchasing systems)
3. permanent teaching support staff that are paid enough and can be engaged as a career in excellence
4. administrative support for scholarly endeavors such as organizing a scientific meeting, improving course tools for laboratory courses
5. competitive support (financial, and especially career mentoring) for graduate students
6. availability of funds for professional activities to attend conferences and meetings, for cutting edge research prospects or bridging grants
7. leadership and schedule of grants support services office not being aligned with clearly defined deadlines for major grants

While I know little of this technique, I see an increasing number of novel/much discussed/award winning studies that utilize fMRI in research. A faculty member competent in this area using MRI available in Greenville would be a giant step forward for many research areas.

Also, I am deeply troubled by the volume of work that is being done overseas in non-western developing countries by inexperienced faculty, boasting of free trips to (enter exotic location), who seem to have little awareness of the ethical issues, and the long and troubled history of failed interventions by North Americans into other cultures. I would encourage dialogue about course work and oversight in this arena.

As a new faculty member I am slowed down by the requirement of PI-certification, a process that will take two to three hours and I just could not find time to do it. I understand to reduce paperwork is not easy in a big organization. In that case, to have a new faculty member start a bit earlier (say, Aug 1st instead of Aug 15th) will be helpful.

The most challenging barrier I face is teaching 3 courses a semester. There is very little time for research. Lack of funds for pilot studies is another issue. To be competitive for large grants the pilot work must be completed and published or presented.
I also think a sabbatical system for tenure track/tenured faculty is needed. You earn time towards your sabbatical each semester you teach. For example, you teach 5 semesters and you earn a semester off. That allows you to plan—you know you will have a block of time free for your research. At present sabbaticals are given so rarely at Clemson.

I would definitely like to see (and would definitely be willing to work on) creating a better avenue to perform research in athletics at this university.

There is a lot of needs for support on the post-award process. With regard to external funding, Clemson quite apparently functions with an audit orientation rather than a helpful one. In other words, the institution spends more attention and resources on following rules and established procedures to the detriment of the expenditures and projects.

The biggest problem I see with our infrastructure and culture relates to grants. I'm not clear why colleges need their own people handling grants; it seems to me that one group for the university,
dedicated to supporting the faculty rather than having the faculty feel they are working for the grants people, would go a long way to helping. (This is no way is meant to disparage our HEHD people who do extremely well under some strange conditions.) A budget process that is more responsive to the funder rather than the bean counters would help, as it seems our budgets rarely are fully aligned. The high cost of graduate students means we are often better using faculty rather than students who would gain more through the process (while freeing up faculty). It is often much easier to work directly with funders through contracts rather than work through the university.

So I think it's a matter of university culture with one, consistent organization university-wide to support faculty, from cradle to grave, that might make a difference.

There is a consensus among senior researchers across campus that, overall, Clemson's pre- and post-award mechanisms for external funding and ancillary support services are second-rate at best, and often worse. Even where there are islands of efficiency and savvy support, they exist within an ocean of mediocrity or incompetence and a lack of coordination and communication.

• I know this may sound silly, but office hours are a minor but consistent drain on my general productivity. Typically I sit in my office and feel stuck there, with 0 student visits or calls. It feels very unproductive, both to my scholarly output and to other demands on my professional time. Granted, I can work on some scholarly tasks during that time, but not all — data collection, research meetings, etc. are not really possible then.
  o I am more than happy to answer student emails any time I receive them and I do: before 6 am this morning I was answering a student question sent at 3:20 am. I also will and do meet with students after class and during arranged appointments — I had two of those yesterday. So it isn't like I'm not available, and I think that's true of many of my peers. But it feels like a gigantic waste of time to devote hours per week to sitting around the office waiting for people who might or might not decide to drop by.
  o I'd propose instead of the standard requirement for office hours that faculty be allowed to choose either posted office hours OR a higher level of scrutiny by their chair on the availability outside of class item on student evaluations, or even a more detailed student evaluation of my availability appended to the regular evaluation.
The Welfare Committee met on our today, though attendance was very light due to the cancellation of classes. Attending were Alan Winters, Tina Robbins, and Diane Perpich.

1. Benefits. Based on the results of the Provost's COACHE report, the Welfare Committee will focus in upcoming months on benefits, especially those related to parental leave for faculty and health and retirement benefits for full time and senior lecturers. We have begun collecting data on parental leave policies at peer institutions and on how different departments and colleges at Clemson currently handle parental leave requests/needs. Beyond FMLA (the federally mandated Family and Medical Leave Act), Clemson has no standardized policies. A central difficulty in the application of FMLA is how to apply its 12 weeks of guaranteed leave in a 15 week semester.

We will also be looking at benefits issues (health and retirement) generally as they impact lecturers.

We will meet on December 4 with Michelle Piekutowski and Rumame Samuels from Human Resources. This is an informational meeting, meant to begin a conversation about possible ways to standardize and improve maternity/parental leave options for faculty and to gather information on benefits for senior and full-time lecturers.

2. "Clemson Cares". The Welfare Committee was contacted by the Health Promotions Office at Redfern to participate in a charrette for the development of a "Faculty Care and Concern Resource Page" on Redfern's website. We will send a representative to the meeting.
FACULTY SENATE POLICY COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES
BILL PENNINGTON, CHAIR
October 16, 2012 2:30-4:30 (103 Cooper Library)

1. University Professors – there is still considerable confusion over what the Provost would like for this, but we did begin to discuss a possible structure to address what we think are her concerns.

A) A mechanism to provide incentive and reward for full professors who perform at a high level. Any full professor receiving Annual Performance Ratings of "very good" or better for five consecutive years is eligible to request review for an "in-rank" salary increase. The details of how this review would be accomplished (internal or external, particularly weighted toward scholarship, or teaching, or research, or a balance of all three, etc.) would be up to individual departments.

B) To reward those achieving at the highest level, twelve new named/endowed professorships (University Professors, Provost Professors, Trustee Professors, ???) will be created. The selection pool for these positions will come from those receiving salary increases in 1.A) above. For each of the next four years three faculty members will be selected. After that positions will be filled as they become vacant. The position will be accompanied by a $5K salary stipend, similar to that provided for Alumni Distinguished Professors.

2. PTR revisions. I've attached a file describing changes to be recommended to the EAB.

3. Revision of Goals, Accomplishments, and Evaluation section of the FM – John Meriwether has done a great job revising this section to replace the old Form 1-3 system with modifications to FAS. While the FM changes are nearly complete, we will need to meet with Wickes Wescott to discuss the actual changes to the FAS system. I've attached John's draft.

4. President's Commission on Sustainability - Scott has come up with a section describing the PCS, and the role that the Faculty Senate will play in nominating faculty for membership. Inclusion of this section will require that the PCS modify their charter. Scott has also requested the charters of the other President's Commissions to determine whether we can (or need to) make them more uniform. I've attached Scott's draft.
FM-IV.H. Revision

At present, post tenure review (PTR) occurs on a five year cycle. Any faculty member receiving two or more Annual Performance Ratings (APR) of “fair” or worse during a given five year window undergoes Phase II of PTR, involving additional review. If this review results in a PTR rating of “unsatisfactory”, a remediation plan is developed to address the problem areas.

This policy leads to the possibility that students might be exposed to inferior teaching for a relatively long period of time, and it has been suggested that we change the policy so that Part II is triggered as soon as a second inadequate APR is received.

Text below was taken from the current faculty manual, pages 25-27. Text in blue will be replaced by text in read. Text in black will remain as is.

An additional concern has arisen during discussion of these changes, namely that in the revised form, two inadequate APRs trigger additional evaluation, but no remediation is pursued until/unless a PTR rating of Unsatisfactory is received. A potential “fix” might be to insert a new step 6a below, which would consist of development of a remediation plan, similar to that described in step 7. Assuming that Phase II evaluation would take one semester to complete, the remediation plan would be for the same time period. If the eventual PTR rating is Satisfactory, then no further remediation would be required. An Unsatisfactory PTR rating would trigger step 7. Please let me know your thoughts on this.


Current Wording

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

2. Coverage. All faculty members holding a tenured faculty position shall be subject to PTR except for a faculty member planning to retire by August 15th of the same academic year in which the post tenure review would occur, providing that a binding letter of intent to retire is signed thereby waiving the PTR.

The period for post tenure review is after every five years and is coincident with the beginning of the next five year cycle. The first five-year period begins at the time that tenure is granted. Promotion during that period does not alter the schedule for review. PTR review covering that five year period are conducted during the fall semester of the sixth year when one or more faculty members in a department or equivalent unit is scheduled for review. Review of tenured academic administrators is accomplished in accordance with Section VI. J. of the Faculty
Post tenure review is conducted on an annual basis, beginning at the time tenure is granted. Review of tenured academic administrators is accomplished in accordance with Section VI. J. of the Faculty Manual.

Periods of sick leave, sabbatical leave, or leave without pay will be excluded from this five-year period. Faculty who give birth, father, or adopt a child during any five-year period may, at their request, receive a one-year extension of the post-tenure review. The request for an extension must come within two months of the birth or adoption. The extension will automatically be granted unless the chair or dean can document sufficient reason for denial. Extension of the post-tenure review period of a faculty member for serious illness, family tragedy or other special circumstances may be granted with the approval of the department chair, dean and Provost.

Periods of sick leave, sabbatical leave, or leave without pay will be excluded from PTR review. Faculty who give birth, father, or adopt a child may, at their request, receive a one-year exemption of PTR. The request for an exemption must come within two months of the birth or adoption, and will be automatically granted unless the chair or dean can document sufficient reason for denial. Exemption from PTR of a faculty member for serious illness, family tragedy or other special circumstances may be granted with the approval of the department chair, dean and Provost.

5. Part I, Post Tenure Review. The PTR committee will review the ratings received on the most recent available series of five years of annual performance reviews, as specified in the Best Practices for Post-Tenure Review (#3). Merit salary increments are based on these annual performance reviews, as is consistent with the Best Practices for Post-Tenure Review (#9). All tenured faculty members receiving no more than one (of five) annual performance rating of “fair,” “marginal,” or “unsatisfactory” in Part I of the Post Tenure Review process receive a Post Tenure Review rating of “satisfactory.” These faculty members are thereby exempt from Part II of Post Tenure Review.

5. Part I, Post Tenure Review. The PTR committee will review the ratings received for the most recent five annual performance reviews of each tenured faculty member, as specified in the Best Practices for Post-Tenure Review (#3). Merit salary increments are based on these annual performance reviews, as is consistent with the Best Practices for Post-Tenure Review (#9). Any tenured faculty members receiving two or more ratings of “fair,” “marginal,” or “unsatisfactory” within the last five annual performance reviews, will be subjected to additional review under Part II of the Post Tenure Review process (section 6 below). All others will receive a Post Tenure Review rating of “satisfactory,” and are thereby exempt from Part II of Post Tenure Review.

6. Part II, Post Tenure Review. Part II consists of additional review by the Post Tenure Review Committee and the department chair of those identified in Part I as subject to further review. All tenured faculty members receiving two or more annual performance ratings of “fair,” “marginal,” or “unsatisfactory” will be reviewed under Part II of Post Tenure Review.

6. Part II, Post Tenure Review. Part II consists of additional review by the Post Tenure Review
Committee and the department chair of those identified in Part I as subject to further review. All tenured faculty members receiving a second annual performance ratings of "fair," "marginal," or "unsatisfactory" within the most recent five annual performance reviews will be reviewed under Part II of Post Tenure Review.

a. In order to ensure adequate external representation in the Part II Post Tenure Review process, departments must choose ONE of these options in drafting departmental personnel policy procedures.
   • utilize reference letters submitted from outside the department on each individual under review,
   • add to the PTR committee a faculty member or professional equivalent from outside the department nominated and elected according to departmental bylaws,
   • allow each faculty member under review the option of either having external letters solicited or incorporating the external committee member in the review process.

b. The faculty member undergoing Part II of PTR must provide, at a minimum, the following documents to the PTR committee and the department chair.
   • a recent copy of the curriculum vita (paper or electronic);
   • a summary of student assessment of instruction for the last 5 years including a summary of statistical ratings from student assessments of instruction (if appropriate to the individual’s duties).
   • a plan for continued professional growth;
   • detailed information about the outcomes of any sabbatical leave awarded during the preceding five years; and
   • if required by departmental personnel policy procedures, the names of six referees outside the department whom the PTR committee could contact for references.

c. The chair of the academic unit must provide the PTR committee with copies of the faculty member’s annual performance reviews covering the preceding five years.

d. The role and function of each faculty member, as well as the strength of the overall record, will be examined by the PTR committee. If provided in departmental bylaws, the PTR committee is required to obtain a minimum of four reference letters of which at least two must come from the list of six submitted by the faculty member.

e. The PTR committee will provide a written report to the faculty member. The faculty member should be given at least two weeks to provide a response to the committee. Both the committee’s initial report and the response of the faculty member will be given to the dean of the academic unit. The department chair will submit an independent written report to the faculty member who will then have two weeks to provide a response. The chair’s original report and the faculty member’s response will be forwarded to the college dean. The ratings of either Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory will be used in all stages of the review by the PTR committee and the chair.

f. If both the PTR Committee and the chair, or either the PTR Committee or the chair, rates the candidate as satisfactory, the candidate’s final rating shall be satisfactory. If both the PTR Committee and the Chair rate the candidate as unsatisfactory, the candidate’s final rating shall be
unsatisfactory.

g. If the candidate’s final rating is satisfactory, the dean will forward that information to the Provost in summary form without appending any candidate materials. If the candidate’s final rating is unsatisfactory, the dean will forward all materials to the Provost.

