THERE WAS NO

FACULTY SENATE MEETING

IN JANUARY, 2011

DUE TO INCLEMENT WEATHER (SNOW)
1. **Call to Order:** The Faculty Senate Meeting was called to order at 2:34 p.m. by President Bill Surver.

2. **Approval of Minutes:** The General Faculty & Staff Minutes dated December 15, 2010 were approved as distributed.

3. **Special Orders of the Day:**
   Larry LaForge, Faculty Athletics Representative, informed the Senate of his perspective regarding academic integrity/athletic programs. There is more pressure to win in college athletics than ever before. He stated that Clemson needs to balance our perspective. Ways that faculty can and should be involved are: to have the position of a faculty representative to athletics; have an athletic council that includes faculty and that those faculty are in leadership roles as committee chairs and have athletics as part of the SAC accreditation process, a process by the NCAA. He also stated that faculty indifference is troublesome. Schools which have had problems did not have faculty involvement. He further stated that Clemson’s athletic administration understands that we must have balance and integrity.

   Bill D’Andrea, Director of External Affairs, spoke about other areas in which faculty can help the athletic program including involving themselves in the activities of Vickery Hall. Vickery Hall would like faculty feedback. Vickery Hall is to provide intervention and interference. He also stated that the economic situation has impacted IPTAY and ticket sales.

   Terry Don Phillips, Athletics Director, noted compliance issues which include rules and regulations that to which Clemson must adhere. Progress is being made. He further informed the Senate of the measure of retention, graduate success rates and dealing with adversity.

   A question and answer period followed.

4. **Presentation and Slate of Faculty Senate Officers:**
   a. President Surver asked for nominations from the floor for the positions of Vice President/President-Elect and Secretary. There were none. The floor for nominations was then closed.

   b. Statements of interest to serve were then received from: Jeremy King (Vice President/President-Elect); Graciela Tissera (Secretary) and Scott Dutkiewicz (Secretary).
President Surver then reminded all Senators to ensure that college elections for the Faculty Senate are being held within respective colleges.

5. "Free Speech": None

6. Committee Reports:

a. Standing Committees
1) Finance Committee – Chair Rich Figliola submitted the Committee Report dated January 18, 2011. President Surver then stated that the Salary Report is in the final stages of editing and will be publicized soon.

2) Welfare Committee – Senator Danny Smith for Chair Michelle Martin noted that the Committee is doing research on the roles of department chairs versus department heads.


4) Research Committee – No report.

5) Policy Committee – Chair Jeremy King submitted and briefly explained the Committee Report. President Surver stated that the conflict of interest and the intellectual property drafts will go back to original committees to be further addressed.

Select Senate Committees:
1) Budget Accountability Committee – Chair Antonis Katsiyannis noted that the Committee has met and will meet again after the State of the University address.

2) Compensation Advisory Group – President Surver noted that information from this Group will soon be transferred to the Administrative Council.

3) Academic Calendar Committee – Chair Pat Smart stated that this Committee will meet Thursday.

4) Lecturer Committee – Chair Dan Warner stated that a Committee plan is in place with the knowledge that there may be further work on it. The Report will be presented at the next Faculty Senate meeting.

University Commissions and Committees: None

7. President's Report: President Surver:
1) informed the Senate of the upcoming Town Hall meeting (date to be announced) and the State of the University Addressed to be held at 6:00 p.m., February 17th at the Strom Thurmond Institute Auditorium;
2) stated his confidence in the forthcoming plan which will soon be announced; and
3) reminded the Senators of the Faculty Senate/Staff Senate Habitat for Humanity endeavor which will formally begin on February 28th.

8. **Old Business:** None

9. **New Business:**
   a. Proposed *Faculty Manual* Change – Part IX. J. Sabbatical Leave – Senator King submitted and explained. Following discussion, vote was to accept was taken and proposed change passed with required two-thirds vote.

   b. Immediate Past Faculty Senate President, Bill Bowerman, also Chair of the Workload Committee, submitted for acceptance and briefly explained the Committee Report. There was no discussion. Vote to accept Report passed unanimously and will be forwarded to the Policy Committee for further review.

10. **Announcements:**
    a. The next Executive/Advisory Committee meeting will be held on February 22, 2011.

    b. The next Faculty Senate meeting will be held on March 8, 2011.

11. **Adjournment:** President Surver adjourned the meeting at 4:01 p.m.

    [Signature]

    Linda A. Howe, Secretary

    [Signature]

    Cathy Toth Sturkie, Program Coordinator

Faculty Senate Finance Committee Report

Meeting: 1/18/2011  email exchange  2:30PM – 3:20PM

Submitted by: Senator Figliola

Due to holidays and weather, the Committee exchanged information only.

Overall, major strategic decisions are to be announced regarding changes at Clemson that are directly the result of budget cuts. The Senate Finance Committee has not been involved with proposed changes to date.

Task 2: University Budget Flow (Lead: Figliola)

The University Budget Accountability Committee (BAC) is to meet in February. To date, the University has released a detailed budget (resource/budget expense) at the broadest category level (admin support, instructional support, etc) and the new monthly release of the University expenditure list (~ 86,000 items per month). Hopefully, the Committee will become informed in examining money flows (resources versus costs) that affect strategic decisions (priorities versus resources).

Other business:

Senator Meriwether reported some discussions related to departmental expenditures of lab fees.

Lab fee discussions prompted questions about extra “fees” in general. How are they assigned and how amounts are fixed and how monies collected are spent. Is there a written policy? Who initiates and what is the process chain? These are questions for the future.
SCHOLASTIC POLICIES COMMITTEE – Bob Horton, Chair – (HEHD)

Sean Brittain (E&S)
David Tonkyn (AFLS)
Xiaobo Hu (BBS) abs
Kelly Smith (AAH) abs
Leslie Williams (AAH) abs

Also in attendance: Stan Smith, Jeff Appling, Ben Boone, Logan Roof

Meetings: Next meetings: February 15, March 15, April 19. All meetings will start at 2:30.

Faculty-Authored Textbooks and Course Materials
This originally came from Richard Cowden, auditor, 656-4899. There is a brief mention in Faculty Manual. We have discussed a possible form and have received some clarification from Richard Cowden on some issues. Our intention is to have a form readily available in every college office. A draft of an audit for Provost Helms indicated that we as a university were not in compliance.

Horton attended a meeting on 1/19 about this with the auditors, Mr. Cowden, and Provost Helms. They are looking for us to establish policy, suggesting something that would go to Policy and then to the whole Senate. Two things are needed: the textbook/course materials disclosure form and a form to indicate faculty are working on textbooks or course materials for which they may receive remuneration. This latter should likely be in conjunction with the Consulting Form. How it is administered would be determined by administration.

Academic Eligibility Policy Committee: Lead David Tonkyn
David is SP’s representative on this committee. The policy is still being rewritten for clarity and will be broken into two, one part for students new to Clemson and the other for those who have been here.

Academic Integrity: Lead Kelly Smith
The issue concerns, at least in large part, how to deal with dishonesty that is not tied directly to a course (e.g. plagiarism on an essay competition). Should dishonesty outside of courses be considered under conduct, for which there is some flexibility as to consequences, or under Academic Integrity, which has explicitly delineated consequences? What specifically is an academic activity? This is something we need to determine.

We have also been asked to provide guidance as to whether planning to cheat is a violation of Academic Integrity. The Student Senate has passed a resolution arguing against this. Where do we stand on this?

Acceptance into Major and Graduation
Wayne Stewart has brought the following to our attention. On page 28 of the Undergraduate Announcements, under the section titled “Special Requirements,” it states: “Candidates for graduation must be officially accepted in the major in which they are applying for a degree no later than the term prior to submitting the application.” He suggested that the policy either be eliminated or enforced consistently. We discussed changing the timeline to indicate that acceptance into the major should occur by the beginning of the final term before graduation.

Mr. Smith indicated that this is not a common occurrence, that there was only one such case, for example, in fall 2010. He has offered to discuss this with Senator Stewart. He indicated that Registration follows the policy UNLESS the department is willing to override it.
Undergraduate Senate's Academic Affairs Committee
Ben provided a quick synopsis of their main issues. He will provide an updated version of these

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Evaluation of Courses, Including Online Courses
A survey has been constructed and will be distributed over the next few weeks to assess students' views on the quality of online courses. On December 1, Horton met with Debbie Jackson, Ben Boone, and Dave Knox to discuss concerns about the quality of some online courses. We don't have a good means of ensuring the quality of these courses. Debbie is suggesting questions that might be included on Student Evaluation of Instructors for online courses, and Horton has contacted Dale Layfield to see what might already be happening. We also discussed the possibility of some type of peer evaluations to try to ensure the quality of instruction in all courses, not just online ones. Any thoughts on this? Also we're checking to see if anyone is looking at the questions on the form itself.

OLD/COMPLETED BUSINESS

Graduate Advisory Committee
In August 2010, SP voiced unanimous support for the proposed change to the Graduate Advisory Committee. This was passed back to Policy and presented and passed at the EAC meeting.

Summer Schedule (Lead: Leslie Williams)
This is in place for summer 2011.

Gen Ed
Provost Helms convened a student group to discuss ideas for general education, but at this time there is no official movement.

EPortfolios
All students are now required to provide documentation on 8 competencies.

Definition of Credit Hour
Scholastic Policies believes this is an important issue that needs to be addressed. A committee, led by Dale Layfield, has been established to evaluate distance education. At some later date, we may revisit this, using the information this committee gathers, to help establish some type of policy.

Graduate Committees
We have collected data on how various departments are using Form 3 and FAS to identify which faculty members may serve on students' graduate committees. We have found that that this policy is not being uniformly enforced and that there is great variation in how this determination is made.

We have recommended that each department develop a policy for making this determination and include it in their bylaws. This should reduce the potential for problems and give faculty members a means of recourse when they are unhappy with a decision that they believe was not made correctly. This was agreed to by the Executive Advisory Committee and a letter has been sent by Bill Surver to the Provost.

Graduate Credit Applied to Undergraduate Degree
We have approved the following statement. EAC and the Faculty Senate have also endorsed it.

Degree-seeking undergraduate students may apply graduate level coursework toward their undergraduate degree at the discretion of the degree-granting program. Ordinarily, graduate credits taken at institutions other
than Clemson University will be awarded only if those institutions are in good standing with regional accrediting organizations. Word is that the Graduate Council approved this, but limited it to 12 hours.

**Academic Integrity and Academic Redemption**

These policies were somewhat at odds with each other. SP was asked to make a recommendation on a proposal. Academic Integrity stated, “If a student is found in violation of the academic integrity policy and receives a redeemable grade as the penalty, he/she will not be allowed to redeem that grade under the Academic Redemption Policy” (p. 30 2010-2011 Undergraduate Announcements). The current Academic Redemption Policy states, “The ARP may not be applied to...any course in which the student was previously found in violation of the academic integrity policy” (p. 26, 2010-2011 Undergraduate Announcements).

The proposed wording for the Academic Redemption Policy is as follows: “The ARP may not be applied to...any course in which the student was previously found in violation of the academic integrity policy and received a redeemable grade as the penalty.”

We did not support this proposed change to the Academic Redemption Policy. While we agreed that the two policies need to match, we believed the Academic Integrity Policy should be modified to match the Academic Redemption Policy. In our view, students should not be allowed to redeem a course in which they have been found guilty of a violation of Academic Integrity and have a received a grade of D or F, regardless of the punishment that was imposed because of the violation. We were unanimous in our opposition to this proposed change. Our recommendation was to leave the current Academic Redemption Policy alone. This recommendation was made to the Undergraduate Council and was supported by the Undergraduate Senate’s Academic Affairs. The Undergraduate Academic Council accepted our suggestion and approved the change as we have recommended. Students who have been found in violation cannot redeem the course.
Report of the Faculty Senate Policy Committee
18 Feb 2011 Meeting

Committee members present: Scott Dutkiewicz, Jeremy King, Dale Layfield, Bill Pennington, Pradip Srimani

Special guests: Bill Bowerman, Fran Mcguire, Pat Smart, Cathy Sturkie

The Policy Committee met on 18 February 2011 and conducted the following items of business:

1. Past President Bowerman presented his Select Committee on Workload’s (SCW) recommended changes to the Faculty Manual. Inasmuch as the SCW found it unfeasible to develop a single specific policy that would cover all faculty in the Clemson enterprise, the recommendations are focused at requiring policies to be established, approved, and implemented at departmental unit levels.

The Policy Committee was receptive to the proposed changes, but discussed three issues. First, the policy needs to distinguish between absolute levels of workload and the distribution of workload across different activities. Second, the Policy Committee saw the need for department level policies to consider how to protect faculty from being targeted with capricious variations in workload distribution that varied from those described in an original offer letter, yet still allow significant adjustments to distribution when truly merited. Finally, the Policy Committee considered the need to changes in grievable actions to include workload distributions and assignments.

Senator King will formulate redline versions of the proposed changes following this discussion. Because the University administration has a significant stake in a faculty workload policy, these proposed changes will be shared with the Provost as an initial framework to initiate a collaborative review and discussion of workload and, we hope, a final revised policy that is more reflective of the Clemson enterprise today, protects faculty, provides greater flexibility to chairs and faculty to meet workload requirements in ways that may enhance productivity and further the diverse missions of the University, and still retain ultimate oversight of workload in the hands of appropriate administrators.

2. The committee discussed again a draft of a Faculty Manual change formalizing the Presidential Commission on Sustainability (PCS) kindly provided by President Barker’s Chief of Staff, Marvin Carmichael. The Policy Committee felt a number of changes would be in order to ensure greater consistency of the structure of this Commission with others reporting to the University President. Inasmuch as agreement to changes by the extant PCS
and President Barker is desirable, the Committee will seek to have Marvin Carmichael and the current chair of the PCS attend our February meeting for consultation.
Proposed Faculty Manual Change
Part IX, Section J (Sabbatical Leave)

Current Wording:

J. Sabbatical Leave
Sabbatical leave may be granted by the President of the University to any tenured faculty member who has completed at least six years of full-time service with the university. The purpose of sabbatical leave is to relieve faculty of normal duties so that they might pursue significant projects facilitating their professional growth and development, thus enhancing their future contributions to the mission of the university. Such leaves, therefore, are not granted automatically upon completion of the necessary period of service. Sabbaticals cannot occur more frequently than every seventh year. Applications for sabbatical leave by faculty on nine-month appointments may entail a request for one semester of leave at full pay or for two successive semesters at half pay. Applications for sabbatical leave by faculty on twelve-month appointments and administrators with faculty rank may be made for periods up to six months at full pay or for periods of over six months to one calendar year at half pay. There shall be no discrimination between one-semester or two-semester sabbaticals for nine-month faculty and between six-month or twelve-month sabbaticals for faculty with twelve-month appointments. Certain fringe benefits may be continued during sabbatical if arrangements are made in advance with the Division of Human Resources. Faculty on sabbatical leave will maintain all the rights and privileges of regular faculty. The following steps should be followed in the application and review processes for sabbatical leaves:

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

- Normally, the proposal for a sabbatical leave should be submitted to an elected departmental committee, chaired by the department chair, for review no later than January 31 (for sabbaticals beginning in the fall semester) or no later than May 31 (for sabbaticals beginning in the spring semester).

- The departmental committee's written recommendation shall be forwarded directly to the dean of the college with a copy to the applicant. The departmental committee will take no longer than two weeks to submit its recommendation.