7. Remediation. Individuals who receive a rating of Unsatisfactory must be given a period of remediation to correct deficiencies detailed in the PTR reports. The chair in consultation with the PTR committee and the faculty member will provide a list of specific goals and measurable outcomes the faculty member should achieve in each of the next three calendar years following the date of formal notification of the unsatisfactory outcome. The university will provide reasonable resources (as identified in the PTR reports and as approved by the chair and the dean) to meet the deficiencies. The chair will meet at least twice annually with the faculty member to review progress. The faculty member will be reviewed each year by the PTR committee and the chair, both of whom shall supply written evaluations. At the end of the three-year period, another post-tenure review will be conducted. If the outcome is again Unsatisfactory, the faculty member will be subject to dismissal for unsatisfactory performance. If the review is Satisfactory, then the normal five-year annual performance review cycle will resume.

8. Dismissal for Unsatisfactory Professional Performance. If dismissal for unsatisfactory professional performance is recommended, the case will be subject to the rules and regulations outlined in the Faculty Manual Section IV.K.3.
E. Annual Performance Evaluation

The annual performance evaluation by the chair or director shall be conducted on an academic year basis using the Faculty Activity System (FAS). 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, and Evaluation. These are to be completed during the academic calendar year as required by the Provost. The Goals section shall be completed and frozen within 10 working days of the beginning of the fall semester. The Performance section would be maintained and updated by the faculty member throughout the summer and academic year. The chair or director and the faculty member would complete the Evaluation section within 30 calendar days of the close of the spring semester.

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

Within ten working days of the beginning of the Fall term the faculty member enters his/her goals for the 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 chair or director in consultation with the faculty member; the percentage of emphasis given to each goal area is determined at the same time as part of these negotiations. These goals and assigned duties are to be described within the FAS Goals section. 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 within the Goals section indicating his or her disagreement. The chair then freezes this Goals section for the remainder of the academic year. If a revision of goals is required 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. This revision of the Goals section must be agreed upon by both the department chair or director and the faculty member. If the Goals section is revised, an electronically signed electronic 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 Section (Appendix F):

Within ten days of the conclusion of the spring semester the faculty member completes the entries into the FAS Performance section regarding teaching and research accomplishments and achievements attained in the past period of summer and academic year. 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. Accomplishments not listed as objectives in the Goals section should be clearly identified as such in a separate paragraph that also includes a scholarship summary identifying the
total number of publications, manuscripts in press or submitted, presentations made at meetings, colloquia given at schools, graduate students supervised and graduated, and funding awards received. 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 department chair’s (or school director) summary evaluation of the faculty member. On the basis of material in the Goals and Performance 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 conclusion of the spring semester. In the case of tenure-track faculty, the chair may attach the faculty member’s most recent reappointment recommendation to the annual performance review and then complete the Evaluation section, including evaluation of any further accomplishments after the reappointment evaluation.

The narrative of the Evaluation section within FAS 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, the FAS Evaluation section would include a “Total Performance Rating,” a six-step scale ranging from “excellent” to “unsatisfactory.” The department chair or director will check electronically one category. After the chair or director completes and electronically signs the FAS Evaluation section, access to the FAS Evaluation section is granted to the faculty member who signs it electronically after reading it and returns 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. The chair or director 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 or director 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 three weeks 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. This response must be concluded no later than 1 July. 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 after the faculty
member acknowledges by signature that he/she has received the dean’s response to the
evaluation.

The FAS with these three sections of Goals, Performance, 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.
President’s Commission on Sustainability
Scott M. Dutkiewicz
Sept. 28, 2012

Title

President’s Commission on Sustainability

Charge

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. To creatively address sustainability, the Commission will facilitate collaboration among students, faculty, staff and the community by integrating education, research, and public service with supporting social, economic and environmental infrastructure.

Taken from the Charter’s Purpose statement. Comment: I don’t see how the community in the charge is addressed in the membership of the Commission.

Membership

Membership of the commission consists of members of the faculty, members of the staff, students, and other nonvoting members. Faculty representatives shall be regular or emeriti faculty, nominated by the Faculty Senate Executive/Advisory Board and appointed by the President for three year terms. A faculty plurality must be maintained in the total membership of the Commission. 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.

All of this materials is new. I have been concerned about what appeared to be the underweighting of faculty on the Commission, as well as the needless limitation about keeping senators off the Commission.

Taking the Commission on the Status of Women and the Commission on the Status of Black Faculty and Staff as examples, the Commission would need at least a 50/50 split of faculty as compared to voting staff and students. I tried to obtain a majority of faculty, but it became too complicated to do so. For example:

Chair (1)

Operational areas (3) Note: the Environmental Committee rep. is gone because the committee was dissolved by the President.

Faculty (x)
Student representatives (3)

President's Chief of Staff (1)

Ex-officio (which I take to also be non-voting) no fixed number

If the "faculty" group are the only faculty represented, that would work out to 8 staff or students requiring 9 faculty. If the Chair is faculty (which he is) that would require 8 more faculty. If any of the persons from the operational areas (Student affairs, PSA, or the Exp. Forest) turned out to be faculty, then the number would be reduced. This mathematics assumes that student representatives are equally weighted, which, I sort of doubt ... If they are reduced to a "bloc" then we would have 1+3+1+1 requiring 7 faculty (if no others are faculty). This doubles the number of faculty called for; did we obtain that many nominations in the recent selection process?

If we ask for a plurality, then the highest number of faculty required, assuming none of the other members were faculty, would be four. Thus we are currently only 1 faculty member short of an appropriate blend. This may be the best way forward.

Chair

The chair of the commission is appointed by the President for a one year renewable term.

Taken from the Charter, Art. IV. Section 2. It might help the balance of the Commission if it was a requirement that the Chair be regular or emeritus faculty. In practice, I think this has been the case since the Commission's inception. If this is OK, then the faculty balancing act would be further alleviated, without requiring a large number of faculty.

"Clean version" of Proposed section for Faculty Manual (to become part VII.C.10)

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. To creatively address sustainability, the Commission will facilitate collaboration among students, faculty, staff and the community by integrating education, research, and public service with supporting social, economic and environmental infrastructure. Membership of the Commission consists of members of the faculty, members of the staff, students, and other nonvoting members. Faculty representatives shall be regular or emeriti faculty, nominated by the Faculty Senate Executive/Advisory Board and appointed by the President for three year terms. A faculty plurality must be maintained in the total membership of the Commission. 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. The chair of the Commission is appointed by the President for a one year renewable term.
FACULTY SENATE MEETING

December 11, 2012

1. Call to Order: The Faculty Senate Meeting was called to order at 2:38 p.m. by President Jeremy King.

John Mueller, HR Director of Customer Services, made the brief announcement: The South Carolina Supreme Court has put on hold the state health insurance premium increase approved for 2013 by the Budget and Control Board. The court will make a final decision regarding the pending increase after a hearing on Jan. 23, 2013. Additional information will be provided as it becomes available.

2. Approval of Minutes: The Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes dated November 13, 2012 were approved as written and distributed.

3. "Free Speech": None

4. Special Order of the Day: Ami Hood, HR Payroll Director, presented payroll changes that Provost announced will be communicated to all University employees over the next couple of months. As provided in the Welfare Committee Report, Clemson will move to a two-week lag on payroll and from a bi-weekly (every two weeks) to a semi-monthly paycheck (twice per month, roughly on the 15th and 31st). Nine-month faculty will have 18 paychecks instead of 20 and 12-month employees will have 24 paychecks per year. Employees will lose no pay. The proposal is to leave summer of 2013 pay periods bi-weekly, adjusting the number of installments with a full transition to semi-monthly for Faculty in August 2013. HR will still offer the ability for nine-month employees to distribute paychecks over a 12-month period.

Barry Anderson, a Landscape Architect with Clemson Planning + Design, outlined a five-year improvement plan addressing exterior (parking and routes and entrances to academic buildings and two student unions located at the core of campus) core campus accessibility. The analysis is based on international codes and the Americans with Disability Act (ADA). Projects are prioritized to the building or parking demand, current construction, and severity of need. Chief Diversity Officer and chair of this committee, Leon E. Wiles, was slated to present, but was unable to attend. The floor was opened for questions and answers.

5. Committee Reports:
   a. Senate Committees:

Scholastic Policies – Chair David Tonkyn submitted and outlined the Committee Report dated December 10, 2012. Chair Tonkyn reported that the Undergraduate Admissions Committee seeks to enroll 3200 regular first-year students plus 1200 transfer students, of whom 400-500 would be through the Bridge Program. Approximately 500 appeals from students denied admission are anticipated. Senator Tissera worked with Debra Jackson to revise a questionnaire for department Chairs to learn how they use Student Evaluations of Teaching for faculty evaluations. A final version is anticipated for Senate consideration at the January meeting. Undergraduate student government President Austin and Senator...
MicKissick provided SP Committee with a draft report of the General Education Revision Task Force of the Undergraduate Student Senate. This draft report includes modest changes to the general competencies, a reorganization of the requirements into categories of fundamentals, connections, and applications, and some other changes.

SP has been asked to consider 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. Chair Tonkyn broached this question at the last Council on Undergraduate Studies meeting. Clemson does not currently allow this, nor do most other universities, based on an informal professional listserv survey by Robert Barclay. The SP Committee will continue to work on this and welcomes input.

Finance – Chair Antonis Katsiyannis submitted the Committee Report dated November 20, 2012. Chair Katsiyannis provided several updates. In response to a question of the Finance Committee, Provost Helms informed them that grants having foreign personnel on J1 visas will soon be listed as time-limited/temporary employees with a 19% benefit rate assessment versus the current practice of 32%. J1 holders are ineligible for pension related benefits. Temporary grant status will cease to exist. Chair Katsiyannis reported that the committee will collect information on deferred maintenance projects, the process to set priority, and scheduled projects. Lastly, Chair Katsiyannis inquired as to whether there is a need to have a similar faculty program that Staff Senate spearheads to award scholarships for staff children attending Clemson.

Research – Chair Jim McCubbin submitted and outlined the Committee Report dated December 5, 2012. Chair McCubbin reported that the committee is currently analyzing the results of its university-wide survey on issues that impact faculty research and scholarly success at Clemson. Next steps involve meeting with the Vice President for Research and Economic Development and the Dean for Graduate Studies. The committee will also gather data on university teaching loads in various disciplines to compare Clemson University policies with industry standards and best practices for top tier comprehensive research institutions. President King suggested extracting data from the National Research Council’s (NRC) data-based assessment of Research-Doctorate Programs. Chair McCubbin also reported on new business. The committee is assessing the use of Digital Commons for reporting of faculty CVs, publications, and other accomplishments. This platform is currently being assessed as a potential singular portal for input and maintenance of data for CU Faculty Activity System database. Lastly, the Research Committee is in discussions with HR regarding fringe benefit policies for postdoctoral fellows and personnel hired on research grants.

Welfare – Chair Diane Perpich submitted and outlined the Committee Report dated December 4, 2012. Chair Perpich reported that the December meeting focused on benefit issues. Clemson will move to a two-week lag on payroll and from a bi-weekly (every two weeks) to a semi-monthly paycheck (twice per month, roughly on the 15th and 31st). Nine-month faculty will have 18 paychecks instead of 20 and 12-month employees will have 24 paychecks per year. Employees will lose no pay. The proposal is to leave summer of 2013 pay periods bi-weekly, adjusting the number of installments with a full transition to semi-monthly for Faculty in 2014.

A second benefit issue regarding maternity/paternal leave was discussed with HR representatives. HR is compiling a report of what is currently available at Clemson and the committee is researching how other top 20 public institutions address this leave. The
committee is also very interested in hearing stories of women and families who have given birth, adopted, or fostered a child and what sorts of leave arrangements they made (dperpic@clemson.edu). All information will be kept strictly confidential with names and affiliations detached in reporting. And the committee received information from HR that the vast majority of full-time (30+ hour) lecturers receive full benefits, but they are further evaluating the minority cases.

Policy – Chair Bill Pennington submitted the Committee Report dated November 20, 2012, but was unable to attend the Senate meeting. Committee member, John Meriwether outlined the report. Senator Meriwether reported that three Faculty Manual changes were discussed and resolved, including revisions to: Grievance Hearing procedures, Alumni Distinguished Professor emphasis, and Post Tenure Review. The Welfare Committee is looking at additional changes to the Post Tenure Review process regarding maternity/paternity leave. The committee also decided to separate the proposed University Professorship from in-rank promotion and to mirror the Alumni Distinguished Professor selection, with appropriate changes to reflect the differences in emphasis areas. Lastly, individuals continue their work on revisions to FAS and related areas of the Faculty Manual. These two items will be discussed at the January committee meeting and brought to full Senate in February.

b. ad hoc Faculty Senate Committees

Budget Accountability Committee – Chair Antonis Katsiyannis submitted the Committee Report dated December 10, 2012. Chair Katsiyannis reported that they received preliminary information regarding the salary report that will be published in January. Chief Financial Officer, Mr. Brad Dalton, will provide a detailed presentation at the February BAC meeting. Provost Helms asked if there was a need for faculty and staff salary adjustment justifications in the published January report. Chair Katsiyannis responded that the Senate decided justifications for faculty were unnecessary because market value adjustments were made, but the Senate did not express any opinion regarding staff salary adjustment justifications. Lastly, discussions regarding deferred and new construction was postponed to for January BAC meeting.

President King acknowledged the work of HR when referring to the benefits matrix. He noted that by keeping the benefit rate assessment of 32%, it might be possible that the extra money could be contributed to supplemental (not state) retirement benefits to provide more uniform benefits for international employees.

c. University Commissions and Committees: None

6. Old Business: None

7. New Business:
   a. Policy Chair Bill Pennington submitted all policies for consideration and Senator Meriwether presented and explained all proposed changes to the Faculty Manual. All items originated from the Policy Committee and were approved (some with additional revisions) by the Executive/Advisory Committees.

   A modification was proposed to accurately reflect typical employment lengths of Post-doctoral Research Fellows in the Faculty Manual, Part III. Section E. #9 Post-Doctoral Research Fellow. Discussion regarding post-doc status and applicable policy ensued.
President King asked Chairs of Welfare, Research, and Scholastic Policies Committees to review and propose necessary changes suggested during this discussion regarding post-docs. Following discussion, the vote to accept the change proposed by the Policy and Executive/Advisory Committees passed, none opposed. Senator Baldwin's suggested amendment that "satisfactory performance" be added after "program needs" was seconded by Senator Katsiyannis and vote to accept passed, none opposed.

b. A modification was proposed to include reference to the complete Grievance report which would include the transcript (Faculty Manual, Part V. Section I. Grievance Hearings, #9 & 10). Following discussion, vote to accept the change proposed by the Policy and Executive/Advisory Committees passed with none opposed. Senator Dutkiewicz moved to accept an amendment from the Grievance Board; Senator Meriwether seconded and vote to accept passed with none opposed.

c. A modification was proposed to strengthen the focus of the Alumni Distinguished Professorship since a new University Professorship is being created (Faculty Manual change, Part III. Section F. Endowed Chairs and Titled Professorships). The additional changes made by Executive/Advisory Committees were accepted by vote unanimously. There was no discussion.

d. The proposed Faculty Manual change, Part IV. Section H. Post Tenure Review was withdrawn by Senator Meriwether on behalf of the Policy Committee for additional revisions due to a very recent realization that some language is internally inconsistent.

8. President's Report:

a. President King announced that the Faculty Senate President’s Newsletter was posted yesterday and encouraged faculty to read:
   a.ii. a new Social Science Research Network working paper (http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2153122 ) by Martin & Hill on the evolution of costs at public research universities. President King noted that Clemson’s tenure track faculty-to-administrator ratio is within optimal range, where a ratio above or below the public research university data show increased institutional costs.
   a.iii. His column “Athletics, Amygdalas and Apostasy in the ACC”. At the Senate meeting, President King provided the printed report of Harper, Williams, and Blackman (http://www.gse.upenn.edu/equity/sports ) on racial inequities in Division I football and basketball.

b. President King announced that the University has received some initial feedback from SACS regarding accreditation and that he is confident that faculty will have a critical role in addressing this feedback.

10. Announcements:

a. General Faculty meeting – Wednesday, December 19, 2012 at 1:00pm, Brooks Center for the Performing Arts, Theatre
b. First 2013 Faculty Senate meeting – January 8th
   c. First 2013 Executive/Advisory Committee meeting – January 29th (5th Tuesday)
d. Celebration of the Great Class of '39 hosted by Faculty Senate – Monday evening, January 7, 2013 (evites sent)
All are welcome to the Bell Tower Ceremony for the 2012 '39 Award of Excellence recipient: Windsor Westbrook Sherrill, Professor of Public Health Sciences - Tuesday morning, January 8, 2013

11. Adjournment: President King adjourned the meeting at 4:28 p.m.

Denise M. Anderson, Secretary

Monica A. Patterson, Program Coordinator

Also present: Anna Bard Brutzman (Anderson Independent), Gordon Halfacre (Ombudsman for Faculty and Students), Dori Helms (Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs), Fran McGuire (Editorial Consultant of the Faculty Manual), John Mueller (HR Director of Customer Service), Monica Patterson (Faculty Senate Program Coordinator), Michelle Piekutowski (Interim Chief HR Officer), Suzanne Rook Schilf (Alternate)

12 month employees
monthly and implementing a lag for all
Changing the pay frequency to semi-

Pay Frequency

Conversion to Semi-monthly
Current State

- Clemson University is the only Higher Education institution in SC to pay all employees bi-weekly (26 paydays per year)

- All SC State agencies moved to semi-monthly pay in 1985 (24 paydays per year / twice monthly)

- Employees across campus expend over 3,350 hours annually processing 2 extra payrolls associated with bi-weekly pay and the Fiscal Year End processes. This equates to over 450 days of work, which can be redirected to more strategic initiatives.

- 1985 (24 paydays per year / twice monthly)

- All SC State agencies moved to semi-monthly pay in 1985 to pay all employees bi-weekly (26 paydays per year)

- Clemson University is the only Higher Education Institution in SC to pay all employees bi-weekly
• Future State

A transition to semi-monthly pay for Clemson University will occur in June 2013. Pay will occur on the 15th and on the last day of the month. No longer paid every other Friday. Actual "day of pay" will fluctuate.

University will occur in June 2013. A transition to semi-monthly pay for Clemson.
A change to semi-monthly will eliminate 2 payroll processing cycles annually.

- Eliminate special Fiscal Year End processing to capture salary and fringe expense through 6/30, eliminating an additional 4 special payroll processing cycles annually.
- Eliminate special Fiscal Year End process to capture Fiscal Year End exercises as well as many other special education of processes.
- Easier to close-out Grant related projects ending on 6/30 annually.
- Create one payroll process for all 12 month employees annually.

Benefits
A transition to semi-monthly pay will occur in August 2013 for 9 month Faculty.

- Allows for more time at the start of each semester to onboard new hires.
- Allows for more time at the start of each academic year to 18 pay periods, 8/31 through 5/15.
- 9 month faculty pay will transition from 20 pay periods.
- A transition to semi-monthly pay will occur in August 2013 for 9 month Faculty.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personnel Action Due Dates</th>
<th>Proposed:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12/13/2012</td>
<td>8/15/xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/2/2012</td>
<td>8/15/xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current State:</td>
<td>12/31/xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed:</td>
<td>12/13/2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9 Month Faculty
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spring Dates</th>
<th>Fall Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8/26/2016</td>
<td>12/31/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/14/2015</td>
<td>1/2/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/15/2014</td>
<td>1/3/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/16/2013</td>
<td>1/4/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/17/2012</td>
<td>1/6/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/18/2011</td>
<td>1/7/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/20/2010</td>
<td>1/8/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/21/2009</td>
<td>1/9/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/22/2008</td>
<td>1/11/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/24/2007</td>
<td>1/12/2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/26/2005</td>
<td>1/14/2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/27/2004</td>
<td>1/2/2004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multiple Year View of Changing First Payday

Over time

Eliminates fluctuation of first Spring and Fall payday

9 Month Faculty
No change in May triple deduction

After a special transition during Summer 2013, still allows for 6 semi-monthly installments over the summer for Summer School and Summer Pay

Eliminates Summer Pay also crossing over onto the first installment of Fall academic pay
For 2013 only, distribute Summer I and Summer II over 4 installments rather than 3 as usual.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Days</th>
<th>Summer Pay</th>
<th>Summer II</th>
<th>Payday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9 days</td>
<td>5/24-6/2/13</td>
<td>8/16/2013</td>
<td>1/4th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 days</td>
<td>6/7-6/21/13</td>
<td>8/22/2013</td>
<td>1/4th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 days</td>
<td>6/21-7/5/13</td>
<td>7/19/2013</td>
<td>1/4th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 days</td>
<td>7/5-7/19/13</td>
<td>6/28/2013</td>
<td>1/4th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 days</td>
<td>7/19-8/2/13</td>
<td>7/24/2013</td>
<td>1/4th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 days</td>
<td>8/2-8/16/13</td>
<td>7/24/2013</td>
<td>1/4th</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Payday on 8/16/13 allows for a bridge payday for Summer II vs paying on 8/28/13.

Keep bi-weekly paydays until start of AY 2013.

For 2013 only, distribute Summer I and Summer II.
12 Month Faculty

- Annual rate will be divided by 24
- Elimination of the 26.1 divisor
- Transition, rather than going from 6/21/13 to 7/15/13 between paydays
- A bridge check on 6/28/13 to help with the transition
- Transition to semi-monthly will occur in June 2013
- The 15th will be for work completed through the last day of the previous month
- Transition will involve a lag to pay, meaning pay on
Takeaways

Offer Letters

- Using 8/30/13 as the first check date for Fall 2013 (8/31/13 is a Saturday)
- If applicable, note pay schedule as semi-monthly (15th and last day of the month)
- If applicable, note pay schedule as semi-monthly (15th and last day of the month)

International Hires

- Help with planning how much money to bring with them
- We will still offer ability to set up a deduction to spread pay out over 12 months
- Plan now

10
Next Steps

- Meet with College Deans, Graduate School Dean, Vice Provost for International Affairs, and Department Chairs
- Develop a campus-wide communication plan
- Presenting the concept to Faculty Senate today is part of the over-all communication plan
- Develop on-line tools to address "How does this impact my pay?" type questions
- Create FAQs for website
- Gauge need for financial planning meetings
- Create FAQs for website

Next Steps
Conclusion

Questions and Feedback

Thank you!
Clemson University

Accessible Exterior Routes

Project Summary

December 2012
The Initial 2011 Survey Intent

With ongoing construction projects across campus, exterior accessible routes are frequently changing.

The objective of this study is to **evaluate current conditions and provide up-to-date information on accessible exterior routes** throughout Clemson University's campus.

Provide useful and comprehensive information for the development of a **phased improvement plan** for the campus.

Assess a series of factors focusing on:

1) conditions of designated accessible parking
2) routes leading to buildings
3) accessible building entrances.

The study is **limited to the student unions and academic buildings located at the core of the main campus**.

The analysis is based on codes from the International Building Codes (2006), the Americans with Disability Act (ADA), and the International Code Council section ANSI117.1 (2003).
Scope of Study

Area B:
- Sirrine Hall
- Riggs Hall
- Rhodes Research
- Olin Hall
- Hardin Hall
- Brackett Hall
- Holtzendorff Hall
- Godfrey Hall
- Tillman Hall
- Edgar Brown

Area A:
- Lee Hall
- Lowry Hall
- Harris A. Smith
- Fluor- Daniel
- Freeman Hall
- Hunter Hall
- Lee Hall

Area C:
- Martin Hall
- Long Hall
- Daniel Hall
- Strode Tower
- Jordan Hall
- Edwards Hall
- Jordan Hall
- Student Union
- Newman Hall
- P.A. Brookes Center
- Macadams Hall

Area D:
- McAdams Hall
- Barre Hall
- Brooks Center
- Lehotsky Hall
- P&A
- Newman Hall
- Hendrix Student Center
- Newman Hall
- Fluor-Daniel
- Fluor-Daniel
- Lehotky Hall
- Strode Tower
- Riggs Hall
- Strode Tower

University Planning & Design Office
Overall items to address:

Area A

Site Arrival:

- Poor asphalt conditions at crosswalk.
- Elevation rises above 6% at E-04 parking.
- Building is not accessible.
- Building need signage directing to accessible entrance.
- Building need signage directing to accessible exit.
- Access blockaded with heavy equipment.
- No elevators provided allowing access to second floor.
- No signage directing to accessible entrance.
- Elevator on basement floor rises above 54" at every material change.
- Elevation rises above 6% at E-04 parking.

Route:

- Poor asphalt conditions allowing access to basement.
- Elevation rises above 6% at E-04 parking.
- Building is not accessible.
- Building need signage directing to accessible entrance.
- Building need signage directing to accessible exit.
- Access blockaded with heavy equipment.
- No elevators provided allowing access to second floor.
- No signage directing to accessible entrance.
- Elevator on basement floor rises above 54" at every material change.

Point of Entry:

- Poor asphalt conditions at crosswalk.
- Elevator on basement floor rises above 6% at E-04 parking.
- Building is not accessible.
- Building need signage directing to accessible entrance.
- Building need signage directing to accessible exit.
- Access blockaded with heavy equipment.
- No elevators provided allowing access to second floor.
- No signage directing to accessible entrance.
AREA A - Points of Interest

Image 1.
Route 1: 1.5" ledge at main entrance of Lee Hall.

Image 2.
Route 5: Rises 1/2" at every material change leading to main entrance of Fluor-Daniel.

Image 3.
Route 9: Poor condition of pavement leading to the basement access of Freeman Hall.

Image 4.
Route 5: Loading ramp used as accessible access to the basement of Freeman Hall.

Image 5.
Route 10: Lack of sidewalk leading from Tau Ct. parking to Cook Lab. Pavement in poor condition.