- The dean of the college will forward his or her recommendation to the Provost and the applicant no later than February 28 or June 30, as appropriate.

- By March 15 or July 15, the Provost will forward his or her recommendation to the President and inform the applicant, the dean of the college, and the chair of the department of his or her recommendation.

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

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

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

J. Sabbatical Leave

Sabbatical leave may be granted by the President of the University to any tenured faculty member holding regular faculty rank who has completed at least six years of full-time service with the university. Normally, a faculty member shall have completed six full years of full-time service with the University to be eligible for sabbatical leave; however, exceptions may be granted upon approval of the department chair (or equivalent supervisor), dean, and Provost. The purpose of sabbatical leave is to relieve faculty of normal duties so that they might pursue significant projects facilitating their professional growth and development, thus enhancing their future contributions to the mission of the university. There is no period of service to the University or any other conditions that shall ensure that such leaves are granted, automatically upon completion of the necessary period of service. Sabbaticals cannot occur more frequently than every seventh year.

Applications for sabbatical leave by faculty on nine-month appointments may entail a request for one semester of leave at full pay or for two successive semesters at half pay. Applications for sabbatical leave by faculty on twelve-month appointments and administrators with faculty rank may be made for periods up to six months at full pay or for periods of over six months to one calendar year at half pay. There shall be no discrimination between one-semester or two-semester sabbaticals for nine-month faculty and between six-month or twelve-month sabbaticals for faculty with twelve-month appointments. Certain fringe benefits may be continued during sabbatical if arrangements are made in advance with the Division of Human Resources. Faculty on sabbatical leave will maintain all the rights and privileges of regular faculty except those explicitly restricted elsewhere in the Faculty Manual. Faculty who are on sabbatical leave are still considered employees of Clemson University and, therefore, may not be employed by another entity. Faculty on sabbatical leave are, however, eligible to engage in outside professional consulting or receive honoraria, in accordance with the University's consulting policy and provided such activities pose no conflict of interest to the University.

The following steps should be followed in the application and review processes for sabbatical leaves:

- Applicants requesting sabbatical leaves should prepare a proposal containing information on the goals of the sabbatical including supporting materials and information on how the teaching, student advising/mentoring, service, and any administrative responsibilities of the applicant will be handled while he or she is away from campus. If relevant, the applicant must consult with the department chair (or school director or immediate supervisor) concerning teaching responsibilities.

- Normally, the proposal for a sabbatical leave should be submitted to an elected departmental committee, chaired by the department chair, for review no later than January 31 (for sabbaticals beginning in the fall semester) or no later than May 31 (for sabbaticals beginning in the spring semester).

- The departmental committee's written recommendation shall be forwarded directly to the dean of the college with a copy to the applicant. The departmental committee will take no longer than two weeks to submit its recommendation.
• The dean of the college will forward his or her recommendation to the Provost and the applicant no later than February 28 or June 30, as appropriate.

• By March 15 or July 15, the Provost will forward his or her recommendation to the President and inform the applicant, the dean of the college, and the chair of the department of his or her recommendation.

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

Administrators with Faculty rank should prepare a proposal containing information on the goals of the sabbatical including supporting materials and information on how the assigned duties of the applicant will be handled while he or she is away from campus. This proposal should be submitted to his/her immediate supervisor no later than January 31 (for sabbaticals beginning in the fall semester) or no later than May 31 (for sabbaticals beginning in the spring semester). The supervisor will forward his or her recommendation to the Provost or the President, as appropriate, no later than February 28 or June 30, as appropriate. If forwarded to the Provost, he or she will forward his or her recommendation to the President by March 15 or July 15, as appropriate, and inform the applicant and his or her immediate supervisor of the recommendation. The President shall render his or her decision within two weeks of receiving a recommendation.

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

Sabbatical leaves are granted in good faith. Faculty granted sabbatical leave shall sign an agreement to maintain University employment for a period at least equal to the period of the sabbatical, or to repay the University any compensation they received from the University during the period of the sabbatical. The obligation to repay shall not apply in situations where a faculty member is unable to return to University employment for reasons beyond the control of the faculty member.

When such a leave is ended, a faculty member is expected to return to regular service with the university for at least one contract year or, at the university's request, refund the remuneration received from the university during that time. Upon return from sabbatical leave the faculty member shall file a written report with the department chair or school director or immediate supervisor on his/her professional activities during the leave period.
J. Sabbatical Leave

Sabbatical leave may be granted by the President of the University to any faculty member holding regular faculty rank. Normally, a faculty member shall have completed six full years of full time service with the University to be eligible for sabbatical leave; however, exceptions may be granted upon approval of the department chair (or equivalent supervisor), dean, and Provost. The purpose of sabbatical leave is to relieve faculty of normal duties so that they might pursue significant projects facilitating their professional growth and development, thus enhancing their future contributions to the mission of the university. There is no period of service to the University or any other conditions that shall ensure that such leaves are granted.

Applications for sabbatical leave by faculty on nine-month appointments may entail a request for one semester of leave at full pay or for two successive semesters at half pay. Applications for sabbatical leave by faculty on twelve-month appointments and administrators with faculty rank may be made for periods up to six months at full pay or for periods of over six months to one calendar year at half pay. There shall be no discrimination between one-semester or two-semester sabbaticals for nine-month faculty and between six-month or twelve-month sabbaticals for faculty with twelve-month appointments. Certain fringe benefits may be continued during sabbatical if arrangements are made in advance with the Division of Human Resources. Faculty on sabbatical leave will maintain all the rights and privileges of regular faculty except those explicitly restricted elsewhere in the Faculty Manual. Faculty who are on sabbatical leave are still considered employees of Clemson University and, therefore, may not be employed by another entity. Faculty on sabbatical leave are, however, eligible to engage in outside professional consulting or receive honoraria, in accordance with the University’s consulting policy and provided such activities pose no conflict of interest to the University.

The following steps should be followed in the application and review processes for sabbatical leaves:

- Applicants requesting sabbatical leaves should prepare a proposal containing information on the goals of the sabbatical including supporting materials and information on how the teaching, student advising/mentoring, service, and any administrative responsibilities of the applicant will be handled while he or she is away from campus. If relevant, an applicant must consult with the department chair (or school director or immediate supervisor) concerning teaching responsibilities.

- The proposal for a sabbatical leave should be submitted to an elected departmental committee, chaired by the department chair, for review no later than January 31 (for sabbaticals beginning in the fall semester) or no later than May 31 (for sabbaticals beginning in the spring semester).

- The departmental committee’s written recommendation shall be forwarded directly to the dean of the college with a copy to the applicant. The departmental committee will take no longer than two weeks to submit its recommendation.

- The dean of the college will forward his or her recommendation to the Provost and the applicant no later than February 28 or June 30, as appropriate.

- By March 15 or July 15, the Provost will forward his or her recommendation to the President and inform the applicant, the dean of the college, and the chair of the department of his or her recommendation.

Administrators with Faculty rank should prepare a proposal containing information on the goals of the sabbatical including supporting materials and information on how the assigned duties of the applicant will be handled while he or she is away from campus. This proposal should be submitted to his/her immediate supervisor no later than January 31 (for sabbaticals beginning in the fall semester) or no later than May 31 (for sabbaticals beginning in the spring semester). The supervisor will forward his or her recommendation to the Provost or the President, as appropriate, no later than February 28 or June 30, as appropriate. If forwarded to the Provost, he or she will forward his or her recommendation to the President by March 15 or July 15, as appropriate, and inform the applicant and his or her immediate supervisor of the recommendation. The President shall render his or her decision within two weeks of receiving a recommendation.
The President shall render his or her decision within two weeks of receiving the Provost's recommendation.

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

Sabbatical leaves are granted in good faith. Faculty granted sabbatical leave shall sign an agreement to maintain University employment for a period at least equal to the period of the sabbatical, or to repay the University any compensation they received from the University during the period of the sabbatical. The obligation to repay shall not apply in situations where a faculty member is unable to return to University employment for reasons beyond the control of the faculty member. Upon return from sabbatical leave the faculty member shall file a written report with the department chair or school director or immediate supervisor on his/her professional activities during the leave period.

**Rationale:** In order to accommodate meritorious cases where earlier or more frequent sabbatical would mutually and considerably benefit a faculty member and the University, the firm 6-year service eligibility criterion for sabbatical has been softened to allow for exceptions. The burden of establishing the merit of a sabbatical proposal and explaining how and applicant's duties will be handled while away from campus remains with the applicant. The proposed change ensures consistency with State law by prohibiting faculty on sabbatical, who remain in the employ of Clemson University, to be formally employed by another entity; this restriction, which also protects faculty from violating State law, would not prohibit faculty from receiving allowed remuneration in the form of consultation fees, honoraria, etc as long as such arrangements are in accord with established Clemson policy on consulting and conflict of interest. Missing in the current Faculty Manual is a clear procedure for administrators seeking sabbatical; the proposed change provides one. The change also requires a signed agreement by the faculty member, who agrees to either return to the University (unless he/she cannot due to circumstances beyond his/her control) for at least a period equal to the sabbatical leave or to repay the University any compensation received from the University during the sabbatical.
Proposed Changes:

G. The Department Chairs

Department Chairs are generally responsible for the activities of their departments, for which they are accountable to the school director and/or to the dean of the college. Their primary responsibility is to ensure the quality of the teaching, research, and public service program and its delivery within their departments while continuing to engage in their own teaching, scholarship, and public service activities. Department chairs represent their departments in relations with other departments and schools and with the deans and other administrative officers of the university. In exercising leadership in the improvement of departmental programs and of the departmental faculty, a chair is expected to take initiatives to report that unit’s needs and advocate its goals and plans.

A department chair’s specific functions include:

- ensuring implementation of departmental policies and procedures involving peer evaluations; recommending faculty appointment, reappointment, tenure, promotion, termination, and dismissal; negotiating with prospective faculty;
- monitoring departmental implementation of Affirmative Action policies and procedures;
- annually evaluating each member of the department’s faculty and participating in the evaluation of staff; developing budgets in concert with school directors and college deans and allocating such funds for instructional and other purposes;
- hearing informal faculty grievances and cooperating in formal grievance procedures;
- supervising the department’s program of instruction, including curriculum, scheduling, faculty workload, and departmental research and public service;
- ensure that the written faculty workload procedures are agreed upon and reviewed by departmental faculty;
- ensuring that students’ rights are preserved; supervising the advising of departmental majors and graduate students;
- monitoring student evaluation of instruction, courses, and programs;
- providing leadership in student recruitment, student advising, and student placement;
- coordinating and supervising summer school programs and freshman/transfer orientations;
- making recommendations concerning applications for professional travel and sabbatical leave;
- arranging meetings of the departmental faculty; meeting with the departmental advisory committee and appropriate constituent and advisory groups for the discipline;
- establishing accreditation and ad hoc departmental committees; and
- carrying out other such duties as shall be assigned by the school director and/or the dean of the college or as set down in university policy, or in collegiate bylaws, school or departmental bylaws.

Department chairs serve at the pleasure of their respective school directors and collegiate deans, who formally evaluate the performance in office of chairs reporting to them before the end of the chair’s second year in office and every fourth year thereafter. In making recommendations for reappointment, deans will transmit the results of the faculty evaluation of the chair and confer with the Provost before renewing the appointment. All chairs of academic departments hold faculty rank.
PART VI. THE UNIVERSITY'S ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE

G. The Department Chairs

Department Chairs are generally responsible for the activities of their departments, for which they are accountable to the school director and/or to the dean of the college. Their primary responsibility is to ensure the quality of the teaching, research, and public service program and its delivery within their departments while continuing to engage in their own teaching, scholarship, and public service activities. Department chairs represent their departments in relations with other departments and schools and with the deans and other administrative officers of the university. In exercising leadership in the improvement of departmental programs and of the departmental faculty, a chair is expected to take initiatives to report that unit’s needs and advocate its goals and plans.

A department chair’s specific functions include:

- ensuring implementation of departmental policies and procedures involving peer evaluations; recommending faculty appointment, reappointment, tenure, promotion, termination, and dismissal; negotiating with prospective faculty;
- monitoring departmental implementation of Affirmative Action policies and procedures;
- annually evaluating each member of the department’s faculty and participating in the evaluation of staff; developing budgets in concert with school directors and college deans and allocating such funds for instructional and other purposes;
- hearing informal faculty grievances and cooperating in formal grievance procedures;
- supervising the department’s program of instruction, including curriculum, scheduling, faculty workload, and departmental research and public service;
- ensuring that students’ rights are preserved; supervising the advising of departmental majors and graduate students;
- monitoring student evaluation of instruction, courses, and programs;
- providing leadership in student recruitment, student advising, and student placement;
- coordinating and supervising summer school programs and freshman/transfer orientations;
- making recommendations concerning applications for professional travel and sabbatical leave;
- arranging meetings of the departmental faculty; meeting with the departmental advisory committee and appropriate constituent and advisory groups for the discipline;
- establishing accreditation and ad hoc departmental committees; and
- carrying out other such duties as shall be assigned by the school director and/or the dean of the college or as set down in university policy, or in collegiate bylaws, school or departmental bylaws.

Department chairs serve at the pleasure of their respective school directors and collegiate deans, who formally evaluate the performance in office of chairs reporting to them before the end of the chair’s second year in office and every fourth year thereafter. In making recommendations for reappointment, deans will transmit the results of the faculty evaluation of the chair and confer with the Provost before renewing the appointment. All chairs of academic departments hold faculty rank.
Proposed Changes:

B. Work Load

Each department must have written procedures for assignment of workload. These written workload procedures will be included as an Appendix to the Department’s Bylaws. The written procedures will be developed by the Departmental Advisory Committee or the Department as a whole, voted on by the Faculty, and per the same procedure as adoption of Departmental Bylaws, will be approved by the Department Chair, Dean of the respective College, and the Provost. The procedures must be reviewed by the Department at least every 2 years. Specifically, each Department will include in these procedures, allocation of credit hour equivalency for all activities that a faculty member may undertake in teaching, research, service/extension, and administrative appointments. Workload assignments for faculty on non-teaching appointments and librarians are made on the basis of particular tasks to be accomplished or periods to be covered. Workload assignments will directly correspond with categories and reporting mechanisms of the Faculty Activity System and will be based on a 4 block system per semester. Individual workload assignments for faculty will also be reported on a percentage basis. A faculty member’s workload for the year will be determined prior to approval of Faculty Activity System goals by department chairs, and will be provided in writing to the faculty member by the chair.

Faculty workload may include any combination of teaching and research assignments; service to the department, school, college, and the university; and/or other professional activities. The standard workload assignment at Clemson University is 12 credit hour equivalents for each of the two regular semesters. The particular workload assignment of an individual faculty member may, for a number of reasons, vary from department to department and even within departments.