Image 6.
Route 1, 2, 3, 4: Grate in access aisle of Fernow St. Parking.

Image 7.
Route 10: Large grates covering sidewalk of Tau Ct. parking. Poor pavement conditions.

Image 8.
Route 13: Cracks at cross walk and elevation change greater than 1/4" at E-04 parking.

University Planning & Design Office
How do we prioritize these needs?

- Parking Utilization
- Severe need
- Other ideas?
- Dove tail with current construction initiatives
- As per building contact hours

University Planning & Design Office
The 5-Year Plan
2012 Completed Projects

» Sikes Hall Parking Lot
  - ADA Parking improved for slope compliance
  - Raised pedestrian crosswalk
  - New signage

Sidewalk from parking to campus green before raised crosswalk
2012 Completed Projects continued...

Daniel / Kinard Parking area:
- Budget: $200k
- Repaved ADA parking
- New signage

Cooper Library Plaza Renovation:
- Budget: $960K
- Repaved parking
- Repaved sidewalks
- Construction complete by year end

University Planning & Design Office
2012 Active Projects

» Holtzendorff Hall
  > Budget: $300k
  > Accessible route site survey complete
  > Historic Preservation compliance
  > Ramp In design

  > Rear ADA access
  + Rigg’s Field Pedestrian Bridge Project impact on parking area

  > Next Steps:
  Complete construction drawings for ramp design
2012 Active Projects

Proposed Plan: Porch Extended
FACULTY SENATE SCHOLASTIC POLICIES
Agenda for meeting held Thursday, December 10, 2012.
12:30 am – 2:00 pm
Room 234 of the Academic Success Center

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

Attending: Goddard, Leininger, Marinescu, Tissera, Tonkyn

Invited guests: Perry Austin (Chair, Academic Affairs Committee, Undergraduate Student Senate), Holly McKissick (Undergraduate Student Senate President Pro-Tern), Linda Nilson (Director, Office of Teaching Effectiveness and Innovation),

Old business
Faculty Advisory Board on Online Education: Will meet this Thursday. John Leininger is our representative.

Council on Undergraduate Studies: CUGS met on Nov. 9. At the end of Old Business and Committee Reports, David Tonkyn brought up the question of granting academic credit at the 300 level to courses taught at 2-year colleges as part of articulation agreements. There was a long discussion with different perspectives, which is described in its own section below.

Undergraduate Admissions Committee David Tonkyn attended the Nov. 12 meeting which was mainly informational. We learned that the University will be bringing in guidance counselors from 20 top high schools and using scholarship money strategically to recruit top students, and with success. The current freshman class is the largest and strongest yet, with the highest SAT and ACT scores. The goals for next year are the same as for this, with 3200 regular freshman plus 1200 transfer students, of whom 400-450 would be through the Bridge Program. Also, we look forward to about 500 appeals from students denied admission.

Bridge Program There was no report. Alan Grubb is leading this initiative.

Evaluation of Instruction Form: After meeting with Debra Jackson, Graciela Tissera developed a revised questionnaire for department Chairs to learn how they use Student Evaluations of Teaching for faculty evaluations. We reviewed what is written in the Faculty Manual regarding teaching evaluations, and discussed whether to expand the questionnaire to address other means for assessing teaching, but decided to focus on student evaluations first. We hope to have a final version available for Senate consideration at the next meeting.
University Scholarship and Awards Committee: There was no report. Wayne Goddard is our representative.

General Education changes Perry Austin and Holly MicKissick gave us a draft report of the General Education Revision Task Force, of the Student Senate. This is the result of biweekly meetings through the semester of a committee consisting of two student senators from each College, plus the Chair (Holly) and Vice Chair and various guests. This draft report includes modest changes to the general competencies, a reorganization of the requirements into the categories of fundamentals, connections, and applications, and some other changes. We had an excellent discussion and they hope to come back to us soon with their final report. We may wish to invite them to present this plan to the full Faculty Senate soon.

New articulation agreements SP have been asked to consider 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 listserv survey by Robert Barclay. After our last meeting, Stan Smith forwarded two SACS documents regarding transfer credits. One, a brief position statement, encourages member institutions to make the “transfer of credit easier for students while continuing to honor their obligation to maintain academic quality and integrity.” The other, a five page statement on the policies and procedures for collaborative academic arrangements, does not make this easy. It calls for careful and transparent documentation and oversight of the courses, instructors and outcomes. It appears to be silent on our specific question, though Robert Barclay also reported that some institutions that did give upper level credit for 2xx courses from 2 year institutions were questioned about that during accreditation.

Historically at Clemson, some departments have transferred courses in from two year colleges as 2xx and then substituted them for required 3xx courses. Stan Smith said that he shuts this practice down whenever he finds it. Also, there may be specific programs at Clemson that give upper level credit for such courses, either directly or by examination. An alternative solution would be to renumber such courses at Clemson as 2xx, so that no special considerations need be requested. This seems especially reasonable when the courses in question are entry-level courses for a major and typically taken by sophomores. However, one department that tried to do this stopped when it realized that it would then have to add another upper level course to the degree requirements, in order to meet the SACS requirement of 24 3xx and 4xx courses for a degree.

There are additional questions of what is the role of faculty in designing such articulation agreements, what is the interest of Clemson faculty and departments currently offering these 3xx courses that may be replaced by ones at two-year institutions, and what happens to a student who takes a course as part of an articulation agreement in one major who then changes majors? Will he or she lose that credit?

We will continue to work on this and welcome input.
Update on clarifying and establishing policies regarding benefit rates applied/assessed to grants having foreign personnel on J1 visas (Senator Chapman)

Current practice regarding benefits does not differentiate on the basis of visa status (J1). If someone is hired as a temporary grant employee, then a 32% rate is assessed. If hired as a temporary employee with a specified term, then a 19% rate is assessed. It appears that the funding source is what determines the rate...however it is possible to use grant money to hire a temporary employee at the 19% rate which negates the statement before.

Questions-what is the actual policy that serves as the basis for these different rates? Also, why charge a 32% rate for J1 holders when ineligible for pension related benefits?

Update by the Provost

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.

Infrastructure/facility update-questions to ask administration

- List of deferred maintenance projects
- Process to set priority
- Scheduled projects

Faculty Scholarships

Staff raise money to award scholarship for staff children attending Clemson...Is there a need to have a similar program for faculty? How do we find out (perhaps, a couple of questions on another faculty survey). Assuming there is need, how should the scholarships be awarded?
Faculty Senate Research Committee Report
December 5, 2012

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

Old Business:

The committee is currently analyzing the results of its university-wide survey on issues that impact faculty research and scholarly success here at Clemson. The next steps after analysis and interpretation of data are to:

1) Meet with the Vice President for Research and Economic Development to discuss the survey findings and explore action items to strengthen institutional support for faculty research and scholarship.
2) Meet with the Dean for Graduate Studies to discuss the survey findings and explore action items to strengthen institutional support for graduate research assistants.
3) Gather data on university teaching loads in various disciplines to compare Clemson University policies with industry standards and best practices for top tier comprehensive research institutions. Data will be gathered from the National Center for Education Statistics, the Delaware Study and other sources.

New Business:

The Committee is assessing the use 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.

The Research Committee is currently represented in discussions with Kristina Kaylor of Human Resources on fringe benefit policies for postdoctoral fellows and personnel hired on research grants.
The Research Committee has also been represented at the open forums with OSP Director Candidates.
Faculty Senate Welfare Committee Report  
December 4, 2012

Attending were Alan Winters, Tina Robbins, Narendra Vyavahare, Susanna Ashton, Dale Layfield and Diane Perpich.

Guests: Jeremy King (Fac Senate President), Steve Crump (Associate Comptroller), Ami Hood (Payroll Director), Michelle Piekutowski (Chief Human Resources Officer), Rumame Samuels (Director of Recruitment), Krissy Kaylor (Benefits Director)

Our December meeting focused on benefits issues.

1. Payroll changes. We had a report from Ami Hood on changes to payroll. Clemson will move to a two-week lag on payroll and from a bi-weekly (every two weeks) to a semi-monthly paycheck (twice per month, roughly on the 15th and 31st). For 9-month faculty this means moving to 18 paychecks from 20. For 12-month faculty and staff this will mean 24 paychecks per year. All other state colleges and universities currently follow a similar system and the change will save approximately 3,350 work hours or 450 days of work per year (the estimated time it takes for employees campus-wide to process the paper work for the two additional paychecks). The change will also allow more time to process new employees, especially those who are hired very close to the start of a semester.

Employees will lose no pay as the system is changed. HR is very mindful of the need to make sure that no employee has to bridge a long gap between paychecks as the new system is put in place and is working to address that need. Since the transition will occur during the summer of 2013, the proposal is to leave the summer of 2013 pay periods bi-weekly, adjusting the number of installments for Summer School sessions and providing an extra pay period to accommodate a 6/30/13 period end date. The full transition to semi-monthly for Faculty would be in 2014.

2. Maternity/Parental Leave. We had a very positive opening discussion with HR representatives about the need to address maternity and parental leave for teaching faculty. HR is currently compiling for us a report on what is currently available at Clemson. The committee is researching how other top 20 public institutions address this leave and will share the information with HR. The committee is also very interested in hearing the stories of women and families who have given birth, adopted, or fostered a child and what sorts of leave arrangements they made. If you or a colleague would like to share your story, please contact dperpic@clemson.edu. All information will be kept strictly confidential. Names and departmental/college affiliations will not be attached to any information as we move forward.

3. Lecturer Benefits. Krissy Kaylor compiled information on the status of lecturers across the university by benefit program code, numbers of hours work, and availability of benefits including health, retirement, and sick leave or personal leave accrual. We discovered that the vast majority of full-time (30+ hour) lecturers receive full benefits. Krissy is digging down and looking into the minority cases. She will report back to us on what she finds.
Current State of Payroll at Clemson University

- The Huron Consulting Group recommended a change to our payroll processing frequency
- Clemson University is the only Higher Education institution in SC to pay all employees bi-weekly
- All SC State agencies moved to semi-monthly pay in 1985
- 12 month employees hired as of 2002 are on a 2 week lag
- Employees across campus expend over 3,350 hours annually processing the 2 extra payrolls associated with bi-weekly pay and the fiscal year end processes to properly account for a June 30th cut-off. This equates to over 450 days of work, which can be redirected
- Changing to semi-monthly will eliminate 2 payroll processing cycles annually
- We will eliminate the need for special Fiscal Year End processing, saving an additional 4 processes annually
- Allow more processing time at the beginning of each semester to bring 9 month faculty on board, as well as 9 month students

Conversion to Semi-Monthly Pay: Faculty Impact

We are planning a transition to semi-monthly pay to occur in June 2013. Instead of being paid 26 times annually, 12 month pay will move to 24 pay periods. Pay will occur on the 15th and Last Day of the Month.

As part of the transition, it has been determined that a change in 9 month pay would be most optimal. The transition would involve changing from 20 pay periods per Academic Year to 18 pay periods. Instead of pay running mid-August through mid-May, the set first payday for would be 8/31 for Fall and 1/15 for Spring.

### Proposed New Faculty Pay Periods (18) and New Twice Monthly Insurance Deductions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semi-Monthly Paydays</th>
<th>Insurance Impact of new twice monthly deductions</th>
<th>Insurance premiums prior to new twice monthly deductions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8/31/xx 1st installment</td>
<td>Full insurance for current month; No overlap of Summer payments</td>
<td>Full month of insurance for September for returning faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/15/xx 2nd installment</td>
<td>1/2 insurance for current month</td>
<td>New Faculty - August premiums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/30/xx 3rd installment</td>
<td>1/2 insurance for current month</td>
<td>2nd check only - October premiums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/15/xx 4th installment</td>
<td>1/2 insurance for current month</td>
<td>New Faculty - September premiums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/31/xx 5th installment</td>
<td>1/2 insurance for current month</td>
<td>2nd check only - November premiums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/15/xx 6th installment</td>
<td>1/2 insurance for current month</td>
<td>2nd check only - December premiums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/30/xx 7th installment</td>
<td>1/2 insurance for current month</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/15/xx 8th installment</td>
<td>1/2 insurance for current</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12/31/xx  9th installment  1/2 insurance for current month  2nd check only - January premiums
1/15/xx  10th installment  1/2 insurance for current month
1/31/xx  11th installment  1/2 insurance for current month  2nd check only - February premiums
2/15/xx  12th installment  1/2 insurance for current month
2/28/xx  13th installment  1/2 insurance for current month  2nd check only - March premiums
3/15/xx  14th installment  1/2 insurance for current month
3/31/xx  15th installment  1/2 insurance for current month  2nd check only - April premiums
4/15/xx  16th installment  1/2 insurance for current month
4/30/xx  17th installment  1/2 insurance for current month  2nd check only - May premiums
5/15/xx  18th installment  Triple Deduction of insurance to cover May, June & July  Triple Deduction of insurance to cover June, July & August

With the plan above, Summer payments would be scheduled for 5/31, 6/15, 6/30, 7/15, 7/31 and 8/15. A faculty member paid for both regular and summer sessions would have a total of 24 pay periods.

With a transition to 18 pay periods, academic units would have longer at the beginning of each term to enter faculty and 9 month graduate assistant changes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personnel Action Due Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>approx 8/15/xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>approx 12/31/xx</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With bi-weekly pay periods, the first paycheck of the Fall semester has fluctuated between 8/14 and 8/27 and for the Spring, from 12/31 and 1/14. Changing to a set 15th and Last Day of the Month will provide for a consistent first payday annually (barring the payday falling on a weekend and needing to be moved forward to a Friday). Additionally, for faculty starting in the Spring, they also will have a set first payday.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multiple Year View of Changing First Payday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring Dates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2/2004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Since the transition will occur during the summer of 2013, the proposal would be to leave the summer of 2013 pay periods bi-weekly, adjusting the number of installments for Summer School sessions and providing an extra pay period to accommodate a 6/30/13 period end date. The full transition to semi-monthly for Faculty would be in 2014, with summer resuming the 6 pay periods mentioned previously.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summer 2013</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5/24/2013</td>
<td>Summer I, 1/4th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/21/2013</td>
<td>Summer I, 1/4th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Summer Pay 5/24/13-6/6/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/28/2013</td>
<td>Summer I, 1/4th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(extra)</td>
<td>Summer Pay 6/7/13-6/20/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/5/2013</td>
<td>Summer I, 1/4th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/19/2013</td>
<td>Summer Pay 6/22/13-6/30/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/2/2013</td>
<td>Summer II, 1/4th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/16/2013</td>
<td>Summer Pay 5/1/13-6/15/14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summer 2014</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5/30/2014</td>
<td>Summer I, 1/3rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/13/2014</td>
<td>Summer Pay 5/17/14-5/31/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/30/2014</td>
<td>Summer I, 1/3rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/15/2014</td>
<td>Summer Pay 6/1/14-6/15/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/31/2014</td>
<td>Summer I, 1/3rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/15/2014</td>
<td>Summer Pay 6/16/14-6/30/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Summer II, 1/3rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Summer Pay 7/1/14-7/15/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Summer II, 1/3rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Summer Pay 7/16/14-7/31/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Summer II, 1/3rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Summer Pay 8/1/14-8/14/14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Shown below is an example of an on-line tool which would be available to 12 month Faculty members to assist with the conversion to a semi-monthly lag pay schedule:

Impact on a 12 Month Faculty member in Gross Pay dollars

If your paystub indicates you are in Pay Group 12A, then you are a current paid employee. You can find your Pay Group in the top middle section of your paystub.

Input your Pay Rate (Annual) from your paystub:

$50,000.00

You can find your Pay Rate in the middle of the 2nd section of your paystub.

During 2013, we will convert to a semi-monthly pay schedule. Your Gross pay will happen as follows:

12 bi-weekly paydays, 1/4/13 - 6/7/13  $1,915.71 x 12 = $22,988.51
1 payday on 6/21/13 to pay you through 6/15/13 (6 days)  $1,149.43
1 transitional payday on 6/28/13 for 6/17/13-6/21/13 (5 days)  $957.85
12 semi-monthly paydays, 7/15/13-12/31/13  $2,083.33 x 12 = $25,000.00

If you are paid all paydays in 2013, your Annual Gross will be:

$50,095.79

Gross Pay by Month in 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Gross Pay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>$3,831.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>$3,831.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>$5,747.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>$3,831.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>$3,831.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>$4,022.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>$4,166.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>$4,166.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>$4,166.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>$4,166.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>$4,166.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>$4,166.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Pay</td>
<td>$50,095.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We will make the transition to semi-monthly between June and July 2013. Your Gross pay will be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Payday</th>
<th>Units of Pay</th>
<th>Gross Pay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6/7/2013</td>
<td>10 days at bi-weekly rate for 5/24/13-6/6/13</td>
<td>$1,915.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/21/2013</td>
<td>6 days at bi-weekly rate for 6/7/13-6/15/13</td>
<td>$1,149.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/28/2013</td>
<td>5 days for 6/17/13-6/21/13</td>
<td>$957.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/15/2013</td>
<td>1/24th (semi-monthly) for 6/16/13-6/30/13</td>
<td>$2,083.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/31/2015</td>
<td>1/24th (semi-monthly) for 7/1/13-7/15/13</td>
<td>$2,083.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Policy Committee Report

The Policy Committee met on Tuesday, November 20th.

In an unusually non-laconic and productive session, three faculty manual changes were discussed and resolved. These are included as separate attachments and include the following:

1. Revision of the Post Tenure Review Process
2. Revision of Alumni Distinguished Professor wording.
3. Revision of Grievance Procedure wording.

We ask that the EAC vote on these for submission to the entire Faculty Senate. We would like to note that there may be additional changes to the Post Tenure Review Process section of the manual, namely revision of the “two-month window” for request for a one-year extension following birth or adoption of a child. This issue is currently under discussion by the Welfare committee. We feel that these two revisions should be treated separately.

There was additional discussion of the following issues:

4. In-rank Promotion and University Professors - Earlier discussion had centered around tying these two together. The nomination pool for University Professors would be comprised of those full professors who had requested and received In-rank promotion. However, concern was raised that faculty members who were focused on and excelled at fulfilling the mission of the university might, within some departments, not receive Annual Performance Reviews sufficient to receive In-rank promotion (the obvious concern is level of research funding). At this point we intend to separate the two. The selection process for University Professors will mirror that currently used for selection of Alumni Distinguished Professors, with appropriate changes to reflect the differences in emphasis areas.

5. Revision of Goals, Accomplishments, and Evaluation section of the FM – John and Jeremy are meeting with Associate Provost Aziz, Jim McCubbin, and David Tonkyn to discuss changes that they are working on with the respect to FAS. We will report the proceedings of this meeting and how it affects the revisions suggested by John.
Part III, Section E. #9 Post-Doctoral Research Fellow

Current Wording

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

Proposed Change

**Post-Doctoral Research Fellow.** This title denotes an appointment for special research functions, typically in connection with externally funded research projects. The individuals appointed shall have the general qualifications for regular faculty. The term of appointment normally shall not exceed one year. **These appointments are time-limited according to funding constraints, research program needs, grant conditions, etc. Limited renewals may be possible if warranted by research program needs and if funding sources and grant conditions allow.**

Final Wording

**Post-Doctoral Research Fellow.** This title denotes an appointment for special research functions, typically in connection with externally funded research projects. The individuals appointed shall have the general qualifications for regular faculty. **These appointments are time-limited according to funding constraints, research program needs, grant conditions, etc. Limited renewals may be possible if warranted by research program needs and if funding sources and grant conditions allow.**

Rationale:

The Faculty Manual's current 1 year expected term of post-doctoral fellows is out of line with the terms in many/most externally funded post-doctoral programs and opportunities. This is evidenced by the current statistics on campus post-doctoral fellows suggesting that only 20-30% of individuals classified by post-docs in the CUBS system are in very short truly temporary positions. The Faculty Manual's suggested 1 year restriction may also result in less robust program benefit codes to be assigned to post-docs that will be present on campus for multiple years and who should have access to insurance and retirement benefits if allowed under State and University guidelines.

The proposed change removes the out-of-date 1 year soft-restriction. This brings the Faculty Manual in line with common practice and expectations. The use of “time-limited” to describe the term rather than a suggestive temporary 1 year period will assist in preventing any misclassifications of post-doctoral fellows into temporary positions when it makes more sense for them to be classified (for benefits purposes) into grant or time-limited positions.
Part V. Section I. Grievance Hearings, #9 & 10

Rationale for revision
Current wording for these two sections has led to varying interpretations over timeline/deadline issues, especially in what constitutes the final report. The proposed wording should make it clear that the final deadline for decision is based on receipt of the final report, including transcripts.

Part V, I. Sections 9 & 10 (page 36)

Current Wording:

9. Within ten weekdays of the final meeting of the Hearing Panel, the panel shall submit its findings and recommendations only to the Provost along with appropriate documents and records. In the event the Provost has been recused from a decision making capacity, the findings and recommendations shall be submitted to the President. The majority vote shall be the recommendation forwarded to the Provost by the hearing panel.

10. The Provost or the President shall review the findings and recommendations and the record of the hearing (for Category I grievances, the audiotape or transcript of the hearing) and shall render a written decision within 22 weekdays of receipt of the hearing panel’s report. The decision shall include findings of fact and recommendations, separately stated. Copies of the decision, including the hearing panel’s findings and recommendations, shall be sent to the petitioner by certified mail. The Provost will also provide copies to all named parties, the hearing panel, and the Faculty Senate Office.

Proposed Wording approved by 11-27-12 EAC:

9. Within ten weekdays of the final meeting of the Hearing Panel, the panel shall submit its findings and recommendations only to the Provost along with appropriate documents and records. The ten weekday period may be extended if all appropriate documents and records, including hearing transcripts for Grievance I hearings, are not available within the ten day period. In the event the Provost has been recused from a decision making capacity, the findings and recommendations shall be submitted to the President. The majority vote shall be the recommendation forwarded to the Provost by the hearing panel.

10. The Provost or the President shall review the findings and recommendations, appropriate documents and the record of the hearing (for Category I grievances, the audiotape or transcript of the hearing) and shall render a written decision within 22 weekdays of receipt of the hearing panel’s complete report. The decision shall include findings of fact and recommendations, separately stated. Copies of the decision, including the hearing panel’s findings and recommendations, shall be sent to the petitioner by certified mail. The Provost will also provide copies to all named parties, the hearing panel, and the Faculty Senate Office.

Suggested Amendment from 12-04-12 Grievance Board:

9. Within ten weekdays of the final meeting of the Hearing Panel, the panel shall submit its findings and recommendations only to the Provost along with appropriate documents and records. The ten weekday period may be extended if all appropriate documents and records,
including hearing transcripts for Grievance I hearings, are not available within the ten day period. In the event the Provost has been recused from a decision making capacity, the findings and recommendations shall be submitted to the President. The majority vote shall be the recommendation forwarded to the Provost by the hearing panel.

10. The Provost or the President shall review the complete report including findings and recommendations, appropriate documents and the record of the hearing (for Category I grievances, the audiotape or transcript of the hearing) and shall render a written decision within 22 weekdays of receipt of the hearing panel’s complete report. The decision shall include findings of fact and recommendations, separately stated. Copies of the decision, including the hearing panel’s findings and recommendations, shall be sent to the petitioner by certified mail. The Provost will also provide copies to all named parties, the hearing panel, and the Faculty Senate Office.

Final Wording:

9. Within ten weekdays of the final meeting of the Hearing Panel, the panel shall submit its findings and recommendations only to the Provost along with appropriate documents and records. The ten weekday period may be extended if all appropriate documents and records, including hearing transcripts for Grievance I hearings, are not available within the ten day period. In the event the Provost has been recused from a decision making capacity, the findings and recommendations shall be submitted to the President. The majority vote shall be the recommendation forwarded to the Provost by the hearing panel.

10. The Provost or the President shall review the complete report including findings and recommendations, appropriate documents and the record of the hearing (for Category I grievances, the audiotape or transcript of the hearing) and shall render a written decision within 22 weekdays of receipt of the complete report. The decision shall include findings of fact and recommendations, separately stated. Copies of the decision, including the hearing panel’s findings and recommendations, shall be sent to the petitioner by certified mail. The Provost will also provide copies to all named parties, the hearing panel, and the Faculty Senate Office.
Part III. Section F. Endowed Chairs and Titled Professorships

Rationale for revision
A new endowed professorship (University Professor) is being created to reward faculty who excel in fulfilling the mission of Clemson University. With the emphasis of the new position on service, the focus of the Alumni Distinguished Professorship on teaching and dedication to Clemson students needs to be strengthened to distinguish between them.

Part III, F. Paragraph 3

Current Wording:
A limited number of Alumni Distinguished Professors are selected from those Clemson University faculty holding the rank of professor who have been employed by Clemson University for at least 5 years. Selection is based on dedication to and excellence in teaching and a continuing commitment to Clemson University and Clemson students. Evaluation criteria may encompass achievements in teaching, research, public service and other professional activities. Alumni Distinguished Professors receive a salary supplement from the Clemson University Alumni Association, and one of their number serves on the Alumni National Council.

Proposed Wording from Policy Cmte:
A limited number of Alumni Distinguished Professors are selected from those Clemson University faculty holding the rank of professor who have been employed by Clemson University for at least 5 years. Selection is based primarily on dedication to and excellence in teaching and a continuing commitment to Clemson University and Clemson students. Additional evaluation criteria may encompass achievements in research, university and public service and other professional activities. Alumni Distinguished Professors receive a salary supplement from the Clemson University Alumni Association, and one of their number serves on the Alumni National Council.

Proposed Wording approved by 11/27/12 EAC:
A limited number of Alumni Distinguished Professors are selected from those Clemson University faculty holding the rank of professor who have been employed by Clemson University for at least 5 years. Selection is based primarily on dedication to and excellence in teaching and a continuing commitment to Clemson University and Clemson students. Additional evaluation criteria may encompass achievements in research, university and public service and other professional activities. Alumni Distinguished Professors receive a salary supplement from the Clemson University Alumni Association, and one of their number serves on the Alumni National Council.