Workload is assigned to faculty by the department chair on the basis of written departmental procedures. Factors taken into consideration include: departmental needs, faculty expertise, faculty preferences for particular teaching assignments, faculty schedules, and the nature and extent of nonteaching workloads, depending upon the staffing situation in a given department each year. Faculty research, whether funded or unfunded, may be assigned as credit hour equivalents based on written procedures. Service assignments (e.g., committee work, administrative duties, advisory responsibilities, public service) may also be assigned as credit hour equivalents based on written procedures. Departmental procedures should address issues such as teaching graduate courses, off-campus courses, distance learning courses, course development, or unusually large classes as considerations in workload credit hour equivalency allocation.
PART IX. PROFESSIONAL PRACTICES

B. Work Load

The normal faculty workload entails teaching and research assignments; service to the department, school, college, and the university; and/or other professional activities. The usual teaching assignment at Clemson University is 9-12 credit hours for each of the two regular semesters. The particular teaching assignment of an individual faculty member may, for a number of reasons, vary from department to department and even within departments. Departments with heavy faculty research obligations may in some instances reduce teaching loads and assign the hours so released to research. Released time may also be provided through funded research. Unusually heavy service assignments (e.g., committee work, administrative duties, advisory responsibilities, public service) may also lead to reduced teaching assignments, depending upon the staffing situation in a given department. In some instances graduate courses, off-campus courses, or unusually large classes may be considerations in workload decisions.

Off-campus courses are offered by some colleges, including the program at Furman University leading to the Master of Business Administration degree through the College of Business and Behavioral Sciences and the courses taught at the University Center of Greenville. These courses are taught by Clemson faculty and carry university credit.

Work assignments for faculty on non-teaching appointments and librarians are made on the basis of particular tasks to be accomplished or periods to be covered. Workloads for faculty members whose responsibilities include teaching as well as non-teaching assignments are established on a percentage basis.

Courses are assigned to faculty by the department chair on the basis of established departmental procedures. Factors taken into consideration include: departmental needs, faculty expertise, faculty preferences for particular teaching assignments, faculty schedules, and the nature and extent of nonteaching workloads.
MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
MARCH 8, 2011

1. Call to Order: The Faculty Senate Meeting was called to order at 2:37 p.m. by President Bill Surver and guests were recognized. Angela Nixon introduced herself and informed the Senate of her new position as Public Information Director, replacing Beth Jarrard, who outstandingly served the University and the Faculty Senate for many years in this capacity.

Vice President/President-Elect Dan Warner then read aloud and presented a Resolution of Thanks and Appreciation to Larry L. LaForge, for his recognition, dedication and effective service as Faculty Athletics Representative, and for his commitment to promoting and upholding high standards for Clemson's athletic programs and their student athletes (FS11-04-2 P).

2. Approval of Minutes: The Faculty Senate Minutes dated February 8, 2011 were approved as distributed.

3. Special Orders of the Day: Gail DiSabatino, Vice President for Student Affairs, presented and shared information on students, faculty and alcohol, noting that it is the biggest issue on Clemson’s campus and beyond. Vice President DiSabatino asked for the faculty’s assistance to address the issue. Noting cuts in the federal budget and that educational programs are in place but not working, she further noted that because the issue is so complex it must be addressed at all levels. VP DiSabatino urged faculty to recognize their role as teachers in this very important effort by: using the syllabus, correcting misperceptions, taking advantage of teachable moments, monitoring personal language and jokes, understanding your role as advisor, and raising the bar. In response to a question submitted to the AAH Senators regarding compensation for students holding student government office, VP DiSabatino stated that students are compensated for their part in student government. Serving in this capacity requires much time and dedication. The administration believes that this service is comparable to internships and is valuable to their student experience on and off campus, now and in the future. A question and answer period followed and no objections were expressed by the Senate to this compensation for these students.

Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, Dori Helms, then provided the Faculty Senate with up-to-date information on “the plan.” As a result of the meetings this year among the Vice Presidents, the Faculty Senate President and each academic department, the plan is to pursue excellence in: student quality and performance, student engagement and leadership experiences, top people and competitive infrastructure. A question and answer period followed.
3. Election of Faculty Senate Officers:
a. President Surver asked for nominations from the floor for the positions of Vice President/President-Elect and Secretary. There were none. The floor for nominations was then closed. Elections were then held by secret ballot. Jeremy King was elected as Vice President/President-Elect and Scott Dutkiewicz, as Secretary.

President Surver then reminded all Senators to ensure that college elections for the Faculty Senate are being held within respective colleges.

4. “Free Speech”: None

5. Committee Reports:
a. Standing Committees
   1) Due to the length of the meeting, Standing Committee Chairs submitted written reports and asked Senators to contact them if they had any questions.

b. Select Senate Committees:
   1) Budget Accountability Committee – Senator Figliola announced that this Committee will meet on Monday.

   2) Academic Calendar Committee – Chair Pat Smart stated that this Committee will meet soon and that this issue is an ongoing process.

   3) Lecturer Committee – Chair Dan Warner highlighted the select committee’s draft report which will be submitted to the Executive/Advisory Committee for further review prior to being brought back to the Senate for acceptance.

c. University Commissions and Committees:
   1) Grievance Board Chair, Kelly Smith, briefly explained both the Grievance Category I and Grievance Category II Activity Reports.

6. President’s Report: President Surver:
a. responded to questions submitted to the AAH Senators, President Surver explained that his salary was increased last year by the addition of a supplement for being named an Alumni Distinguished Professor, as did all new Alumni Distinguished Professors. This was reported on last year’s salary report and is reflected in this year’s report. His salary reported on the State newspaper website is 2 years behind. The Faculty Senate President does receive release time. This year, at the suggestion of the previous Senate President, the release time was increased to full time. President Surver is teaching a course. He also noted that Biological Sciences donated his release time so no additional funds were contributed. President Surver encouraged any faculty member to submit questions to the Senate.

7. Old Business: None
8. **New Business:**
   a. Proposed *Faculty Manual* Change – Academic Technology Council – Senator King submitted and moved to postpone until the April 12th Senate meeting, which was seconded. There was no discussion. Vote to postpone was taken and passed unanimously.

   b. Proposed *Faculty Manual* Change – Workload – Senator King submitted and moved to postpone until the April 12th Senate meeting, which was seconded. There was no discussion. Vote to postpone was taken and passed unanimously.

   c. Endorsement of Change to Undergraduate Announcements – Acceptance of Students by Major – Senator Horton explained the Committee’s request for the Senate to endorse this change on page 28 of the Undergraduate Announcements, section entitled “Special Requirements,” which states: “Candidates for graduation must be officially accepted in the major in which they are applying for a degree no later than the term prior to submitting the application.” Apparently there have been times when this policy has not been followed, though Mr. Smith indicated that this is not a common occurrence.

   The Scholastic Policies Committee recommends leaving the policy in place but modifying it to state: “Candidates for graduation must be officially accepted in the major in which they are applying for a degree no later than the date applications for diplomas are due.” Vote to endorse the Committee’s recommendation was taken and passed unanimously.

10. **Announcements:**
    a. The next Executive/Advisory Committee meeting will be held on March 29, 2011.

    b. The next Faculty Senate meeting will be held on April 12, 2011.

    c. The Annual Spring Reception will be held on April 12, 2011 immediately following the Faculty Senate meeting at the Connector of the Madren Center.

11. **Adjournment:** President Surver adjourned the meeting at 4:38 p.m.

    [Signature]

    Linda A. Howe, Secretary

    [Signature]

    Cathy Toth Sturkie, Program Coordinator
Absent: L. Temesvari, G. Wang, L. Williams, M. LaForge, M. Morris (J. Leininger for), L. Howe
RESOLUTION OF THANKS AND APPRECIATION

to Robert Lawrence LaForge,

Clemson University Faculty Athletics Representative

FS11-04-2 P

WHEREAS, The position of Faculty Athletics Representative at Clemson University is crucial to the strength of Clemson’s Athletic Program; thereby, its most important function is to affirm the importance of academic integrity internally and externally within the University and the public perception of the University;

WHEREAS, The Faculty Athletics Representative must represent the University and its faculty in the University’s relationships with the National Collegiate Athletic Association and the Atlantic Coast Conference; must ensure academic integrity, facilitate institutional control of intercollegiate athletics and must enhance the student-athlete experience;

WHEREAS, Larry LaForge has served as Clemson University’s Faculty Athletics Representative since 2006; has become familiar with the policies and procedures of the Clemson’s Athletic Council and is knowledgeable of Clemson’s Athletics Program;

WHEREAS, Larry LaForge has ensured academic integrity in the functioning of the Athletics Program; reviewed appropriate records of student athletes relating to eligibility requirements; recruitment, admissions, academic advising and evaluation in a manner consistent with the academic mission of Clemson University;

WHEREAS, Larry LaForge played a supportive and advisory role with Clemson’s Office of Compliance Services and a major role in any institutional inquiry into suspected violations or infractions and in any NCAA athletics certification program reviews; and retained significant responsibilities for institutional control structures and activities; and ensured communications of high standards of student-athlete conduct, both on and off campus and in and out of the classroom;

WHEREAS, Larry LaForge served on the Athletic Council and provided regular reports to the Council which provided faculty with information regarding academic integrity, academic preparation and performance of student-athletes, and other matters pertaining to intercollegiate athletics; and

WHEREAS, Larry LaForge worked diligently to promote a balance in the student-athlete’s experience among athletics, academics and a social life
RESOLVED, That the Faculty Senate, on behalf of the students, staff and Administration, conveys its sincere appreciation and great gratitude to Larry LaForge in recognition of his dedicated and effective service as Faculty Athletics Representative, and his commitment to promoting and upholding high standards for Clemson's athletic programs and their student athletes.
Clemson 2020 Roadmap

Fulfilling a Promise
INVESTMENTS

- Competitive infrastructure
- Top people
- Experiences
- Student engagement and leadership
- Student quality and performance
Implement a strategic enrollment management plan to:

- Increase student quality - undergraduate and graduate
- Enroll a Top-15 freshman class
- Increase enrollment in focus areas
- Increase diversity of undergraduate student body
- Increase capacity for strategic enrollment growth
- Enroll a Top-15 freshman class
- Offer competitive scholarships and stipends

Increase student performance:

- Increase retention and graduation rates to top-15 level
- Increase presentations at national meetings
- Increase nationally competitive awards received

Determine capacity for strategic enrollment growth:

- Increase diversity of undergraduate student body
- Increase enrollment in focus areas

Increase student quality - undergraduate and graduate

Student quality and performance
Create a university culture that values engaged learning

- Nurture creativity, critical thinking, communication skills and ethical academic affairs programming
- Integrate leadership and entrepreneurship throughout Student Affairs and "internal co-op" experiences
- Engage students in running the university machine through internships
- Use the university as a laboratory learning and study abroad
- Double the number of students participating in Creative Inquiry, Service-Learning and Study Abroad
- Offer course credit for structured engagement experiences

Provide real-world, problem-solving, creative leadership and engagement opportunities for every undergraduate

- Add/enhance two new living-learning communities/year
- Recognize and reward faculty for student engagement activities
- Teach differently to build a culture of creativity that stimulates new ideas

STUDENT ENGAGEMENT & LEADERSHIP EXPERIENCES
Strategically address competitive compensation to help retain outstanding faculty and staff.

- With one-time funds, provide bonuses for performance.
- Performance-driven pay increases (not across-the-board)
- Evaluate participation in and results of staff development program.
- Establish compensation guidelines and budgets on an annual basis.
- Council approval.

Compensation Advisory Group developing recommendations for Administrative Council approval.

With cost-of-living adjustments.

Provide performance-driven bonuses for performance/external recognition and "bottom-line" incentives.
Recruit faculty to fill CoEE endowed chairs and add ~ 80 faculty researchers/teams over the next 5 years

- Support economic development in S.C.
- Increase number of national academy members to 10
- Support economic development in S.C.
- Enlist core leaders and lead efforts in emphasis areas that address national "Great Challenges"

- Increase faculty hires in emphasis areas that address national "Great Challenges"

Ensure strong, dedicated leadership for critical university initiatives

Advanced Materials Center
Patewood (Biomedical Research Center)
Greenville Downtown
Summer Programs
Student Engagement and Leadership
Enrollment Management
Distance and Executive Education

Recruit faculty to fill CoEE endowed chairs and add ~ 80
- Fix what's broken
- Build to compete - facilities
- Build to compete - technology
Fix what's broken

- Double annual expenditures for maintenance,
- Complete phase 1 of utility system upgrade, including elimination of coal
- Complete major HVAC and air-quality projects
- Double annual expenditures for maintenance,
Build to compete - facilities

- Flexible lab research space and equipment
- CUBI Graduate education center
- Charleston Architecture Center
- Engineering and science classroom
- Sirrine Hall renovation/addition
- Freeman Hall renovation
- Alternative revenue streams

Enhance teaching and research facilities through

COMPETITIVE INFRASTRUCTURE
Build to compete - facilities

Expand and enhance student housing facilities

- Phase 1 of housing master plan
  - Douthit Hills
  - Core campus
  - Barnett HVAC

Expand and enhance athletics facilities

- Priorities:
  - Pedestrian bridge/plaza
  - Football indoor practice facility
  - Kingsmore Stadium

Requires regulatory reform

Clemson beach/Lake Hartwell

Greek Village

Build to compete - facilities
- Deploy a new student information system
- Enhance business systems to increase efficiency and reduce administrative costs
- Measure impact of high-performance computing
- Enhance digital library resources and technology
- Protect progress (life-cycle replacement)
- Increase number and quality of technology-enhanced classrooms
- Build to compete - technology

COMPETITIVE INFRASTRUCTURE
Reduce personnel costs
- Reallocate/eliminate TER1 positions as people retire
- Offer targeted retirement and severance incentives
- Fill selected vacant staff positions with student interns
- Continue selective outsourcing of non-core functions

Reduce administrative and institutional support costs
- Continue selective outsourcing of non-core functions
- Fill selected vacant staff positions with student interns
- Offer early retirement and severance incentives
- Reallocation/elimination of TER1 positions as people retire

Reduce or eliminate E&G subsidies
- Shift the Madren Center and Alumni Relations to generated revenue
- Shift selected Master's programs to full pay and PhD assistantships to grants
- Combine aviation services, outsource; sell surplus university airplane
- Combine administrative and costly administrative policies and procedures

Restructure departments to enhance quality, build capacity, and create opportunities for new degree programs or enhanced student services
- Continue to phase out E&G funding to selected research centers and institutes
- Shift selected Master's programs to full pay and PhD assistantships to grants
- Shift the Madren Center and Alumni Relations to generated revenue

Leverage existing funds for start-ups, capital improvements, deferred maintenance and technology upgrades
- Reduce waiver of indirect costs and cost sharing
- Vary faculty workloads based on teaching and research strengths
- Merge Michigan Career Center and Cooperative Education
- Phase out low-enrollment degree programs as current majors graduate

DIVESTMENTS
NEW REVENUE

Complete $600M capital campaign to generate over 5 years:

- $110+M in cash to support students, faculty and programs
- $60+M in capital / facilities (academics and athletics)

Double net revenue from online and distance education

Increase departmentally generated revenues by 50%

Increase summer school net revenue by 50%

Develop $25 million in strategic partnerships with new corporations, private companies, and other universities and colleges

Increase research expenditures by 50%

Leverage IT capabilities

Fully leverage existing debt capacity

Leverage IT capabilities

Years:

Complete $600M capital campaign to generate over 5
Faculty Senate Finance Committee

Final Report 2010 - 2011

Committee Senators: Figliola (Chair), Chapman, Goddard, Hewitt, Meriwether, Morris, Wang

The Committee met on the third Tuesday of each month in Room 215 Fluor-Daniel at 2:30PM.