Final Wording:
A limited number of Alumni Distinguished Professors are selected from those Clemson University faculty holding the rank of professor who have been employed by Clemson University for at least 5 years. Selection is based on dedication to and excellence in teaching and a continuing commitment to Clemson University and Clemson students. Alumni Distinguished Professors receive a salary supplement from the Clemson University Alumni Association, and one of their number serves on the Alumni National Council.
Part IV. Section H. Post Tenure Review

Text below was taken from the current faculty manual, pages 25-27. Text in blue will be replaced by text in red. Text in black will remain as is. These proposed changes come from the Policy Committee meeting.
Highlighted sections are the 11/27/12 EAC approved changes within the draft proposal provided by the Policy Committee.

Faculty Manual, page 25.
Part IV. Personnel Practices
H. Post Tenure Review

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

2. Coverage. All faculty members holding a tenured faculty position shall be subject to PTR except for a faculty member planning to retire by August 15th of the same academic year in which the post tenure review would occur, providing that a binding letter of intent to retire is signed thereby waiving the PTR.

The period for post tenure review is after every five years and is coincident with the beginning of the next five year cycle. The first five year period begins at the time that tenure is granted. Promotion during that period does not alter the schedule for review. PTR review covering that five year period are conducted during the fall semester of the sixth year when one or more faculty members in a department or equivalent unit is scheduled for review. Review of tenured academic administrators is accomplished in accordance with Section VI. J. of the Faculty Manual.

Post tenure review is conducted on an annual basis, beginning at the time tenure is granted. Review of tenured academic administrators is accomplished in accordance with Section VI. J. of the Faculty Manual.

Periods of sick leave, sabbatical leave, or leave without pay will be excluded from PTR review. Faculty who give birth, father, or adopt a child during any five year period may, at their request, receive a one year extension of the post-tenure review. The request for an extension must come within two months of the birth or adoption. The extension will automatically be granted unless the chair or dean can document sufficient reason for denial. Extension of the post-tenure review period of a faculty member for serious illness, family tragedy or other special circumstances may be granted with the approval of the department chair, dean and Provost.

Periods of sick leave, sabbatical leave, or leave without pay will be excluded from PTR review. Faculty who give birth, father, or adopt a child may, at their request, receive a one-year exemption of PTR. The request for an exemption must come within two months of the birth or adoption, and will be automatically granted unless the chair or dean can document sufficient reason for denial. Exemption of an annual review period from PTR of a faculty member for
serious illness, family tragedy or other special circumstances may be granted with the approval,
of the department chair, dean and Provost.

Faculty Manual, page 26-27.
5. Part I, Post Tenure Review. The PTR committee will review the ratings received on the most
recent available series of five years of annual performance reviews, as specified in the Best
Practices for Post-Tenure Review (#3). Merit salary increments are based on these annual
performance reviews, as is consistent with the Best Practices for Post-Tenure Review (#9). All
tenured faculty members receiving no more than one (of five) annual performance rating of
“fair,” “marginal,” or “unsatisfactory” in Part I of the Post Tenure Review process receive a Post
Tenure Review rating of “satisfactory.” These faculty members are thereby exempt from Part II
of Post-Tenure Review.

5. Part I, Post Tenure Review. The PTR committee will review the ratings received for the most
recent five annual performance reviews (not counting reviews from exempted years) of each
tenured faculty member, as specified in the Best Practices for Post-Tenure Review (#3). Merit
salary increments are based on these annual performance reviews, as is consistent with the Best
Practices for Post-Tenure Review (#9). Any tenured faculty members receiving two or more
ratings of “fair,” “marginal,” or “unsatisfactory” within the last five annual performance reviews,
will be subjected to additional review under Part II of the Post Tenure Review process (section 6
below). All others will receive a Post Tenure Review rating of “satisfactory,” and are thereby
exempt from Part II of Post Tenure Review.

6. Part II, Post Tenure Review. Part II consists of additional review by the Post Tenure Review
Committee and the department chair of those identified in Part I as subject to further review. All
tenured faculty members receiving two or more annual performance ratings of “fair,”
“marginal,” or “unsatisfactory” will be reviewed under Part II of Post Tenure Review.

6. Part II, Post Tenure Review. Part II consists of additional review by the Post Tenure Review
Committee and the department chair of those identified in Part I as subject to further review. All
tenured faculty members receiving a second annual performance ratings of “fair,” “marginal,” or
“unsatisfactory” within the most recent five annual performance reviews will be reviewed under
Part II of Post Tenure Review.

Faculty members under review in Part II are exempted from Part I review. Upon completion of
Part II review, Part I review resumes with a new rolling window.

a. Upon entering Part II review, faculty must begin a remediation program in order to correct
deficiencies detailed in their annual performance reviews. The chair in consultation with the PTR
committee and the faculty member will provide a list of specific goals and measurable outcomes
the faculty member should achieve during the Part II review period. The university will provide
reasonable resources (as identified in the PTR reports and as approved by the chair and the dean)
to meet the deficiencies.

b. In order to ensure adequate external representation in the Part II Post Tenure Review process,
departments must choose ONE of these options in drafting departmental personnel policy
procedures.
• utilize reference letters submitted from outside the department on each individual under
review,
• add to the PTR committee a faculty member or professional equivalent from outside the
department nominated and elected according to departmental bylaws,
- allow each faculty member under review the option of either having external letters solicited or incorporating the external committee member in the review process.

c. The faculty member undergoing Part II of PTR must provide, at a minimum, the following documents to the PTR committee and the department chair.
   - a recent copy of the curriculum vita (paper or electronic);
   - a summary of student assessment of instruction for the last 5 years including a summary of statistical ratings from student assessments of instruction (if appropriate to the individual’s duties).
   - a plan for continued professional growth;
   - detailed information about the outcomes of any sabbatical leave awarded during the preceding five years; and
   - if required by departmental personnel policy procedures, the names of six referees outside the department whom the PTR committee could contact for references.

d. The chair of the academic unit must provide the PTR committee with copies of the faculty member's annual performance reviews covering the preceding five years.

e. The role and function of each faculty member, as well as the strength of the overall record, will be examined by the PTR committee. If provided in departmental bylaws, the PTR committee is required to obtain a minimum of four reference letters of which at least two must come from the list of six submitted by the faculty member.

f. The PTR committee will provide a written report to the faculty member. The faculty member should be given at least two weeks to provide a response to the committee. Both the committee’s initial report and the response of the faculty member will be given to the dean of the academic unit. The department chair will submit an independent written report to the faculty member who will then have two weeks to provide a response. The chair’s original report and the faculty member’s response will be forwarded to the college dean. The ratings of either Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory will be used in all stages of the review by the PTR committee and the chair.

g. If both the PTR Committee and the chair, or either the PTR Committee or the chair, rates the candidate as satisfactory, the candidate’s final rating shall be satisfactory. If both the PTR Committee and the Chair rate the candidate as unsatisfactory, the candidate’s final rating shall be unsatisfactory.

h. If the candidate’s final rating is satisfactory, the dean will forward that information to the Provost in summary form without appending any candidate materials. If the candidate’s final rating is unsatisfactory, the dean will forward all materials to the Provost.

7. Remediation. Individuals who receive a rating of Unsatisfactory must be given a period of remediation to correct deficiencies detailed in the PTR reports. The chair in consultation with the PTR committee and the faculty member will provide a list of specific goals and measurable outcomes the faculty member should achieve in each of the next three calendar years following the date of formal notification of the unsatisfactory outcome. The university will provide reasonable resources (as identified in the PTR reports and as approved by the chair and the dean) to meet the deficiencies. The chair will meet at least twice annually with the faculty member to review progress. The faculty member will be reviewed each year by the PTR committee and the chair, both of whom shall supply written evaluations. At the end of the three-year period, another
post-tenure review will be conducted. If the outcome is again Unsatisfactory, the faculty member will be subject to dismissal for unsatisfactory performance. If the review is Satisfactory, then the normal Part I rolling five-year annual performance review cycle will resume.

8. Dismissal for Unsatisfactory Professional Performance. If dismissal for unsatisfactory professional performance is recommended, the case will be subject to the rules and regulations outlined in the Faculty Manual Section IV.K.3.

**Rationalization for Revision**

At present, post tenure review (PTR) occurs on a five year cycle. Any faculty member receiving two or more Annual Performance Ratings (APR) of “fair” or worse during a given five year window undergoes Phase II of PTR, involving additional review. If this review results in a PTR rating of “unsatisfactory”, a remediation plan is developed to address the problem areas.

This policy leads to the possibility that students might be exposed to inferior teaching for a relatively long period of time, and it has been suggested that we change the policy so that Part II review and an associated remediation program are begun as soon as a second inadequate APR is received.

**Final Proposed Wording**

**Faculty Manual, page 25.**

**Part IV. Personnel Practices**

**H. Post Tenure Review**

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

2. Coverage. All faculty members holding a tenured faculty position shall be subject to PTR except for a faculty member planning to retire by August 15th of the same academic year in which the post tenure review would occur, providing that a binding letter of intent to retire is signed thereby waiving the PTR.

Post tenure review is conducted on an annual basis, beginning at the time tenure is granted. Review of tenured academic administrators is accomplished in accordance with Section VI. J. of the Faculty Manual.

Periods of sick leave, sabbatical leave, or leave without pay will be excluded from PTR review. Faculty who give birth, father, or adopt a child may, at their request, receive a one-year exemption of PTR. The request for an exemption must come within two months of the birth or adoption, and will be automatically granted unless the chair or dean can document sufficient reason for denial. Exemption of an annual review period from PTR of a faculty member for serious illness, family tragedy or other special circumstances may be granted with the approval of the department chair, dean and Provost.
5. Part I, Post Tenure Review. The PTR committee will review the ratings received for the most recent five annual performance reviews (not counting reviews from exempted years) of each tenured faculty member, as specified in the Best Practices for Post-Tenure Review (#3). Merit salary increments are based on these annual performance reviews, as is consistent with the Best Practices for Post-Tenure Review (#9). Any tenured faculty members receiving two or more ratings of "fair," "marginal," or "unsatisfactory" within the last five annual performance reviews, will be subjected to additional review under Part II of the Post Tenure Review process (section 6 below). All others will receive a Post Tenure Review rating of "satisfactory," and are thereby exempt from Part II of Post Tenure Review.

6. Part II, Post Tenure Review. Part II consists of additional review by the Post Tenure Review Committee and the department chair of those identified in Part I as subject to further review. All tenured faculty members receiving a second annual performance ratings of "fair," "marginal," or "unsatisfactory" within the most recent five annual performance reviews will be reviewed under Part II of Post Tenure Review.

Faculty members under review in Part II are exempted from Part I review. Upon completion of Part II review, Part I review resumes with a rolling window.

a. Upon entering Part II review, faculty must begin a remediation program in order to correct deficiencies detailed in their annual performance reviews. The chair in consultation with the PTR committee and the faculty member will provide a list of specific goals and measurable outcomes the faculty member should achieve during the Part II review period. The university will provide reasonable resources (as identified in the PTR reports and as approved by the chair and the dean) to meet the deficiencies.

b. In order to ensure adequate external representation in the Part II Post Tenure Review process, departments must choose ONE of these options in drafting departmental personnel policy procedures.
- utilize reference letters submitted from outside the department on each individual under review,
- add to the PTR committee a faculty member or professional equivalent from outside the department nominated and elected according to departmental bylaws,
- allow each faculty member under review the option of either having external letters solicited or incorporating the external committee member in the review process.

c. The faculty member undergoing Part II of PTR must provide, at a minimum, the following documents to the PTR committee and the department chair.
- a recent copy of the curriculum vita (paper or electronic);
- a summary of student assessment of instruction for the last 5 years including a summary of statistical ratings from student assessments of instruction (if appropriate to the individual’s duties).
- a plan for continued professional growth;
- detailed information about the outcomes of any sabbatical leave awarded during the preceding five years; and
- if required by departmental personnel policy procedures, the names of six referees outside the department whom the PTR committee could contact for references.
d. The chair of the academic unit must provide the PTR committee with copies of the faculty member’s annual performance reviews covering the preceding five years.

e. The role and function of each faculty member, as well as the strength of the overall record, will be examined by the PTR committee. If provided in departmental bylaws, the PTR committee is required to obtain a minimum of four reference letters of which at least two must come from the list of six submitted by the faculty member.

f. The PTR committee will provide a written report to the faculty member. The faculty member should be given at least two weeks to provide a response to the committee. Both the committee’s initial report and the response of the faculty member will be given to the dean of the academic unit. The department chair will submit an independent written report to the faculty member who will then have two weeks to provide a response. The chair’s original report and the faculty member’s response will be forwarded to the college dean. The ratings of either Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory will be used in all stages of the review by the PTR committee and the chair.

g. If both the PTR Committee and the chair, or either the PTR Committee or the chair, rates the candidate as satisfactory, the candidate’s final rating shall be satisfactory. If both the PTR Committee and the Chair rate the candidate as unsatisfactory, the candidate’s final rating shall be unsatisfactory.

h. If the candidate’s final rating is satisfactory, the dean will forward that information to the Provost in summary form without appending any candidate materials. If the candidate’s final rating is unsatisfactory, the dean will forward all materials to the Provost.

7. Remediation. Individuals who receive a rating of Unsatisfactory must be given a period of remediation to correct deficiencies detailed in the PTR reports. The chair in consultation with the PTR committee and the faculty member will provide a list of specific goals and measurable outcomes the faculty member should achieve in each of the next three calendar years following the date of formal notification of the unsatisfactory outcome. The university will provide reasonable resources (as identified in the PTR reports and as approved by the chair and the dean) to meet the deficiencies. The chair will meet at least twice annually with the faculty member to review progress. The faculty member will be reviewed each year by the PTR committee and the chair, both of whom shall supply written evaluations. At the end of the three-year period, another post-tenure review will be conducted. If the outcome is again Unsatisfactory, the faculty member will be subject to dismissal for unsatisfactory performance. If the review is Satisfactory, then the normal Part I rolling five-year annual performance review cycle will resume.

8. Dismissal for Unsatisfactory Professional Performance. If dismissal for unsatisfactory professional performance is recommended, the case will be subject to the rules and regulations outlined in the Faculty Manual Section IV.K.3.
Present: Dalton, Helms, King, Lusk, Srimani, Piecutowski, Samuels, Hood, Katsiyannis

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.

Mr. Dalton (CFO) will provide a detailed presentation on the issue at the February meeting.

Salary report will be published in January (prior to the February senate meeting)

Deferred maintenance and New Construction Update was postponed for January to include recent initiatives...

Pay Schedule- Changes in the pay schedule will affect all of us. Details to ensure advanced planning by staff and faculty will be presented by Ms. Hood at the December faculty meeting.
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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 compare underrepresented groups (Black men) against overrepresented groups (football and basketball teams, student body) across four years.

Major results of our study include:

- 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.
- 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.
- 96.1% of these NCAA Division I colleges and universities graduated Black male student-athletes at rates lower than student-athletes overall.
- 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.
- At one university, Black male student-athletes graduated at a comparable rate to Black undergraduate men overall. On 72.4% of the other campuses, graduation rates for Black male student-athletes were lower than rates for Black undergraduate men overall.

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 tables indicating which institutions graduated Black male student-athletes at rates lower than student-athletes overall. 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, journalists, and Black male student-athletes and their families.
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 question 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 championship 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. Are these racial inequities in college completion best explained by Black men's fascination with playing for the NFL and NBA, or is it that coaches 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? Which is right, which is wrong?

Do Black men on college sports teams graduate at higher rates than do their same-race male peers who do not participate in athletics? Yes at about one-quarter of the institutions in this study, no at the overwhelming majority of others. The NCAA maintains that student-athletes graduate at higher rates because they are better at maximizing limited study time bounded by hours of practice, travel, and competition. This lyrical belief seems not to apply to Black male student-athletes at institutions in the six championship sports conferences examined in this report.

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 accountability and policy responsiveness, study provides statistical insights into structural barriers success and development. The authors express the path we must take to improve accountability and policy responsiveness. This study provides statistical insights into structural barriers success and development.

Warmest Regards,
Kenneth L. Shropshire, J.D.
David W. Hauck Professor of Legal Studies and Business Ethics
Director, Wharton Sports Business Initiative
University of Pennsylvania

Professor Shropshire is an affiliate in the Penn Institute on Education and Equity in Education. His books include "Agents of Opportunity: Sports Agents on Corruption in Collegiate Sports."
Background and Research Methods

This report builds on Harper's (2006) analysis of Black male student-athletes' representation on revenue-generating sports teams (football and basketball), as well as racial differences in six-year graduation rates, at 50 public flagship universities. Black men were 2.8% of undergraduates, but 54.6% of football players and 60.8% of basketball team members at institutions in the report. Across four cohorts of student-athletes, 47% of Black men graduated within six years, compared to 60% of White males and 62% of student-athletes overall in the 2006 study.

In this report, we provide data on representation trends and six-year graduation rates at 76 colleges and universities that comprise six major sports conferences: the ACC, Big East, Big Ten, Big 12, Pac 12, and SEC. These conferences were chosen for our analysis because every NCAA Division I football champion since 1989 and each Division I men's basketball championship team since 1991 have come from them. They were also selected because their football conference champions receive automatic bids to the 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 when men's basketball teams at member institutions advance to the NCAA Division I Final Four championship. Above all, we are focusing on colleges and universities in these six conferences because they are likely sites at which trends reported in published research on Black male student-athletes are most problematic.

Black Male Student-Athletes: A Research Overview

Much has been written over the past four decades about Black male student participation in intercollegiate athletics. Numerous studies highlight a range of inequities at Division I institutions, the NCAA's highest and most financially lucrative competition level. Most emphasis in the literature has been on members of revenue-generating sports teams, namely football and men's basketball. 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 apparel).

Scholars have recently examined how Black men are socialized to value sports over academics at a young age (e.g., Beamon & Bell, 2006; Benson, 2000); the ways in which colleges and universities reap enormous financial benefits at the expense of Black male student-athlete success (e.g., Beamon, 2008; Donnor, 2005; Harper, 2009a); and the long-term effects of sports participation on Black men's psychological wellness and post-college career transitions (e.g., Beamon & Bell, 2011; Harrison & Lawrence, 2003). Considerable effort has also been devoted to exploring racial differences between Black men and their White male teammates. For example, Harrison, Comeaux, and Plecha (2006) found disparities in the academic preparation of Black and White student-athletes. Specifically, Blacks were recruited from less prestigious high schools with insufficient resources, which likely underprepared them for the rigors of college-level academic work.

Nearly 30 years ago, renowned scholar-activist Harry Edwards wrote, "They must contend, of course, with the connotations and social reverberations of the traditional 'dumb jock' caricature. But Black student-athletes are burdened also with the insidiously racist implications of the myth of 'innate Black athletic superiority,' and the more blatantly racist stereotype of the 'dumb Negro' condemned by racial heritage to intellectual inferiority" (1984, p. 8). This caricature and other racial stereotypes continue to plague Black male student-athletes at many predominantly white colleges and universities (Hodge, Burden, Robinson, & Bennett, 2008; Hughes, Satterfield, & Giles, 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, alumni, and administrators) often erroneously presume they are members of intercollegiate sports teams and stereotype them accordingly.

The importance of engaging student-athletes in educationally purposeful activities and enriching educational experiences, both inside and outside the classroom, has been well established in the literature (Comeaux, Speer, Taustine, & Harrison, 2011; Gayles & Hu, 2009; Martin, 2009). Notwithstanding, Black male student-athletes rarely accrue benefits and developmental outcomes associated with high levels of purposeful engagement beyond athletics. This has serious implications for faculty-student interaction, an important form of engagement. Comeaux and Harrison (2007) found that engagement with faculty was essential to academic achievement for Black and White male student-athletes, yet professors spent significantly more out-of-class time with Whites. Furthermore, high-achieving Black male student-athletes in Martin, Harrison, and Bukstein's (2010) study reported that coaches prioritized athletic accomplishment over academic engagement and discouraged participation in activities beyond their sport.
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 each cohort year at each of the 76 colleges and universities in this study. These percentages were then compared with Black men’s share of scholarship student-athletes at each institution, using data from the NCAA database. 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 all student-athletes, undergraduate students overall, and Black undergraduate men overall. These graduation rates were averages across four cohorts, as opposed to a single year. These undergraduate students entered college in 2001, 2002, 2003, and 2004 and graduated by 2005, 2006, 2007, and 2008. Rates reported herein are for Black male scholarship athletes on all sports teams, not just football and basketball.

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 fewer Black male members who were not athletic scholarship recipients. Second, graduation rates do not account for undergraduates who transferred from one institution to another. These students are counted as dropouts. No published evidence or anecdotal reports suggest 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 MEN VS. BLACK MALE STUDENT-ATHLETES³ (% DIFFERENCE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Marquette University²</td>
<td>77.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>University of Mississippi</td>
<td>73.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>University of Miami</td>
<td>72.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Florida State University</td>
<td>71.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Providence College²</td>
<td>70.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Mississippi State University</td>
<td>70.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>University of Georgia</td>
<td>69.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>University of Illinois</td>
<td>67.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>University of South Carolina</td>
<td>67.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>University of Alabama</td>
<td>67.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>University of Tennessee</td>
<td>66.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>University of North Carolina</td>
<td>66.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Virginia Polytechnic Institute &amp; State University</td>
<td>66.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>University of Texas</td>
<td>66.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Georgia Institute of Technology</td>
<td>66.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Oklahoma State University</td>
<td>65.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>University of Louisville</td>
<td>64.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>University of Kentucky</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>University of South Florida</td>
<td>64.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Seton Hall University²</td>
<td>64.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Texas A&amp;M University</td>
<td>63.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Louisiana State University</td>
<td>63.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Auburn University</td>
<td>63.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Rutgers, State University of New Jersey</td>
<td>63.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>University of Maryland</td>
<td>63.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANK</th>
<th>UNIVERSITY</th>
<th>GRAD RATE³</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Northwestern University</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>University of Notre Dame</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Villanova University</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Pennsylvania State University</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Vanderbilt University</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Duke University</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Wake Forest University</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Georgetown University</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Boston College</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Stanford University</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Across four cohorts

Highlighted in this section are colleges and universities with exceptionally high and low statistical indicators of equity for Black male student-athletes. 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 universities that outperform others on benchmarks chosen for this study, hence the rank-ordered lists on these two pages. But on the other hand, we deem it problematic to offer kudos to institutions that sustain any version of inequity. Put differently, just because a university performs well in comparison to others of similar size or schools within the same athletic conference, does not necessarily render it a national model that is exempt from recommendations offered at the end of this report. For example, Northwestern University is ranked first on our list of institutions with the highest graduation rates for Black male student-athletes. But it is important to note that this rate is 11 points lower than the University's six-year rate for all undergraduates. While they deserve praise for graduating 83% of Black men on intercollegiate sports teams, administrators and coaches at Northwestern must assume greater responsibility for closing this 11-point gap.

Losers are institutions in the six NCAA Division I championship conferences

---

¹ 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).

² These three institutions do not have NCAA Division I intercollegiate football teams.
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 tournaments. Across these 76 colleges and universities, Black male student-athletes graduate at 5.3 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>Grad 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>Indiana University</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Arizona State University</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>University of Minnesota</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Comparison of Graduation Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparison Group</th>
<th>Equal To or Higher Than</th>
<th>% Higher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Student-Athletes</td>
<td>Texas Christian University</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Undergraduates</td>
<td>Auburn University</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Undergraduates</td>
<td>Texas Christian University</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Student-Athletes</td>
<td>Vanderbilt University</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Student-Athletes</td>
<td>Vanderbilt University</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Student-Athletes</td>
<td>Vanderbilt University</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Student-Athletes</td>
<td>Vanderbilt University</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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 tournaments. Across these 76 colleges and universities, Black male student-athletes graduate at 5.3 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.
Tracking Race

Black men comprised over one quarter (26%) of scholarship student-athletes on cross country/track and field teams at member institutions in the six NCAA Division I championship conferences during the 2011-12 school year.
## Atlantic Coast Conference

### Representation

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>INSTITUTION % OF UNDERGRADUATES</th>
<th>% OF BASKETBALL AND FOOTBALL TEAMS</th>
<th>% DIFFERENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boston College</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>-42.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clemson University</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>75.4</td>
<td>-49.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke University</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>50.3</td>
<td>-46.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida State University</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>75.4</td>
<td>-71.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Institute of Technology</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>70.1</td>
<td>-66.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Maryland</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>68.4</td>
<td>-63.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Miami</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>75.7</td>
<td>-72.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Carolina</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>69.9</td>
<td>-66.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina State University</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>66.4</td>
<td>-62.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Virginia</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>-53.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Polytechnic Institute &amp; State University</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>-66.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Graduation Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>BLACK MALE STUDENT-ATHLETES %</th>
<th>ALL UNDERGRADUATES %</th>
<th>% DIFFERENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boston College</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clemson University</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke University</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida State University</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>-37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Institute of Technology</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Maryland</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Miami</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Carolina</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina State University</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Virginia</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>-37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Polytechnic Institute &amp; State University</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wake Forest University</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>-21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Graduation Rates

<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>Boston College</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clemson University</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke University</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida State University</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>-37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Institute of Technology</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Maryland</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Miami</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Carolina</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina State University</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Virginia</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>-37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Polytechnic Institute &amp; State University</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>-26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Graduation Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>BLACK MALE STUDENT-ATHLETES %</th>
<th>ALL BLACK MEN %</th>
<th>% DIFFERENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boston College</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clemson University</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke University</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida State University</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Institute of Technology</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Maryland</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Miami</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Carolina</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina State University</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Virginia</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Polytechnic Institute &amp; State University</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wake Forest University</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>-8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Big East Conference

Representation
Black Men on Revenue-Generating Sports Teams vs. Black Men in Undergraduate Student Body