Compensation Report Study (Lead: Wang)

The Annual Compensation Report was released in February, 2011. It incorporated changes developed over the past few years to elaborate on salary changes. The Committee is still engaged in discussions to include a total compensation column to the Annual Report.

University Budget Flow (Lead: Figliola; Second: Goddard)

The Committee was represented on the University Budget Accountability Committee (BAC) by Senator Figliola. Highlights this year included visits to the Senate by CFO Brett Dalton to present a primer on money flows at the University and elaborate on Budget expenditures versus Budget Resources by general category.

University International Programs Study (Lead: Morris)

The Committee requested a report on the financial aspects of International Programs. Vice Provost David Grigsby made a presentation to the Senate on his office budget details and activities. We learned that each College also has international study activity but he did not provide details of those costs and incomes. He reported that program assessment processes were planned.

Lab Fees and Other Fees (Lead: Meriwether)

Continued studies into lab fee use has returned mixed results. The intent for lab fees is to recover direct operating expenses of operating a lab. Half of lab fees collected are retained by the Provost and used for facility renovation, a procedure approved by the Trustees. That portion is clearly accounted for. The other half of the collected fees are returned to the Colleges for distribution to the Departments and distributed on the basis earned. That portion is clearly accounted for. The review found mixed results on how fees were actually being used at the college and department levels. There is not a clear accounting for fees at the lower levels with a portion of fees being used for central college administration and a portion of fees used by chairs in covering other department operating expenses.

The growing list of added student fees merits the question: how is the amount of a fee assessed, what is the process for adding a fee, and how are the acquired funds actually used. The question will be addressed in the 2011 – 2012 period.

Sabbatical Policy (Lead: Figliola)

At its February meeting, the Senate approved a change to the wording of the Sabbatical Policy, with opposition. The new policy brings to issue the legality of external compensation beyond “consulting and honoraria”, the procedure for receiving approval for other types of external compensation, and the process needed for legally receiving compensation from another institution while on sabbatical leave. A key point is that faculty on sabbatical are often compensated for duties within their areas of competence at the host institution, which could be considered “employment,” such as teaching classes or engaging in research activity.
Faculty who are on sabbatical leave are still considered employees of Clemson University and, therefore, may not be employed by another entity. Faculty on sabbatical leave are, however, eligible to engage in outside professional consulting or receive honoraria, in accordance with the University’s consulting policy and provided such activities pose no conflict of interest to the University.

Senator Figliola (with President-elect Warner) have met with University counsel in attempts to clarify the definitions of employment and types of compensation allowed, and for setting up a simple process for granting administrative approval for any faculty compensation that may be considered as a form of employment, albeit it temporary. Counsel is working with the Senate and considering changes to the Sabbatical Request form and clarification language. The action will be addressed in the 2011 – 2012 period and forwarded to Policy, as appropriate.

Other Business:

Sales and Use Tax requirements (Lead: Chapman)

The South Carolina sales and use tax policy on departmental purchases was reviewed and the policy clarified for faculty information. Items purchased for research purposes that include equipment or are related to equipment are exempt from sales and use tax and a form for that purpose is on the Office of Sponsored Programs website. The Committee found that many faculty were not aware of this exemption and provided a reminder with a link to the appropriate form.
FACULTY SENATE SCHOLASTIC POLICIES  
Report for 2010-2011

SCHOLASTIC POLICIES COMMITTEE 2010-2011
Bob Horton (Chair, HEHD)  
Sean Brittain (E&S)  
David Tonkyn (AFLS)  
Xiaobo Hu (BBS)  
Kelly Smith (AAH)  
Leslie Williams (AAH)

Attendance Policy
A concern has been raised about some professors’ unwillingness to accept any excused absences, invoking a “death penalty” for students who miss a pre-determined number of classes regardless of circumstances. Though students can file a grievance, this is done after the conclusion of the course. Furthermore, some students may be disinclined to file a grievance for fear of retribution.

This is an issue we will continue to discuss. At this point we do not see a change in policy forthcoming. However, we would encourage some type of communication asking faculty to follow Clemson policy and to be reasonable about making decisions that can have such a profound impact upon students. We also recommend investigating the creation of a process that students might follow when they believe they are being treated unfairly and in opposition to university policy.

A major related concern is having students attend class for fear of grade repercussions when they have a contagious disease. We hope that Redfern could assist in this matter by certifying that, when appropriate, a student should not attend class to protect both her or his own health and the health of others in the classroom. Ben Boone is meeting with George Clay to discuss this.

Academic Integrity: Lead Kelly Smith
The issue concerns, at least in large part, how to deal with dishonesty that is not tied directly to a course (e.g. plagiarism on an essay competition). Though we will continue to look at this issue, at this point we believe that dishonesty that is not tied directly to a course should be dealt with via the Student Code of Conduct and the Office of Community and Ethical Standards, not as a breach of Academic Integrity policy.

We have also been asked to provide guidance as to whether planning to cheat is a violation of Academic Integrity. The Student Senate has passed a resolution arguing against this. We believe this too should continue to be dealt with via the Student Code of Conduct and the Office of Community and Ethical Standards. Nevertheless, it’s an issue we want to continue to discuss.

Undergraduate Senate’s Academic Affairs Committee
- Ben Boone mentioned that they are still waiting for the okay to send the survey concerning online courses. It should go sometime in early March.
- An ad hoc group is still discussing General Education through brainstorming sessions.
- They are meeting with George Clay in an effort to have Redfern issue excused absences.
- They are looking at the framework for Academic Integrity in the hopes of helping to restructure Grievance. One aspect that would help is having a steady pool of counselors.
- The survey on BlackBoard showed that students are not overly dissatisfied with faculty ability to use BlackBoard but would like to see improvement in use of 1) Gradebook, 2) Calendar, 3) Uploaded documents, and 4) Announcements.
• Their big project is trying to establish Advisory Boards for each college, much as BBS has done. Though this will not be finished this spring, they hope the groundwork will have been laid to complete this next year. absences.

Graduate Advisory Committee
In August 2010, SP voiced unanimous support for the proposed change to the Graduate Advisory Committee. This was passed back to Policy and presented and passed at the EAC meeting.

Summer Schedule
This is in place for summer 2011. Another committee continues to look at details of implementation and attracting more students to attend Clemson during the summer.

Definition of Credit Hour
Scholastic Policies believes this is an important issue that needs to be addressed. A committee, led by Dale Layfield, has been established to evaluate distance education. At some later date, we may revisit this, using the information this committee gathers, to help establish some type of policy.

Graduate Committees
We have collected data on how various departments are using Form 3 and FAS to identify which faculty members may serve on students’ graduate committees. We have found that that this policy is not being uniformly enforced and that there is great variation in how this determination is made.

We have recommended that each department develop a policy for making this determination and include it in their bylaws. This should reduce the potential for problems and give faculty members a means of recourse when they are unhappy with a decision that they believe was not made correctly. This was agreed to by the Executive Advisory Committee and a letter has been sent by Bill Surver to the Provost.

Graduate Credit Applied to Undergraduate Degree
We have approved the following statement. EAC and the Faculty Senate have also endorsed it.

Degree-seeking undergraduate students may apply graduate level coursework toward their undergraduate degree at the discretion of the degree-granting program. Ordinarily, graduate credits taken at institutions other than Clemson University will be awarded only if those institutions are in good standing with regional accrediting organizations. The Graduate Council approved this, but limited it to 12 hours.

Academic Integrity and Academic Redemption
These policies were somewhat at odds with each other. SP was asked to make a recommendation on a proposal. Academic Integrity stated, “If a student is found in violation of the academic integrity policy and receives a redeemable grade as the penalty, he/she will not be allowed to redeem that grade under the Academic Redemption Policy” (p. 30 2010-2011 Undergraduate Announcements). The current Academic Redemption Policy states, “The ARP may not be applied to...any course in which the student was previously found in violation of the academic integrity policy” (p. 26, 2010-2011 Undergraduate Announcements).
The proposed wording for the Academic Redemption Policy is as follows: “The ARP may not be applied to...any course in which the student was previously found in violation of the academic integrity policy and received a redeemable grade as the penalty.” We did not support this proposed change to the Academic Redemption Policy. While we agreed that the two policies need to match, we believed the Academic Integrity Policy should be modified to match the Academic Redemption Policy. We were unanimous in our opposition to this proposed change. Our recommendation was to leave the current Academic Redemption Policy alone. This recommendation was made to the Undergraduate Council and was supported by the Undergraduate Senate’s Academic Affairs. The Undergraduate Academic Council accepted our suggestion and approved the change as we have recommended. Students who have been found in violation cannot redeem the course.

Method of Delivery
A concern had been brought to our attention as to whether or not a faculty member should have some say in the method of delivery for a course. A department’s curriculum committee had decided that no courses would be offered online in fall and spring semesters, even for courses that were offered online in summer. If this is because online courses are deemed to be inferior, then the implication is that we do not care as much about the quality of courses in the summer as we do in fall and spring, something we find problematic.

Though we believe the decision on delivery should be made as locally as possible, we also believe that the faculty member should have input on the decision and blanket policies on the delivery method are not advisable.

We also note that Clemson is required to track and report the usage of online courses.

Enforcement of Prerequisites
Exceptions have been made for students to enroll in classes for which they do not have the proper prerequisites. In one reported case, the exception was granted by the intervention of a Senator. Others have reported cases of upper administrators allowing enrollment. Faculty members do have the right to enforce stated prerequisites. In fact, Mr. Smith discussed and showed us a means for faculty to check whether or not students have the proper prerequisites. This is available via the Registrar’s homepage. Faculty can work with Kelly McDavid in the Registrar’s Office if they desire.

Faculty-Authored Textbooks and Course Materials
A form currently exists that was created a few years back and vetted through the legal offices to ensure it was in compliance with South Carolina law. After considerable discussion, we have determined that the current form is satisfactory, and we request that all college offices be reminded of the form’s existence and make the form readily available, and that faculty be reminded periodically of their legal requirement to complete the form when they assign texts or course materials for which they have a potential financial gain. In a survey earlier this year triggered by an audit, we found that, as a whole, we as a university were not in compliance.

We had also been asked to explore whether faculty should file a form to disclose when they are working on a text or other course materials for which they may have future financial gain. We determined that this was not needed or desirable. We discussed that in some cases, authoring a text or course materials could be a form of scholarship that should be rewarded and count toward the faculty member’s evaluation, while in other cases, it may not be deemed worthwhile scholarship activity. However, that is not a decision for Scholastics Policy, but for the faculty member and her/his supervisor.

Gen Ed
There has been talk about eliminating the distinction between literature and non-literature for the Arts & Humanities General Education requirement. Though our discussions suggested we do not favor eliminating the distinction, at this point we believe that this should be left in the hands of the Curriculum Committee, which is, of course, composed of faculty members who represent their departments and colleges. Consequently, we urge faculty members to voice their concerns to their Curriculum Committee representatives.
Academic Eligibility Policy Committee: Lead David Tonkyn
David was SP's representative on this committee. The policy has been rewritten and is pending final approval. The major change is students new to Clemson will have three semesters instead of two to complete before they may be suspended.

Acceptance into Major and Graduation
We were asked to consider the statement on page 28 of the Undergraduate Announcements, under the section entitled "Special Requirements," which states: "Candidates for graduation must be officially accepted in the major in which they are applying for a degree no later than the term prior to submitting the application." Apparently there have been times when this policy has not been followed, though Mr. Smith indicated that this is not a common occurrence.

Our recommendation was to leave the policy in place but modify it to state: "Candidates for graduation must be officially accepted in the major in which they are applying for a degree no later than the date applications for diplomas are due." The Executive/Advisory Committee raised no objections to this.
Report of the Faculty Senate Policy Committee
15 Feb 2011 Meeting

Committee members present: Claudio Cantalupo, Scott Dutkiewicz, Jeremy King, Dale Layfield, Jane Lindle, Bill Pennington

Special guests: Marvin Carmichael, Fran Mcguire, Pat Smart, Gerald Vander Mey

The Policy Committee met on 15 February 2011 and conducted the following items of business:

1. The committee discussed again a draft of a Faculty Manual change formalizing the Presidential Commission on Sustainability (PCS) kindly provided by the Office of President Barker. Marvin Carmichael (President Barker’s Chief of Staff) and Gerald Vander Mey (Campus Planning Director) kindly joined the committee to answer several questions about the draft and the ongoing and future role of the Commission. The Policy Committee felt a number of changes would be in order to ensure greater consistency of the structure of this Commission with others reporting to the University President. Senator King will forward the draft with the changes to the Commission for review and approval.

2. The committee discussed a proposed Faculty Manual change related to criteria for the rank of Assistant Professor. The proposed change would supplement the “normal” requirement of a terminal degree or the “possible” alternative of progress towards the terminal degree with the additional alternative of relevant experience. The committee believed this would provide needed, but currently unavailable, flexibility in making Adjunct appointments at the Assistant Professor rank for some candidates. The change was approved and forwarded to the E/AC for review and consideration.
Annual Report of the Faculty Senate Policy Committee  
2010/2011 Academic Year

Committee Members: Senators Claudio Cantalupo (BBS), Scott Dutkiewicz (Libraries), Jeremy King (Chair; CoES), Dale Layfield (CAFLS), Jane Lindle (HEHD), Bill Pennington (CoES), Pradip Srimani (CoES)

The 2010/2011 academic year was an active one for the Policy Committee. Significant activities/products of the committee are summarized below. The Committee gratefully acknowledges that it was once again privileged to benefit from collegial working relationships and constructive feedback, suggestions, and guidance from a large number of concerned and helpful faculty, staff, and administrators across campus—especially, the Office of General Counsel, which provided willing assistance to the committee throughout the year. It is a sincere pleasure to single out Fran McGuire (Faculty Manual Editorial Consultant), Pat Smart (Interim Assistant Provost for Faculty Relations), and Cathy Sturkie (Faculty Senate Program coordinator) for their sage and regular counsel to the committee in the course of its work throughout the year.

- The committee recommended a Faculty Manual changing the name of the Alcohol and Other Drug Task Force, providing it with a definite charge, and revising its membership. The changes were ultimately approved by the Senate.

- The committee recommended a change to the Faculty Manual related to changing the Faculty Manual. The proposed revision would allow the Faculty Manual to be updated on short notice. Such immediate inclusions would be subject to stringent requirements for approval, as well as for subsequent notification. The proposed change was ultimately approved by the Senate.

- The committee proposed 3 separate changes to the Faculty Manual related to the Grievance Board, Grievance Hearings. The proposed change would require two Senior Lecturers elected by the Senate E/AC to be eligible to act (at the discretion of the Grievance Board) as non-voting consultants to the Board or its Hearing Panels in grievance cases involving lecturers. The proposed changes were ultimately approved by the Senate.

- The committee proposed a change to the Faculty Manual recognizing the University’s Intellectual property policy, which was approved by the Administrative Council in November 2009. The change was not an endorsement of this policy, but updated the existence and
The committee proposed a Faculty Manual change related to Sabbatical Leaves. The proposed change: relaxed the firm 6-year full time service eligibility requirement for sabbatical, advises faculty to be aware of dual employment restrictions while on sabbatical, require a signed agreement by the faculty member to maintain service with Clemson for a period at least equal to the sabbatical leave, and provides a procedure for administrators seeking sabbatical to apply. The proposed change was ultimately approved by the Senate.

The committee continued to support a change to the Faculty Manual related to membership on the Graduate Advisory Committee—such a change was initially suggested by the committee last academic year. After a long and tortuous path of endorsement, the proposed change placing one faculty member representing all the interdisciplinary programs housed within the Graduate School on the GAC was approved by the Senate.

The committee revised another holdover proposed Faculty Manual change from the previous academic year—this one related to the contentious issue of evaluation of teaching by students. The proposed change updates the Manual to reflect the current evaluation system, requires that student evaluation forms be consistent with current research-based practices in teaching evaluation, clarifies the difference in Chair access and instructor access to various parts of the evaluation, and reiterates that evaluation of teaching in general must be carried out using means other than student evaluations. The proposed change was ultimately approved by the Senate.

The committee recommended a Faculty Manual change noting that there exists eligibility criteria for those individuals who receive remuneration provided by public funds that is associated with award programs. The change notes that the eligibility criteria are available in the HR Policy and Procedures Manual. This change was endorsed by the E/AC, but was postponed by the Senate in order to resolve a question concerning awards using Foundation funds. It is hoped that this issue can be resolved by the end of the Senate year.

The committee proposed a Faculty Manual change related to criteria for the rank of Assistant Professor. The proposed change would supplement the “normal” requirement of a terminal degree or the “possible” alternative of progress towards the terminal degree with the additional alternative of relevant experience. The committee believed this would provide needed, but currently unavailable, flexibility in making Adjunct appointments at the Assistant Professor rank for some candidates. The change was approved by the committee, but rejected by the E/AC.
The committee reviewed and slightly revised the recommendations of Past President William Bowerman’s Select Committee on Work Load. The proposed draft of changes to the Faculty Manual Work Load policy was sent to Provost Helms for review and comment. As of this date, we understand that Provost Helms has reviewed the draft and made comments, which we await before proceeding further.

Future Work and Initiatives

During the course of the year, several items of business could not be completed by the Policy Committee given its full agenda.

- **Appointment of Administrators:** Part IV, Section I of the Faculty Manual on the Selection of Other Academic Administrators is out of date and deficient in several respects (e.g., apparently providing no defined mechanism to select the Vice President of Research or College Deans). In addition, the definition and meaning of Academic Administrators in the Faculty Manual is unclear. The Manual also lacks a parallel structure describing administrative positions and the procedure to fill them. Senator King worked on draft changes to this portion of the Faculty Manual during 2010/2011. The needed revisions are substantial, and strong coordination with the Provost, the President, and the BOT will be needed to complete this effort. Senator King is happy to continue working with the 2011/2012 Policy Committee on the needed changes if they so desire.

- **Termination Policy for Faculty:** Senator Pennington worked with Clay Steadman (Office of General Counsel) on the development of a faculty termination policy in the event of program discontinuance. This collaboration was productive, yielding many areas of agreement on principles and details. At present, Senator Pennington continues to deal with the thorny issue of program definition. While the University administrations’ response to recent fiscal pressures has not included termination of faculty, work on completing a draft policy should continue in the 2011/2012 year. Next year’s Policy Committee is urged to coordinate with Senators Pennington and King and Counselor Steadman and be aware of the work accomplished on this policy to date.

- **Work Load:** As of this date, the status of the proposed Faculty Manual change related to Work Load is unclear. If a revised policy is not presented to the Senate during this 2010/2011 academic year, then the 2011/2012 Policy Committee should resume work on this issue.
Adjunct Appointments and Titles: An approach to providing improved but currently lacking flexibility to make appointments to Adjunct Assistant Professor was approved by the Committee, but rejected by the E/AC (see above). Next year’s Policy Committee will need to re-examine the issue including, perhaps, whether a regular faculty rank title must accompany the Adjunct title.

Presidential Commission on Sustainability: The committee revised a draft of a Faculty Manual change formalizing the Presidential Commission on Sustainability (PCS) kindly provided by the Office of President Barker. This draft is being forwarded by Senator King to the Commission for review and approval. Next year’s Policy Committee will need to follow up the disposition of this review.

Faculty Manual Changes related to the VPR: Several suggested Faculty Manual changes were brought to the Policy Committee by the former Interim Vice President of Research J. Ballato. These need to be reviewed and discussed by the 2011/2012 Policy Committee. It should be stressed that the 2011/2012 Policy Committee should take care to involve the new VPR, Dr. Gerald Sonnenfeld, in these discussions.

Academic Computing Advisory Committee: The Policy Committee heard concerns that the ACAC was not an active committee on campus, but should be. A draft Faculty Manual change rejuvenating this committee in the form of an Academic Technology Council was provided to the Policy Committee by Mary Beth Kurz (CoES), working with Senate Vice-President Dan Warner, Matt Saltzman (the most recent chair of the ACAC), and CIO Jim Bottum. At the writing of this report, the disposition of this draft Faculty Manual change is unknown. If it is not considered by the Senate during the 2010/2011 year, then the 2011/2012 Policy Committee should coordinate with Prof. Kurz and Senate President Warner on this issue.
The Provost circulated a detailed list of projects funded in the past 3 years... almost $2.5 million per year are used for large scale projects across the colleges (10-1-11)

Salary report. The format of last year’s report will be maintained (e.g., explanation on raises) (10-1-11)

Overview of Student Fee revenue trends over the past 5 years ($251.1 million for FY 2010; $266.6 million projected for FY 2011). This figure includes what is often referred to as tuition (general academic fees). Student Fees include debt service (Debt service and capital financing is what is called “tuition”). What most think of tuition is “general academic fee”), summer school, differential tuition, online courses, lab fees, student organizations, other student service fees, general operations/academic fees (10-26-10).

Other student Fees (often referred to as fees; not tuition)-$11.8 million for FY 2010; $11.6 projected for 2011). These fees include campus recreation fee, career services, library fee, student health, Microsoft licensing, technology fee (10-26-10).

CU Budget 2010-11- An overview of the budget for fiscal year ending in June 30, 2011 was presented. Budget is projected to be approximately $797 million. A few highlights-Stimulus funding for current fiscal year to reach $19+ million (partially offsetting state support; No stimulus money anticipated for next fiscal year; State support reduced by $25 million- Institutional support (administration) fell as percentage of CU Budget from 5.2% to 3.9 (more cuts forthcoming in this category)

CFO Dalton presented highlights of the CU Budget at the December meeting.
Ad Hoc Committee on the Status of Lecturers

2010-2011 Final Report

Members
Paul Dawson, Sandy Edge, Linda Howe, Beth Kunkel, Meredith Morris, Todd Schweisinger, Daniel Warner (chair), and Leslie Williams.

Activity
The activities this year started with the chair attending the Ninth meeting of the Coalition of Contingent Academic Labor that was held at the Université Laval in Québec City, Canada. The participants were higher education faculty from Canada, Mexico, and the United States, and the vast majority of the participants were contingent faculty, both full time and part time, along with a handful of tenured faculty. The participants represented 26 unions, 15 labor federations, and 7 Confederations.

The most significant presentations and discussions at the conference revolved around the report by the American Association of University Professors. This AAUP report, entitled "Tenure and Teaching-Intensive Appointments" was circulated as a draft at the conference and was officially released on Labor Day. The report begins:

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.

The AAUP report goes on to point out:

By 2007, almost 70 percent of faculty members were employed off the tenure track. 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.

The collective bargaining organizations represented at the COCAL IX meeting have focused almost exclusively on redressing the economic difficulties encountered by contingent faculty. However, the AAUP position focuses on the broader needs of the entire university. The AAUP supports the restoration of the true tenure process. The AAUP report has been studied by this Ad Hoc Committee, has been circulated to the Faculty Senate, and is available online at:

During the first semester, the chair interviewed most of the participants of the 2009-2010 Senate Select Committee on Best Management Practices in Support of Academic Lecturers. He also discussed the issues of Contingent Faculty with the Provost and several past and present Faculty Senators with a view toward enhancing the proposal of the Select Committee to bring it more in line with the AAUP guidelines.

The Ad Hoc Committee began meeting weekly after the start of the current semester. The committee reviewed the report from the 2009-2010 Select Committee, the AAUP report, and data generated by the Office of Institutional Research. The committee discussed a broad outline for modifying the current tenure and promotion practices at Clemson in order to bring our process more in line with the AAUP guidelines. Members of the committee elicited feedback from colleagues and administrators, and this feedback was discussed at subsequent meetings. The committee met on March 2, 2011, and endorsed the attached Draft Proposal on Contingent Faculty and the Tenure Process.
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.
Tenure and Teaching-Intensive Appointments (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 has risen sharply. 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 multiter 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. 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-tenuretrack 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. 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. Mindful that their working conditions are their students’ 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 the privilege of those who are, have been, or soon will 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 parttime 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 infrastructure is to bundle the employment and economic securities that activist faculty on contingent appointments are already winning for themselves with the rigorous scrutiny of the tenure system. The ways in which contingent teachers and researchers are hired, evaluated, and promoted often bypass the faculty entirely and are generally less rigorous than the intense review applied to faculty in tenurable positions.

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, 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.

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 report 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.

**Appendix A: Conversion Practices and Proposals**

Some institutions have already taken steps to convert contingent faculty positions to the tenure track. At 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.

**Pennsylvania 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 have sometimes 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 nontenure-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 fulltime, 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.wmuaaup.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 fulltime 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 fulltime 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:**
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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 threyear 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 onetime 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 faculty, 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 lecturers 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 instructors with job security may apply to be promoted to the rank of associate professor with tenure.
- Special instructors earn more as their seniority grows. They are eligible to buy into medical and vision plans, and the portion of premiums paid by the university 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 tenured assistant professors and before all tenured faculty. 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 bargaining 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 relating 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 represented 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/aaup_2007-11.pdf.

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 professor to adjunct professor. After teaching approximately half time for three years (specifics vary by campus and unit) and successfully completing a review by full-time members of their department or
program, adjuncts are eligible 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 discharge or suspend an adjunct whose term appointment 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.

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 (reduced or separated) if courses are assigned to tenurestream faculty or graduate students teaching in the department of their major.

Vancouver Community College

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.
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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.

Layoff and recall rights:

- All layoffs are by reverse-accrued seniority, not by full- or part-time status.
- 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.

The collective bargaining agreement does not have explicit provisions on academic freedom.

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

- All faculty have full voting rights in departments, including the right to elect and be elected as chair (in the latter case, the person is converted to full-time regular status).
- Term and regular faculty have the same right to vote for and be elected to all statutory college governance bodies.
- 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.
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Jeremy Nienow (Anthropology), Minneapolis Community and Technical College and Inver Hills Community College
Karen G. Thompson (English), Rutgers University, consultant
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Endnotes

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 ( ). (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); (4) tenure-line positions can be part time as well as full time (Regulation 13 of the ); (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 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, 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.

3. As of 1970, roughly three-fourths of all faculty were in the tenure stream and 78 percent of all faculty were full-time; in 1969, only 3.2 percent of full-time appointments were nontenurable. Among all full-time appointments in 1969, teaching-intensive faculty (with nine or more hours a week of teaching) outnumbered research intensive faculty (with six or fewer hours a week of teaching) in a ratio of 1.5:1, accounting for 60 percent of the total number of full-time appointments. See Jack H. Schuster and Martin J. Finkelstein, The American Faculty: The Restructuring of Academic Work and Careers (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2006), 41 (Table 3.2, “American Faculty by Employment Status, 1970–2003”); 174 (Table 6.1, “Non-Tenure-Eligible Faculty, 1969–1998,”); 97 (Table 4.4, “Ratio of High to Low Teaching Loads among Full-Time Faculty, 1969–1998”).

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.).

5. “ (compiled by the AAUP).


10. For part-time contingent faculty, the AAUP’s 2006 addition to its (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 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.”
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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
JOINT PROVOST-FACULTY SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE ON BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES
IN SUPPORT OF ACADEMIC LECTURERS

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 promotion 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.
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.

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.
PREFACE

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. On January 27, 1956, the Constitution was adopted by the General Faculty, and on April 9, 1956, the Constitution was approved by the Board of Trustees. On September 6, 1956, Dr. F. M. Kinard, Dean of the College, appointed a committee of faculty members consisting of F. B. Schirmer, Chair. After lengthy deliberation, the committee was able to organize the teaching faculty of Clemson College.

Faculty Manual May 1956
1956 Teaching Faculty
1957
1966 First mention of "research"
1972 NA
1976 Teaching Faculty/Research Faculty
1982 First mention of "Lecturers"
Research Faculty/Teaching Faculty & Lecturers
2009 Teaching Faculty/Research Faculty
2010 Research Faculty/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.

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

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

Recognition for membership on committees, are considered regular faculty members with respect to voting privileges and recognition for stellar performance at Senior Lecturer level. Master Lecturers
Paraphrased quote from a Senior Lecturer:

"... 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 not."
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.
# Clemson University Grievance Board
## Grievance Procedure Activity
### Category I Petitions
January 2010 through January 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Grievances</td>
<td>1</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>1</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>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petitions Not Supported By Hearing Panel</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing Panel Grievance Recommendations Supported By Provost</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grievances Appealed to President</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presidential Decisions Supporting Petitioner</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grievances Appealed to Board of Trustees</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Petitioner</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Petitioner</td>
<td>0</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>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### CLEMSON UNIVERSITY GRIEVANCE BOARD
### GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE ACTIVITY
### CATEGORY II PETITIONS

**January, 2010 through January, 2011**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total Number of Grievances to Submitted to Grievance Board</th>
<th>Total Number of Grievances Submitted to Provost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Grievances Found Non-Grievable by Grievance Board**
  - by Grievance Board: 1
  - by Provost: 1

- **Grievances Found to be Grievable**
  - by Grievance Board: 0
  - by Provost: 2

- **Not Yet Determined Grievable Or Non-Grievable**
  - 0

- **Grievances In Process**
  - 2

- **Suspended Grievances**
  - 0

- **Withdrawn Grievances**
  - 0

- **Petitions Supported by Hearing Panel**
  - 0

- **Petitions Not Supported by Hearing Panel**
  - 0

- **Petitions Supported by Provost**
  - 0

- **Petitions Not Supported by Provost**
  - 2

- **Hearing Panel Grievance Recommendations Supported by Provost**
  - 0

- **Provost Recused**
  - 0

- **Grievances Decided by Provost**
  - 3

- **Grievances Appealed to President**
  - 2

- **Presidential Decisions Supporting Petitioner**
  - 0

- **Grievances Appealed to Board of Trustees**
  - 0

- **Male Petitioner(s)**
  - 3

- **Female Petitioner(s)**
  - 1

### 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>IEHD</th>
<th>LIBRARY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. **Call to Order:** The meeting was called to order by President Bill Surver at 2:40 p.m. and guests were welcomed and recognized.

2. **Approval of Minutes:** The Faculty Senate meeting Minutes dated March 8, 2011 were approved as written.