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTION</th>
<th>% OF UNDERGRADUATES</th>
<th>% OF BASKETBALL AND FOOTBALL TEAMS</th>
<th>% DIFFERENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Cincinnati</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>-53.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Connecticut</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>-51.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DePaul University</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>54.9</td>
<td>-52.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgetown University</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>-46.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Louisville</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>69.4</td>
<td>-64.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marquette University</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>78.8</td>
<td>-77.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Notre Dame</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>-43.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Pittsburgh</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>-54.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence College</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>71.6</td>
<td>-70.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutgers, State University of New Jersey</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>-63.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seton Hall University</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>-64.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. John's University (New York)</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>-36.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temple University</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>58.4</td>
<td>-55.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of South Florida</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>68.4</td>
<td>-64.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villanova University</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>-55.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graduation Rates
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>University of Cincinnati</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Connecticut</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DePaul University</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>-36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgetown University</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Louisville</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marquette University</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Notre Dame</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Pittsburgh</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence College</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>-38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutgers, State University of New Jersey</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seton Hall University</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. John's University (New York)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syracuse University</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temple University</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of South Florida</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villanova University</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graduation Rates
Black Male Student-Athletes vs. All Black Undergraduate Men

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTION</th>
<th>BLACK MALE STUDENT-ATHLETES %</th>
<th>ALL BLACK MEN %</th>
<th>% DIFFERENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Cincinnati</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Connecticut</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DePaul University</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgetown University</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Louisville</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marquette University</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Notre Dame</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Pittsburgh</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence College</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutgers, State University of New Jersey</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seton Hall University</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. John's University (New York)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syracuse University</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temple University</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of South Florida</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villanova University</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Football teams at these universities are not members of the Big East Conference.
### Black Men on Revenue-Generating Sports Teams vs. Black Men in Undergraduate Student Body

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>% Undergraduates</th>
<th>% Revenue-Generating Sports</th>
<th>% Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Illinois</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>70.1</td>
<td>-67.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana University</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>-51.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Iowa</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>-38.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Michigan</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td>-55.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State University</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>-51.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Minnesota</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td>-48.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Nebraska</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>-51.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern University</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>-32.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Ohio State University</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>-50.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania State University</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>-50.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purdue University</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>-51.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wisconsin</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>-46.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University of Illinois</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graduation Rates

<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>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>67</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Michigan</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State University</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>-10</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>83</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Ohio State University</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>-36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania State University</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purdue University</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wisconsin</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University of Illinois</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>-30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graduation Rates: Black Male Student-Athletes vs. All Black Undergraduate Men

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Black Male Student-Athletes</th>
<th>All Black Men</th>
<th>% Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Illinois</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana University</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Iowa</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Michigan</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State University</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>-10</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>83</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Ohio State University</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>-36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania State University</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purdue University</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wisconsin</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University of Illinois</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>-30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Big 12 Conference

#### Representation

**Black Men on Revenue-Generating Sports Teams vs. Black Men in Undergraduate Student Body**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTION</th>
<th>% OF UNDERGRADUATES</th>
<th>% OF BASKETBALL AND FOOTBALL TEAMS</th>
<th>% DIFFERENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baylor University</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>-60.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa State University</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>-51.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Kansas</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>-56.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas State University</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>-48.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oklahoma</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>-59.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma State University</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td>-65.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Christian University</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>-51.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Texas</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>67.9</td>
<td>-66.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Tech University</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>-56.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia University</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>58.4</td>
<td>-56.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Graduation Rates

**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>44</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa State University</td>
<td>30</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>University of Oklahoma</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>54</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>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Texas</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Tech University</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia University</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>-10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Graduation Rates**

**Black Male Student-Athletes vs. All Undergraduates**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTION</th>
<th>BLACK MALE STUDENT-ATHLETES %</th>
<th>ALL UNDERGRADUATES %</th>
<th>% DIFFERENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baylor University</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa State University</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>-38</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>University of Oklahoma</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>-25</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>65</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>57</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia University</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>-7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Graduation Rates**

**Black Male Student-Athletes vs. All Black Undergraduate Men**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTION</th>
<th>BLACK MALE STUDENT-ATHLETES %</th>
<th>ALL BLACK MEN %</th>
<th>% DIFFERENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baylor University</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa State University</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Kansas</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas State University</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oklahoma</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma State University</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Christian University</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Texas</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Tech University</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia University</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Representation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>% of Undergraduates</th>
<th>% of Basketball &amp; Football Teams</th>
<th>% Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Arizona</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>-52.5</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>1.2</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>-49.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California, Los Angeles</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>Oregon State University</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>-53.4</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>2.2</td>
<td>56.2</td>
<td>-54.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Utah</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>-32.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Washington</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td>-54.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington State University</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>-38.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Graduation Rates

### 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>University of Arizona</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona State University</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>-25</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>46</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Colorado</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon State University</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford University</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Southern California</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>-47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Washington</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington State University</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>-14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Black Male Student-Athletes vs. All Black Undergraduate Men

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Black Male Student-Athletes %</th>
<th>All Black Undergraduate Men %</th>
<th>% Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Arizona</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona State University</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California, Berkeley</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California, Los Angeles</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Colorado</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon State University</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford University</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Southern California</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>-44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Washington</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington State University</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>-31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Undergraduate Student Body: Black Men on Revenue-Generating Sports Teams vs. Black Men in Undergraduate Student Body
### Representation
Black Men on Revenue-Generating Sports Teams vs. Black Men in Undergraduate Student Body

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTION</th>
<th>% OF UNDERGRADUATES</th>
<th>% OF BASKETBALL AND FOOTBALL TEAMS</th>
<th>% DIFFERENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Alabama</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>71.6</td>
<td>-67.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Arkansas</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>-60.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn University</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>-63.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Florida</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>-63.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Georgia</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>71.8</td>
<td>-69.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Kentucky</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>67.2</td>
<td>-64.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana State University</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>-63.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Mississippi</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>78.1</td>
<td>-73.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi State University</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>79.1</td>
<td>-70.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Missouri</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>62.6</td>
<td>-59.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of South Carolina</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>71.7</td>
<td>-67.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Tennessee</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td>-66.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas A&amp;M University</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>65.2</td>
<td>-63.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanderbilt University</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>-40.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Graduation Rates
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>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>57</td>
<td>-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Missouri</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of South Carolina</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Tennessee</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas A&amp;M University</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanderbilt University</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Graduation Rates
Black Male Student-Athletes vs. All Black Undergraduate Men

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTION</th>
<th>BLACK MALE STUDENT-ATHLETES %</th>
<th>ALL BLACK MEN %</th>
<th>% DIFFERENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Alabama</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Arkansas</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn University</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Florida</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Georgia</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Kentucky</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana State University</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Mississippi</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi State University</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>-3</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>40</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Tennessee</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas A&amp;M University</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanderbilt University</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Goaltending?

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.

Recommendations for Improving Racial Equity in College Sports

Problems as pervasive as the underrepresentation of Black men in the undergraduate student population at predominantly white colleges and universities, their overrepresentation on revenue-generating NCAA Division I sports teams, and their comparatively lower six-year graduation rates warrant a multidimensional response from various stakeholders. In this section we provide recommendations for five groups, including Black male student-athletes and their families.

The NCAA and Sports Conference Commissioners

The NCAA Federal Graduation Rates Database was one of two data sources used for this study. We commend the Association for gathering and making publicly available these data. A necessary next step would be to produce a series of NCAA research reports that disaggregate data by race, sex, sport, division, and particular subsets of institutions within a division (for example, the six conferences that routinely win Division I football and men's basketball championships). Data in the aggregate allows the NCAA to make claims such as “Black male student-athletes at Division I institutions graduate at higher rates than Black men who do not play college sports.” While this may be true across the entire Division I, it is not the case at the overwhelming majority of colleges and universities in the six championship conferences.

We also recommend that the NCAA establishes a commission on racial equity that routinely calls for and responds to disaggregated data reports, raises consciousness within and beyond the Association about the persistence and pervasiveness of racial inequities, and partners with athletic conferences and institutions to develop policies and programs that help narrow racial gaps. Each athletic conference should create its own commission that is charged with overseeing racial equity at member institutions.

In March 2010, U.S. Secretary of Education Arne Duncan suggested that any sports team failing to graduate at least 40% of its players should be ineligible for participation in post-season play and championship contests. We support this recommendation. A policy intervention such as this is important and should be racialized. That is, the NCAA and conference leaders must pay attention not only to overall team rates, but also racial trends within teams. For instance, the overall graduation rate for a football team may be 49% but Black men, the population that comprises two-thirds of that team, may graduate at a rate far below 40%. One response from the NCAA to the Duncan proposal is that it is unfair to punish current student-athletes for graduation rates based on previous cohorts. We do not see the difference here between this and other sanctions imposed by the NCAA. Ohio State University and Penn State University, for example, were ineligible for post-season play in 2012 because of policy violations (and in the case of PSU, felony crimes) committed several years prior. Furthermore, while the release of data from the federal government and the NCAA tends to lag by 2-3 years, our four-cohort analysis of six-year graduation rates showed very little variation from one year to the next. Teams that sustain racial inequities should not be rewarded with opportunities to play for NCAA championships.

We believe conferences should 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 do what we propose in the next section – money from athletic conferences would help. These funds also could be used to support the work of the commissions on racial equity that we proposed earlier.

College and University Leaders

Accountability is practically impossible in the absence of transparency. Thus, college and university presidents, trustees, provosts, and faculty senate committees that oversee athletics must demand disaggregated data reports from 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 inequities in graduation rates. Furthermore, campus leaders should pay more careful attention to racial differences in student-athletes’ grade point averages (GPAs), classroom experiences, course enrollment and major selection patterns, participation in enriching educational experiences beyond athletics (e.g., study abroad, summer internships, service learning, and research opportunities with faculty), and post-college pathways (graduate school, employment in one’s major field of study, etc.). Presidents must hold themselves and athletics directors and coaches accountable for narrowing racial gaps documented in these reports.

The underrepresentation of Black male undergraduates is an issue that many campus leaders (especially admissions officers) view as difficult to address.
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 and academic success among Black male student-athletes must include some emphasis on their confrontations with low expectations and stereotypes in classrooms and elsewhere on predominantly white campuses.

In August 2009, the U.S. Department of Education released a report titled "Keeping Score When it Counts: Racial Differences in Academic Progress Among Teams Selected for Participation in the NCAA Division I Basketball Tournaments (women's and men's) as well as football post-season bowl games (the BCS bowl games and others). These reports are available on the TIDES website: www.tidesport.org. The Institute also publishes timely reports that highlight demographic trends in college coaching and administration. More published analyses, such as these, that make racial inequities apparent, are needed across all NCAA divisions."

A Call for Greater Transparency

Speciating 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. Black male student-athletes should also be involved in this strategic planning process.

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. Commission 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 Black men on NCAA Division I football and basketball teams who graduate with higher than average GPAs and transition into rewarding careers and productive post-college lives that no longer include participation in organized sports. Understanding how these men managed to succeed in college would be useful to coaches and others who endeavor to help lower-performing student-athletes thrive personally, academically, and athletically.

Black Women Ballers
Equity and Experiences in NCAA Division I Women’s Sports
Although this report is specific to Black male student-athletes on revenue-generating sports teams, it is important to acknowledge the experiences of their same-race female peers. During the 2011-12 school year, Black women comprised 3.7% of undergraduate student enrollments across the 76 colleges and universities in the six NCAA Division I championship conferences — they were 59.8% of women's basketball teams on those campuses. Despite their overrepresentation, good news about Black female student-athletes can be found 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 88.5% 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 achievement and sense of belonging on predominantly white campuses. In comparison to Black men, much less has been written and a lot less is known about the experiences of Black female participants in intercollegiate athletics. College administrators, the American public, and others who are concerned about racial and gender equity in sports must recognize how racism and sexism converge differently for Black women and Black men.
able them to achieve racial equity? Inspiration can be derived from effective
or higher than student-athletes overall, undergraduate students overall, and
Similarly, athletics departments can learn from other NCAA Division I institu
tions that include senior administrators from the athletics department as well as
tenured faculty, and a vice provost. Game initiative, which prepares Black male student-athletes for post-college
options beyond professional sports. The initiative is led by a cross-sector team
students who are highly engaged inside and outside the classroom are
From an early age, 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
By spending a semester abroad or doing a summer
Only when you ask the right questions do coaches engage with faculty outside the classroom, a diverse cadre of peers
Considering that coaches and staff in athletics departments should encourage student
coaches are unlikely to be supportive of anything that threatens their own ca
But are coaches and staff in athletics departments engaging students in such academic activities?
our perspective, a more expansive set of questions to coaches during the college recruitment
process: What is the graduation rate for Black men on your team? Besides
Almost three-quarters of Black men on college teams are engaged in some form of academic activity outside of
the few who got drafted, what are recent Black male graduates doing?
Young Black men's aspirations to play professional sports are shaped largely,
or internship related to one's field of study. Student-athletes
competing are unlikely to be engaged in these ways unless their coaches are supportive;
what's the graduation rate for students who get drafted? What are coaches doing to ensure
students in classrooms and on the field of play. We advise Black
coaches to include metrics related to student-athlete engagement.
coaches are unlikely to be supportive of anything that threatens their own ca
professors or an internship related to one's field of study. Student-athletes
employment can be balanced through career mentors and professors in other offices on
career development, leadership skills, or spending a semester abroad:
we advise Black male student-athletes to take advantage
we advise Black male student-athletes to take advantage
coaches to include metrics related to student-athlete engagement.
coaches to include metrics related to student-athlete engagement.
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