3. **“Free Speech”:** None

4. **Committees:**
   a. **Faculty Senate Committees**
      1) **Welfare Committee** – No report.
      2) **Scholastic Policies Committee** – No report.
      3) **Research Committee** – Chair Paul Dawson submitted and briefly explained the March 22, 2011 Research Committee Report (attachment).
      4) **Policy Committee** – Jeremy King, Chair, noted that this Committee met after the final report was submitted and that new items will come under Old Business this afternoon since it is the final meeting of the 2010-11 Faculty Senate.
      5) **Finance Committee** – Chair Rich Figliola, stated that the annual report for this Committee was submitted at the last meeting.
      6) **Budget Accountability Committee** – Antonis Katsiyannis, Chair, stated that the Committee on March 14, 2011 and are continuing to discuss two issues: faculty compensation and academic infrastructure.
   b. **Faculty Senate Select Committees**
      1) **Academic Calendar** – Pat Smart, Chair, highlighted the committee report which will be submitted under Old Business.
      2) **Status of Lecturers** – Chair Dan Warner noted that the committee report submitted in March was discussed at the recent Executive/Advisory Committee meeting and will be formally submitted under Old Business.
      3) **Workload** – President Surver stated that this Committee’s Report has already been submitted and accepted by the full Senate. It is now in the hands of the Policy Committee and the Provost’s Office.
c. Other University Committee/Commissions:
   3) President Surver stated that President Barker’s Compensation Advisory Group will continue and that the Group is working on a plan for bonuses and salary increases.

5. Old Business:
   a. Jeremy King, Chair of the Policy Committee, submitted for approval and explained the proposed Faculty Manual Change, VII, D. 1. Academic Computing Advisory Committee. There was no discussion. Vote to approve change was taken and passed unanimously.

   b. Senator King then submitted for approval and explained the proposed Faculty Manual Change, III. J. Faculty Awards, which had been tabled at the December Faculty Senate Meeting. Motion was made to remove proposed change from the table and return it to the floor for consideration which was seconded. There was no discussion. Vote to approve change was taken and passed unanimously.

   c. Senator King, submitted for approval and explained the proposed Faculty Manual Change, IX. J. Sabbatical Leave. There was no discussion. Vote to approve change was taken and passed unanimously.

   d. Vice President Warner submitted for acceptance the 2010-11 Final Report from the Select Committee on the Status of Lecturers (Attached). There was no discussion. Vote to accept Report was taken and passed unanimously.

   e. Professor Smart submitted for acceptance the 2011 Report to the Faculty Senate from the Select Committee on the Academic Calendar (Attached). There was no discussion. Vote to accept Report was taken and passed unanimously.

6. Presentations
   a. Secretary Linda Howe read aloud the Resolution Conferring the Distinction of Honorary Faculty Senator to Thomas Michael Keinath, Dean Emeritus (FS11-04-1 P) which was electronically and unanimously passed by the Faculty Senate. President Surver then read aloud the certificate that he presented to Dean Keinath to accompany the resolution.

   b. President Surver presented a plaque and a copy of the book, Life Death & Bialys by Dylan Schaffer to Professor Beth Kunkel, the 2011 Recipient of the Alan Schaffer Faculty Senate Service Award.

   c. President Surver then congratulated retiring Faculty Senators by thanking them for their service and presenting certificates to each person.
d. President Surver introduced Daniel D. Warner, as the Faculty Senate President for 2011-12. New officers were installed at approximately 3:28 p.m.

Linda Howe, Secretary
Cathy Toth Sturkie, Program Coordinator

8. New Business:
   a. The new and continuing Senators introduced themselves.
   b. President Warner provided information on the upcoming Faculty Senate Orientation – May 10, 2011 at 10:00 a.m. – invitations forthcoming.
   c. President Warner asked for a vote to continue the Budget Accountability Committee and the Academic Calendar Committee and both passed unanimously; the vote to continue the Status on Lecturers Committee, passed and the vote to establish a Committee on Teaching Effectiveness passed unanimously.
   d. The Senate was reminded to return their committee preference forms to the Faculty Senate Office as soon as possible so that the new session may proceed.
   e. President Warner encouraged Senators to notify the Senate Office with the two names of Advisory Committee members one of which will be the delegation lead senator.
   f. Next Executive/Advisory Committee meeting will be held on April 26, 2011 in the Executive Boardroom of the Madren Center. The next Faculty Senate Meeting will be on May 10th at 2:30 p.m. at the Madren Center.
   g. Senator Alan Grubb provided a handout on behalf of Professor Emeritus John Bednar.

9. Adjournment: 3:47 p.m.
8. **INTRODUCTION OF FACULTY SENATE PRESIDENT, DAN WARNER (by Bill Surver)**

9. **NEW BUSINESS**
   a. Introduction of New Senators – President Warner
   b. Establishment of Select Committees – President Warner
   c. Committee Preferences – President Warner
   d. Executive/Advisory Committee Representatives – President Warner

10. **ANNOUNCEMENTS**
   a. Next Executive/Advisory Committee Meeting – April 26, 2011
   b. Next Faculty Senate Meeting – May 10, 2011

10. **ADJOURNMENT**

    **ANNUAL SPRING RECEPTION**
    **WILL FOLLOW**
    **IMMEDIATELY AFTER MEETING**
Faculty Senate Research Committee Report 3-22-11

The Faculty Senate Research Committee has addressed several topics this year. These topics were reported to the University Research Council on 3-10-11 and there was some feedback from Dr. Gerald Sonnenfeld on a few of these issues. The topics are listed below.


Section 5 Determination of ownership rights in Intellectual Property. Specifically parts 5.a.v.1. under university ownership and 5.b.iv.1. under creator ownership which seem to potentially overlap (See below). The committee requests clarification and possible review by the policy committee.

5.a.v.1. For clarification purposes, the University shall retain rights to:

Classes and/or Courseware developed for teaching at the University whether fixed in tangible or electronic media. For illustration purposes only, a Class includes the syllabus and any Class notes, if provided, but would not include teaching notes. Courseware includes any and all software and digital material (in any media).

5. b.iv.1. iv. For clarification purposes, Creators shall retain rights to:

Creative or scholarly works including artworks, musical compositions, and literary works directly related to their professional endeavors, credentials, and/or activities. This includes any personal material created, developed, or used solely by Authors in connection with their delivery of University Classes.

2. Reviewing suggested changes to Part VII of the Faculty Manual dealing with the description for the IP committee.

The Intellectual Property Committee was only defined as “representatives from the faculty and administration.” The Faculty Research committee has several recommendations to be considered by the Faculty Senate.

a. The Research committee recommends using the IPC return the previous description in the faculty manual except for having a graduate and undergraduate student on the committee. The committee was not sure why the committee make-up was changed to the vague description in the revised section of the manual. The Research committee recommends the Manual read:

The IPC consists of a chair appointed by the VP of Research, the Associate Director of Research Operations who serves as secretary, the general counsel or his/her designee, a representative from administration and advancement, an associate dean from each college, a faculty representative from each college and the person from Cooper Library identified as patent coordinator.
b. The Research Committee recommends that any appeals to the decisions by the IPC be reviewed by an Appeal committee comprised of equal number of faculty and administrators from the university.

c. The Research Committee recommends that when a faculty submits an appeal, the faculty will have the option to present written input from person(s) with expertise specific to the IP being considered.

Dr. Sonnenfeld stated that filing for patents through the IPC would become more stringent since the number of successful filings was low and cost was high. He also stated he did not see a need for an appeals process since if the university decided not to pursue the IP, the inventor was free to take ownership and pursue a patent themselves.

3. **Internal Grant Submission Process**: The internal selection of single submission proposals, i.e. proposals whose number per institution is limited by the funding agencies? Knowing the process and the people reviewing the proposals may allow faculty to improve the clarity and quality of their submission. The committee wondered if expertise of faculty could be placed into FAS and this could be used to identify potential reviewers of internal grants. This was determined to be too cumbersome and require additional faculty time. The suggestion has been made to include keywords with internal submissions and this could be used to identify potential reviewers. Senator Temesvera will contact Wickes Westcott to see if a keywords option for research can be added to the FAS.

4. Developing a way to document and account for **non-traditional awards**. Can FAS be changed to address this?

There is currently a non-traditional award form.

5. Revision of the consulting policy has been discussed also. The committee concluded that some timeline for response was needed since some research opportunities are time sensitive and examples of lost research funding were mentioned due to the faculty not being able to get an expedited approval for consulting. An expedited form for short term consulting was discussed. A possible sign off at the Dean level was also discussed for cases that fell under certain guidelines approved by the VP of Research ahead of time as “rubber stamp” types.

Dr. Sonnenfeld felt that a timeline for consulting forms was reasonable but that there could not be a “rubber stamp” for streamlined cases due to legal implications.
Proposed Faculty Manual Change
Part VII, Section D, Number 1 (Academic Computing Advisory Committee)

Move from Section D to a new Section H Committees and Councils Reporting to the Vice Provost for Computing and Information Technology

Index current section H and subsequent sections by one letter

Current Wording

1. Academic Computing Advisory Committee reviews and advises on policies related to academic computing and information technology, including educational and research computing. The Committee also sets the membership criteria for three standing subcommittees: Research Computing and Cyberinfrastructure, Customer Relations and Learning Technologies, and Distance Education. Voting membership consists of one faculty member serving a three-year term elected by each of the colleges and the library; a representative from the Faculty Senate elected annually and a graduate student appointed by the President of Graduate Student Government. The chairs of standing subcommittees also serve as ex-officio members of the Committee. Non-voting membership includes the Vice Provost for Computing and Information Technology (chair) and a representative from Public Service Activities (PSA).

Proposed Wording

1. Academic Computing Advisory Committee Technology Council reviews and advises on recommends policies to the Vice Provost for Computing and Information Technology related to academic computing, and information technology, including educational and research computing and media supporting the teaching, learning, research, scholarship and advising activities of faculty and students. The Committee also sets the membership criteria for three standing subcommittees: Research Computing and Cyberinfrastructure, Customer Relations and Learning Technologies, and Distance Education. Voting membership consists of one two faculty members serving a three-year terms elected by each of the colleges and the library; a representative from the Faculty Senate elected annually; and a graduate student appointed by the President of Graduate Student Government; an undergraduate student appointed by the President of the Undergraduate Student Government; and up to two other faculty appointed by the Council Membership for the purpose of adding needed representation of area experts (such as PSA and distance education faculty). The chairs of standing subcommittees also serve as ex-officio members of the Committee. Non-voting membership includes the Vice Provost for Computing and Information Technology (chair) and a representative from Public Service Activities (PSA). The Council is chaired by a faculty member elected by the voting membership of the Council. Non-voting membership includes the Vice Provost for Computing and Information Technology a representative from CCIT, a representative from Student Disability Services, and others as deemed necessary by the Council Membership. Sub-committees are chartered by the Council as needed, concerning topics such as technology in the classroom, high performance computing and learning technologies. Each of these sub-committees will have at least one member selected from the voting membership of the Council.
Final Wording

1. Academic Technology Council reviews and recommends policies to the Vice Provost for Computing and Information Technology related to academic computing, information technology, and media supporting the teaching, learning, research, scholarship and advising activities of faculty and students. Voting membership consists of two faculty members serving three-year terms elected by each of the colleges and the library; a representative from the Faculty Senate elected annually; a graduate student appointed by the President of Graduate Student Government; an undergraduate student appointed by the President of the Undergraduate Student Government; and up to two other faculty appointed by the Council Membership for the purpose of adding needed representation of area experts (such as PSA and distance education faculty). The Council is chaired by a faculty member elected by the voting membership of the Council. Non-voting membership includes the Vice Provost for Computing and Information Technology, a representative from CCIT, a representative from Student Disability Services, and others as deemed necessary by the Council Membership. Sub-committees are chartered by the Council as needed, concerning topics such as technology in the classroom, high performance computing and learning technologies. Each of these sub-committees will have at least one member selected from the voting membership of the Council.

Rationale: The intent of the currently defined ACAC is to ensure faculty representation in the development and support of academic computing policy. This important goal needs to be revisited and rejuvenated for two reasons. First, the ACAC has not met in approximately two years, its 3 standing sub-committees do not exist, and Colleges do not seem to be electing members to the ACAC consistently. Thus, associated policy issues that might have formerly been addressed by the ACAC have fallen to CCIT’s internal Education Technology Council. Second, faculty utilize and contend with more fanciful resources than just “computing”—they now contend with a dizzying array of teaching and learning technologies; furthermore, because these technologies are incredibly fluid and their advent and impact unpredictable, a body with reasonable flexibility in its structure (supplemental membership and subcommittees) is needed to be effective in studying and recommending technology policy.

The proposed change transforms the Academic Computing Advisory Committee into the Academic Technology Council, and revises its membership and structure to address the problems and achieve the aims described above. The proposed changes were developed as a collaborative effort between Vice Provost for Computing and Information Technology Jim Bottum, Faculty Senate Vice President/President-Elect Dan Warner, and Prof. Matt Saltzman (the most recent chair of the ACAC). It should be noted that Vice Provost Bottum has expressed the desire for increased faculty input into technology policy and the distribution of technology-related resources.
Proposed Faculty Manual Change
Part IX, Section J (Sabbatical Leave)

Current Wording (2010/2011 Faculty Manual):

J. Sabbatical Leave

Sabbatical leave may be granted by the President of the University to any tenured faculty member who has completed at least six years of full-time service with the university. The purpose of sabbatical leave is to relieve faculty of normal duties so that they might pursue significant projects facilitating their professional growth and development, thus enhancing their future contributions to the mission of the university. Such leaves, therefore, are not granted automatically upon completion of the necessary period of service. Sabbaticals cannot occur more frequently than every seventh year. Applications for sabbatical leave by faculty on nine-month appointments may entail a request for one semester of leave at full pay or for two successive semesters at half pay. Applications for sabbatical leave by faculty on twelve-month appointments and administrators with faculty rank may be made for periods up to six months at full pay or for periods of over six months to one calendar year at half pay. There shall be no discrimination between one-semester or two-semester sabbaticals for nine-month faculty and between six-month or twelve-month sabbaticals for faculty with twelve-month appointments. Certain fringe benefits may be continued during sabbatical if arrangements are made in advance with the Division of Human Resources. Faculty on sabbatical leave will maintain all the rights and privileges of regular faculty. The following steps should be followed in the application and review processes for sabbatical leaves:

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

- Normally, the proposal for a sabbatical leave should be submitted to an elected departmental committee, chaired by the department chair, for review no later than January 31 (for sabbaticals beginning in the fall semester) or no later than May 31 (for sabbaticals beginning in the spring semester).

- The departmental committee's written recommendation shall be forwarded directly to the dean of the college with a copy to the applicant. The departmental committee will take no longer than two weeks to submit its recommendation.

- The dean of the college will forward his or her recommendation to the Provost and the applicant no later than February 28 or June 30, as appropriate.

- By March 15 or July 15, the Provost will forward his or her recommendation to the President and inform the applicant, the dean of the college, and the chair of the department of his or her recommendation.

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

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

Sabbatical leaves are granted in good faith. When such a leave is ended, a faculty member is expected to return to regular service with the university for at least one contract year or, at the university's request, refund the remuneration received from the university during that time. Upon return from sabbatical leave the faculty member shall file a written report with the department chair or school director on his/her professional activities during the leave period.
**Wording of Change Approved by the Senate in February 2011:**
(Relevant passage underlined and highlighted in yellow)

**J. Sabbatical Leave**

Sabbatical leave may be granted by the President of the University to any faculty member holding regular faculty rank. Normally, a faculty member shall have completed six full years of full time service with the University to be eligible for sabbatical leave; however, exceptions may be granted upon approval of the department chair (or equivalent supervisor), dean, and Provost. The purpose of sabbatical leave is to relieve faculty of normal duties so that they might pursue significant projects facilitating their professional growth and development, thus enhancing their future contributions to the mission of the university. There is no period of service to the University or any other conditions that shall ensure that such leaves are granted.

Applications for sabbatical leave by faculty on nine-month appointments may entail a request for one semester of leave at full pay or for two successive semesters at half pay. Applications for sabbatical leave by faculty on twelve-month appointments and administrators with faculty rank may be made for periods up to six months at full pay or for periods of over six months to one calendar year at half pay. There shall be no discrimination between one-semester or two-semester sabbaticals for nine-month faculty and between six-month or twelve-month sabbaticals for faculty with twelve-month appointments. Certain fringe benefits may be continued during sabbatical if arrangements are made in advance with the Division of Human Resources. Faculty on sabbatical leave will maintain all the rights and privileges of regular faculty except those explicitly restricted elsewhere in the Faculty Manual. Faculty who are on sabbatical leave are still considered employees of Clemson University and, therefore, may not be employed by another entity. Faculty on sabbatical leave are, however, eligible to engage in outside professional consulting or receive honoraria, in accordance with the University's consulting policy and provided such activities pose no conflict of interest to the University.

The following steps should be followed in the application and review processes for sabbatical leaves:

- Applicants requesting sabbatical leaves should prepare a proposal containing information on the goals of the sabbatical including supporting materials and information on how the teaching, student advising/mentoring, service, and any administrative responsibilities of the applicant will be handled while he or she is away from campus. If relevant, an applicant must consult with the department chair (or school director or immediate supervisor) concerning teaching responsibilities.

- The proposal for a sabbatical leave should be submitted to an elected departmental committee, chaired by the department chair, for review no later than January 31 (for sabbaticals beginning in the fall semester) or no later than May 31 (for sabbaticals beginning in the spring semester).

- The departmental committee's written recommendation shall be forwarded directly to the dean of the college with a copy to the applicant. The departmental committee will take no longer than two weeks to submit its recommendation.

- The dean of the college will forward his or her recommendation to the Provost and the applicant no later than February 28 or June 30, as appropriate.

- By March 15 or July 15, the Provost will forward his or her recommendation to the President and inform the applicant, the dean of the college, and the chair of the department of his or her recommendation.

Administrators with Faculty rank should prepare a proposal containing information on the goals of the sabbatical including supporting materials and information on how the assigned duties of the applicant will be handled while he or she is away from campus. This proposal should be submitted to his/her immediate supervisor no later than January 31 (for sabbaticals beginning in the fall semester) or no later than May 31 (for sabbaticals beginning in the spring semester). The supervisor will forward his or her recommendation to the Provost or the President, as appropriate, no later than February 28 or June 30, as appropriate. If forwarded to the Provost, he or she will forward his or her recommendation to the President by March 15 or July 15, as appropriate, and inform the applicant and his
or her immediate supervisor of the recommendation. The President shall render his or her decision within two weeks of receiving a recommendation.

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

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

Sabbatical leaves are granted in good faith. Faculty granted sabbatical leave shall sign an agreement to maintain University employment for a period at least equal to the period of the sabbatical, or to repay the University any compensation they received from the University during the period of the sabbatical. The obligation to repay shall not apply in situations where a faculty member is unable to return to University employment for reasons beyond the control of the faculty member. Upon return from sabbatical leave the faculty member shall file a written report with the department chair or school director or immediate supervisor on his/her professional activities during the leave period.

Proposed Change to February 2011 Change Approved by Senate:
2nd Paragraph

Applications for sabbatical leave by faculty on nine-month appointments may entail a request for one semester of leave at full pay or for two successive semesters at half pay. Applications for sabbatical leave by faculty on twelve-month appointments and administrators with faculty rank may be made for periods up to six months at full pay or for periods of over six months to one calendar year at half pay. There shall be no discrimination between one-semester or two-semester sabbaticals for nine-month faculty and between six-month or twelve-month sabbaticals for faculty with twelve-month appointments. Certain fringe benefits may be continued during sabbatical if arrangements are made in advance with the Division of Human Resources. Faculty on sabbatical leave will maintain all the rights and privileges of regular faculty except those explicitly restricted elsewhere in the Faculty Manual. Faculty who are on sabbatical leave are still considered employees of Clemson University and, therefore, may not be employed by another entity. Faculty on sabbatical leave are, however, eligible to engage in outside professional consulting or receive honoraria, in accordance with the University's consulting policy and provided such activities pose no conflict of interest to the University. However, faculty on sabbatical may receive compensation directly from another university or other entity as an independent contractor or other status which does not entail full-time employment. A faculty member on sabbatical may also receive compensation indirectly from another entity through a contract for the faculty member's services between the other entity and the University. This Sabbatical Policy does not prohibit or otherwise affect the application of University policies regarding outside professional consulting or the receipt of honoraria.
Final Proposed Wording

J. Sabbatical Leave

Sabbatical leave may be granted by the President of the University to any faculty member holding regular faculty rank. Normally, a faculty member shall have completed six full years of full time service with the University to be eligible for sabbatical leave; however, exceptions may be granted upon approval of the department chair (or equivalent supervisor), dean, and Provost. The purpose of sabbatical leave is to relieve faculty of normal duties so that they might pursue significant projects facilitating their professional growth and development, thus enhancing their future contributions to the mission of the university. There is no period of service to the University or any other conditions that shall ensure that such leaves are granted.

Applications for sabbatical leave by faculty on nine-month appointments may entail a request for one semester of leave at full pay or for two successive semesters at half pay. Applications for sabbatical leave by faculty on twelve-month appointments and administrators with faculty rank may be made for periods up to six months at full pay or for periods of over six months to one calendar year at half pay. There shall be no discrimination between one-semester or two-semester sabbaticals for nine-month faculty and between six-month or twelve-month sabbaticals for faculty with twelve-month appointments. Certain fringe benefits may be continued during sabbatical if arrangements are made in advance with the Division of Human Resources. Faculty on sabbatical leave will maintain all the rights and privileges of regular faculty except those explicitly restricted elsewhere in the Faculty Manual. Faculty who are on sabbatical leave are still considered employees of Clemson University and, therefore, may not be employed by another entity. However, faculty on sabbatical may receive compensation directly from another university or other entity as an independent contractor or other status which does not entail full-time employment. A faculty member on sabbatical may also receive compensation indirectly from another entity through a contract for the faculty member’s services between the other entity and the University. This Sabbatical Policy does not prohibit or otherwise affect the application of University policies regarding outside professional consulting or the receipt of honoraria.

The following steps should be followed in the application and review processes for sabbatical leaves:

- Applicants requesting sabbatical leaves should prepare a proposal containing information on the goals of the sabbatical including supporting materials and information on how the teaching, student advising/mentoring, service, and any administrative responsibilities of the applicant will be handled while he or she is away from campus. If relevant, an applicant must consult with the department chair (or school director or immediate supervisor) concerning teaching responsibilities.

- The proposal for a sabbatical leave should be submitted to an elected departmental committee, chaired by the department chair, for review no later than January 31 (for sabbaticals beginning in the fall semester) or no later than May 31 (for sabbaticals beginning in the spring semester).
The departmental committee's written recommendation shall be forwarded directly to the dean of the college with a copy to the applicant. The departmental committee will take no longer than two weeks to submit its recommendation.

The dean of the college will forward his or her recommendation to the Provost and the applicant no later than February 28 or June 30, as appropriate.

By March 15 or July 15, the Provost will forward his or her recommendation to the President and inform the applicant, the dean of the college, and the chair of the department of his or her recommendation.

Administrators with Faculty rank should prepare a proposal containing information on the goals of the sabbatical including supporting materials and information on how the assigned duties of the applicant will be handled while he or she is away from campus. This proposal should be submitted to his/her immediate supervisor no later than January 31 (for sabbaticals beginning in the fall semester) or no later than May 31 (for sabbaticals beginning in the spring semester). The supervisor will forward his or her recommendation to the Provost or the President, as appropriate, no later than February 28 or June 30, as appropriate. If forwarded to the Provost, he or she will forward his or her recommendation to the President by March 15 or July 15, as appropriate, and inform the applicant and his or her immediate supervisor of the recommendation. The President shall render his or her decision within two weeks of receiving a recommendation.

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

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

Sabbatical leaves are granted in good faith. Faculty granted sabbatical leave shall sign an agreement to maintain University employment for a period at least equal to the period of the sabbatical, or to repay the University any compensation they received from the University during the period of the sabbatical. The obligation to repay shall not apply in situations where a faculty member is unable to return to University employment for reasons beyond the control of the faculty member. Upon return from sabbatical leave the faculty member shall file a written report with the department chair or school director or immediate supervisor on his/her professional activities during the leave period.

Rationale: After approval of the Faculty Manual change related to sabbatical at the February Faculty Senate meeting, some Senators renewed their earnest concern that the revised policy would prohibit customary allowed practices by faculty members on sabbatical for which they receive remuneration. Inasmuch as this was not the intent of the proposed change considered in
February, the Office of General Counsel has suggested a wording change to the second paragraph of the approved change to address these concerns.
Proposed Faculty Manual Change
Part III, Section J (Faculty Awards)

Insert a new paragraph after the numbered list of awards and their descriptions

Proposed Wording:

Eligibility Criteria. State appropriations law requires employee award programs associated with public funds to have approved written criteria regarding who may receive remuneration associated with some of the above awards. Nominators, nominees, and reviewers should be cognizant of these eligibility criteria, which may be found in the Human Resources Policies and Procedures Manual (http://workgroups.clemson.edu/FIN5337_HR_POLY_PROC_MANUAL/view_document.php?id=148).

Rationale:
The Faculty Manual does not currently note the existence of criteria for award winners to be eligible to receive remuneration via public funds that is associated with some Faculty Awards. The change notes the existence of these criteria so that award nominators, nominees, and reviewers might be aware of them.
Committee members–Doris Helms, Provost; Brett Dalton, CFO; Wickes Westcott, Director, Institutional Research; Antonis Katsiyannis, Richard Figliola, Chair, Finance Committee; Gross, staff senate president; Dan Warner, Faculty Senate VP

The Provost circulated a detailed list of projects funded in the past 3 years...almost $2.5 million per year are used for large scale projects across the colleges (10-1-11)

Salary report. The format of last year’s report will be maintained (e.g., explanation on raises) (10-1-11)

Overview of Student Fee revenue trends over the past 5 years ($251.1 million for FY 2010; $266.6 million projected for FY 2011). This figure includes what is often referred to as tuition (general academic fees). Student Fees include debt service (Debt service and capital financing is what is called “tuition”). What most think of tuition is “general academic fee”), summer school, differential tuition, online courses, lab fees, student organizations, other student service fees, general operations/academic fees (10-26-10).

Other student Fees (often referred to as fees; not tuition)-$11.8 million for FY 2010; $11.6 projected for 2011). These fees include campus recreation fee, career services, library fee, student health, Microsoft licensing, technology fee (10-26-10).

CU Budget 2010-11- An overview of the budget for fiscal year ending in June 30, 2011 was presented. Budget is projected to be approximately $797 million. A few highlights–Stimulus funding for current fiscal year to reach $19+ million (partially offsetting state support; No stimulus money anticipated for next fiscal year; State support reduced by $25 million–Institutional support (administration) fell as percentage of CU Budget from 5.2% to 3.9 (more cuts forthcoming in this category)

CFO Dalton presented highlights of the CU Budget at the December meeting.
SCHOLASTIC POLICIES COMMITTEE 2010-2011
Bob Horton (Chair, HEHD)
Sean Brittain (E&S)
David Tonkyn (AFLS)
Xiaobo Hu (BBS)
Kelly Smith (AAH)
Leslie Williams (AAH)

Attendance Policy
A concern has been raised about some professors’ unwillingness to accept any excused absences, invoking a “death penalty” for students who miss a pre-determined number of classes regardless of circumstances. Though students can file a grievance, this is done after the conclusion of the course. Furthermore, some students may be disinclined to file a grievance for fear of retribution.

This is an issue we will continue to discuss. At this point we do not see a change in policy forthcoming. However, we would encourage some type of communication asking faculty to follow Clemson policy and to be reasonable about making decisions that can have such a profound impact upon students. We also recommend investigating the creation of a process that students might follow when they believe they are being treated unfairly and in opposition to university policy.

A major related concern is having students attend class for fear of grade repercussions when they have a contagious disease. We hope that Redfern could assist in this matter by certifying that, when appropriate, a student should not attend class to protect both her or his own health and the health of others in the classroom. Ben Boone is meeting with George Clay to discuss this.

Academic Integrity: Lead Kelly Smith
The issue concerns, at least in large part, how to deal with dishonesty that is not tied directly to a course (e.g. plagiarism on an essay competition). Though we will continue to look at this issue, at this point we believe that dishonesty that is not tied directly to a course should be dealt with via the Student Code of Conduct and the Office of Community and Ethical Standards, not as a breach of Academic Integrity policy.

We have also been asked to provide guidance as to whether planning to cheat is a violation of Academic Integrity. The Student Senate has passed a resolution arguing against this. We believe this too should continue to be dealt with via the Student Code of Conduct and the Office of Community and Ethical Standards. Nevertheless, it’s an issue we want to continue to discuss.

Undergraduate Senate’s Academic Affairs Committee
• Ben Boone mentioned that they are still waiting for the okay to send the survey concerning online courses. It should go sometime in early March.
• An ad hoc group is still discussing General Education through brainstorming sessions.
• They are meeting with George Clay in an effort to have Redfern issue excused absences.
• They are looking at the framework for Academic Integrity in the hopes of helping to restructure Grievance. One aspect that would help is having a steady pool of counselors.
• The survey on BlackBoard showed that students are not overly dissatisfied with faculty ability to use BlackBoard but would like to see improvement in use of 1) Gradebook, 2) Calendar, 3) Uploaded documents, and 4) Announcements.
• Their big project is trying to establish Advisory Boards for each college, much as BBS has done. Though this will not be finished this spring, they hope the groundwork will have been laid to complete this next year.

Graduate Advisory Committee
In August 2010, SP voiced unanimous support for the proposed change to the Graduate Advisory Committee. This was passed back to Policy and presented and passed at the EAC meeting.

Summer Schedule
This is in place for summer 2011. Another committee continues to look at details of implementation and attracting more students to attend Clemson during the summer.

Definition of Credit Hour
Scholastic Policies believes this is an important issue that needs to be addressed. A committee, led by Dale Layfield, has been established to evaluate distance education. At some later date, we may revisit this, using the information this committee gathers, to help establish some type of policy.

Graduate Committees
We have collected data on how various departments are using Form 3 and FAS to identify which faculty members may serve on students’ graduate committees. We have found that this policy is not being uniformly enforced and that there is great variation in how this determination is made.

We have recommended that each department develop a policy for making this determination and include it in their bylaws. This should reduce the potential for problems and give faculty members a means of recourse when they are unhappy with a decision that they believe was not made correctly. This was agreed to by the Executive Advisory Committee and a letter has been sent by Bill Surver to the Provost.

Graduate Credit Applied to Undergraduate Degree
We have approved the following statement. EAC and the Faculty Senate have also endorsed it.

Degree-seeking undergraduate students may apply graduate level coursework toward their undergraduate degree at the discretion of the degree-granting program. Ordinarily, graduate credits taken at institutions other than Clemson University will be awarded only if those institutions are in good standing with regional accrediting organizations. The Graduate Council approved this, but limited it to 12 hours.

Academic Integrity and Academic Redemption
These policies were somewhat at odds with each other. SP was asked to make a recommendation on a proposal. Academic Integrity stated, “If a student is found in violation of the academic integrity policy and receives a redeemable grade as the penalty, he/she will not be allowed to redeem that grade under the Academic Redemption Policy” (p. 30 2010-2011 Undergraduate Announcements). The current Academic Redemption Policy states, “The ARP may not be applied to...any course in which the student was previously found in violation of the academic integrity policy” (p. 26, 2010-2011 Undergraduate Announcements).
The proposed wording for the Academic Redemption Policy is as follows: “The ARP may not be applied to...any course in which the student was previously found in violation of the academic integrity policy and received a redeemable grade as the penalty.” We did not support this proposed change to the Academic Redemption Policy. While we agreed that the two policies need to match, we believed the Academic Integrity Policy should be modified to match the Academic Redemption Policy. We were unanimous in our opposition to this proposed change. Our recommendation was to leave the current Academic Redemption Policy alone. This recommendation was made to the Undergraduate Council and was supported by the Undergraduate Senate’s Academic Affairs. The Undergraduate Academic Council accepted our suggestion and approved the change as we have recommended. Students who have been found in violation cannot redeem the course.

Method of Delivery
A concern had been brought to our attention as to whether or not a faculty member should have some say in the method of delivery for a course. A department’s curriculum committee had decided that no courses would be offered online in fall and spring semesters, even for courses that were offered online in summer. If this is because online courses are deemed to be inferior, then the implication is that we do not care as much about the quality of courses in the summer as we do in fall and spring, something we find problematic.

Though we believe the decision on delivery should be made as locally as possible, we also believe that the faculty member should have input on the decision and blanket policies on the delivery method are not advisable.

We also note that Clemson is required to track and report the usage of online courses.

Enforcement of Prerequisites
Exceptions have been made for students to enroll in classes for which they do not have the proper prerequisites. In one reported case, the exception was granted by the intervention of a Senator. Others have reported cases of upper administrators allowing enrollment. Faculty members do have the right to enforce stated prerequisites. In fact, Mr. Smith discussed and showed us a means for faculty to check whether or not students have the proper prerequisites. This is available via the Registrar’s homepage. Faculty can work with Kelly McDavid in the Registrar’s Office if they desire.

Faculty-Authored Textbooks and Course Materials
A form currently exists that was created a few years back and vetted through the legal offices to ensure it was in compliance with South Carolina law. After considerable discussion, we have determined that the current form is satisfactory, and we request that all college offices be reminded of the form’s existence and make the form readily available, and that faculty be reminded periodically of their legal requirement to complete the form when they assign texts or course materials for which they have a potential financial gain. In a survey earlier this year triggered by an audit, we found that, as a whole, we as a university were not in compliance.

We had also been asked to explore whether faculty should file a form to disclose when they are working on a text or other course materials for which they may have future financial gain. We determined that this was not needed or desirable. We discussed that in some cases, authoring a text or course materials could be a form of scholarship that should be rewarded and count toward the faculty member’s evaluation, while in other cases, it may not be deemed worthwhile scholarship activity. However, that is not a decision for Scholastics Policy, but for the faculty member and her/his supervisor.

Gen Ed
There has been talk about eliminating the distinction between literature and non-literature for the Arts & Humanities General Education requirement. Though our discussions suggested we do not favor eliminating the distinction, at this point we believe that this should be left in the hands of the Curriculum Committee, which is, of course, composed of faculty members who represent their departments and colleges. Consequently, we urge faculty members to voice their concerns to their Curriculum Committee representatives.
Annual Report of the Faculty Senate Policy Committee
2010/2011 Academic Year

Committee Members: Senators Claudio Cantalupo (BBS), Scott Dutkiewicz (Libraries), Jeremy King (Chair; CoES), Dale Layfield (CAFLS), Jane Lindle (HEHD), Bill Pennington (CoES), Pradip Srimani (CoES)

The 2010/2011 academic year was an active one for the Policy Committee. Significant activities/products of the committee are summarized below. The Committee gratefully acknowledges that it was once again privileged to benefit from collegial working relationships and constructive feedback, suggestions, and guidance from a large number of concerned and helpful faculty, staff, and administrators across campus—especially, the Office of General Counsel, which provided willing assistance to the committee throughout the year. It is a sincere pleasure to single out Fran McGuire (Faculty Manual Editorial Consultant), Pat Smart (Interim Assistant Provost for Faculty Relations), and Cathy Sturkie (Faculty Senate Program coordinator) for their sage and regular counsel to the committee in the course of its work throughout the year.

♦ The committee recommended a Faculty Manual changing the name of the Alcohol and Other Drug Task Force, providing it with a definite charge, and revising its membership. The changes were ultimately approved by the Senate.

♦ The committee recommended a change to the Faculty Manual related to changing the Faculty Manual. The proposed revision would allow the Faculty Manual to be updated on short notice. Such immediate inclusions would be subject to stringent requirements for approval, as well as for subsequent notification. The proposed change was ultimately approved by the Senate.

♦ The committee proposed 3 separate changes to the Faculty Manual related to the Grievance Board, Grievance Hearings. The proposed change would require two Senior Lecturers elected by the Senate E/AC to be eligible to act (at the discretion of the Grievance Board) as non-voting consultants to the Board or its Hearing Panels in grievance cases involving lecturers. The proposed changes were ultimately approved by the Senate.

♦ The committee proposed a change to the Faculty Manual recognizing the University’s Intellectual property policy, which was approved by the Administrative Council in November 2009. The change was not an endorsement of this policy, but updated the existence and
The committee proposed a Faculty Manual change related to Sabbatical Leaves. The proposed change: relaxed the firm 6-year full time service eligibility requirement for sabbatical, advises faculty to be aware of dual employment restrictions while on sabbatical, require a signed agreement by the faculty member to maintain service with Clemson for a period at least equal to the sabbatical leave, and provides a procedure for administrators seeking sabbatical to apply. The proposed change was ultimately approved by the Senate.

The committee continued to support a change to the Faculty Manual related to membership on the Graduate Advisory Committee—such a change was initially suggested by the committee last academic year. After a long and tortuous path of endorsement, the proposed change placing one faculty member representing all the interdisciplinary programs housed within the Graduate School on the GAC was approved by the Senate.

The committee revised another holdover proposed Faculty Manual change from the previous academic year—this one related to the contentious issue of evaluation of teaching by students. The proposed change updates the Manual to reflect the current evaluation system, requires that student evaluation forms be consistent with current research-based practices in teaching evaluation, clarifies the difference in Chair access and instructor access to various parts of the evaluation, and reiterates that evaluation of teaching in general must be carried out using means other than student evaluations. The proposed change was ultimately approved by the Senate.

The committee recommended a Faculty Manual change noting that there exists eligibility criteria for those individuals who receive remuneration provided by public funds that is associated with award programs. The change notes that the eligibility criteria are available in the HR Policy and Procedures Manual. This change was endorsed by the E/AC, but was postponed by the Senate in order to resolve a question concerning awards using Foundation funds. It is hoped that this issue can be resolved by the end of the Senate year.

The committee proposed a Faculty Manual change related to criteria for the rank of Assistant Professor. The proposed change would supplement the “normal” requirement of a terminal degree or the “possible” alternative of progress towards the terminal degree with the additional alternative of relevant experience. The committee believed this would provide needed, but currently unavailable, flexibility in making Adjunct appointments at the Assistant Professor rank for some candidates. The change was approved by the committee, but rejected by the E/AC.
The committee reviewed and slightly revised the recommendations of Past President William Bowerman’s Select Committee on Work Load. The proposed draft of changes to the Faculty Manual Work Load policy was sent to Provost Helms for review and comment. As of this date, we understand that Provost Helms has reviewed the draft and made comments, which we await before proceeding further.

Future Work and Initiatives

During the course of the year, several items of business could not be completed by the Policy Committee given its full agenda.

- **Appointment of Administrators:** Part IV, Section I of the Faculty Manual on the Selection of Other Academic Administrators is out of date and deficient in several respects (e.g., apparently providing no defined mechanism to select the Vice President of Research or College Deans). In addition, the definition and meaning of Academic Administrators in the Faculty Manual is unclear. The Manual also lacks a parallel structure describing administrative positions and the procedure to fill them. Senator King worked on draft changes to this portion of the Faculty Manual during 2010/2011. The needed revisions are substantial, and strong coordination with the Provost, the President, and the BOT will be needed to complete this effort. Senator King is happy to continue working with the 2011/2012 Policy Committee on the needed changes if they so desire.

- **Termination Policy for Faculty:** Senator Pennington worked with Clay Steadman (Office of General Counsel) on the development of a faculty termination policy in the event of program discontinuance. This collaboration was productive, yielding many areas of agreement on principles and details. At present, Senator Pennington continues to deal with the thorny issue of program definition. While the University administrations’ response to recent fiscal pressures has not included termination of faculty, work on completing a draft policy should continue in the 2011/2012 year. Next year’s Policy Committee is urged to coordinate with Senators Pennington and King and Counselor Steadman and be aware of the work accomplished on this policy to date.

- **Work Load:** As of this date, the status of the proposed Faculty Manual change related to Work Load is unclear. If a revised policy is not presented to the Senate during this 2010/2011 academic year, then the 2011/2012 Policy Committee should resume work on this issue.
Adjunct Appointments and Titles: An approach to providing improved but currently lacking flexibility to make appointments to Adjunct Assistant Professor was approved by the Committee, but rejected by the E/AC (see above). Next year's Policy Committee will need to re-examine the issue including, perhaps, whether a regular faculty rank title must accompany the Adjunct title.

Presidential Commission on Sustainability: The committee revised a draft of a Faculty Manual change formalizing the Presidential Commission on Sustainability (PCS) kindly provided by the Office of President Barker. This draft is being forwarded by Senator King to the Commission for review and approval. Next year's Policy Committee will need to follow up the disposition of this review.

Faculty Manual Changes related to the VPR: Several suggested Faculty Manual changes were brought to the Policy Committee by the former Interim Vice President of Research J. Ballato. These need to be reviewed and discussed by the 2011/2012 Policy Committee. It should be stressed that the 2011/2012 Policy Committee should take care to involve the new VPR, Dr. Gerald Sonnenfeld, in these discussions.

Academic Computing Advisory Committee: The Policy Committee heard concerns that the ACAC was not an active committee on campus, but should be. A draft Faculty Manual change rejuvenating this committee in the form of an Academic Technology Council was provided to the Policy Committee by Mary Beth Kurz (CoES), working with Senate Vice-President Dan Warner, Matt Saltzman (the most recent chair of the ACAC), and CIO Jim Bottum. At the writing of this report, the disposition of this draft Faculty Manual change is unknown. If it is not considered by the Senate during the 2010/2011 year, then the 2011/2012 Policy Committee should coordinate with Prof. Kurz and Senate President Warner on this issue.
Faculty Senate Finance Committee

Final Report 2010 - 2011

Committee Senators: Figliola (Chair), Chapman, Goddard, Hewitt, Meriwether, Morris, Wang

The Committee met on the third Tuesday of each month in Room 215 Fluor-Daniel at 2:30PM.

Compensation Report Study (Lead: Wang)

The Annual Compensation Report was released in February, 2011. It incorporated changes developed over the past few years to elaborate on salary changes. The Committee is still engaged in discussions to include a total compensation column to the Annual Report.

University Budget Flow (Lead: Figliola; Second: Goddard)

The Committee was represented on the University Budget Accountability Committee (BAC) by Senator Figliola. Highlights this year included visits to the Senate by CFO Brett Dalton to present a primer on money flows at the University and elaborate on Budget expenditures versus Budget Resources by general category.

University International Programs Study (Lead: Morris)

The Committee requested a report on the financial aspects of International Programs. Vice Provost David Grigsby made a presentation to the Senate on his office budget details and activities. We learned that each College also has international study activity but he did not provide details of those costs and incomes. He reported that program assessment processes were planned.

Lab Fees and Other Fees (Lead: Meriwether)

Continued studies into lab fee use has returned mixed results. The intent for lab fees is to recover direct operating expenses of operating a lab. Half of lab fees collected are retained by the Provost and used for facility renovation, a procedure approved by the Trustees. That portion is clearly accounted for. The other half of the collected fees are returned to the Colleges for distribution to the Departments and distributed on the basis earned. That portion is clearly accounted for. The review found mixed results on how fees were actually being used at the college and department levels. There is not a clear accounting for fees at the lower levels with a portion of fees being used for central college administration and a portion of fees used by chairs in covering other department operating expenses.

The growing list of added student fees merits the question: how is the amount of a fee assessed, what is the process for adding a fee, and how are the acquired funds actually used. The question will be addressed in the 2011 – 2012 period.

Sabbatical Policy (Lead: Figliola)

At its February meeting, the Senate approved a change to the wording of the Sabbatical Policy, with opposition. The new policy brings to issue the legality of external compensation beyond “consulting and honoraria”, the procedure for receiving approval for other types of external compensation, and the process needed for legally receiving compensation from another institution while on sabbatical leave. A key point is that faculty on sabbatical are often compensated for duties within their areas of competence at the host institution, which could be considered “employment,” such as teaching classes or engaging in research activity.
Faculty who are on sabbatical leave are still considered employees of Clemson University and, therefore, may not be employed by another entity. Faculty on sabbatical leave are, however, eligible to engage in outside professional consulting or receive honoraria, in accordance with the University's consulting policy and provided such activities pose no conflict of interest to the University.

Senator Figliola (with President-elect Warner) have met with University counsel in attempts to clarify the definitions of employment and types of compensation allowed, and for setting up a simple process for granting administrative approval for any faculty compensation that may be considered as a form of employment, albeit it temporary. Counsel is working with the Senate and considering changes to the Sabbatical Request form and clarification language. The action will be addressed in the 2011 – 2012 period and forwarded to Policy, as appropriate.

Other Business:

Sales and Use Tax requirements (Lead: Chapman)

The South Carolina sales and use tax policy on departmental purchases was reviewed and the policy clarified for faculty information. Items purchased for research purposes that include equipment or are related to equipment are exempt from sales and use tax and a form for that purpose is on the Office of Sponsored Programs website. The Committee found that many faculty were not aware of this exemption and provided a reminder with a link to the appropriate form.
PART IX. PROFESSIONAL PRACTICES

B. Work Load

The normal faculty workload entails teaching and research assignments; service to the department, school, college, and the university; and/or other professional activities. The usual teaching assignment at Clemson University is 9-12 credit hours for each of the two regular semesters. The particular teaching assignment of an individual faculty member may, for a number of reasons, vary from department to department and even within departments. Departments with heavy faculty research obligations may in some instances reduce teaching loads and assign the hours so released to research. Released time may also be provided through funded research. Unusually heavy service assignments (e.g., committee work, administrative duties, advisory responsibilities, public service) may also lead to reduced teaching assignments, depending upon the staffing situation in a given department. In some instances graduate courses, off-campus courses, or unusually large classes may be considerations in workload decisions.

Off-campus courses are offered by some colleges, including the program at Furman University leading to the Master of Business Administration degree through the College of Business and Behavioral Sciences and the courses taught at the University Center of Greenville. These courses are taught by Clemson faculty and carry university credit.

Work assignments for faculty on non-teaching appointments and librarians are made on the basis of particular tasks to be accomplished or periods to be covered. Workloads for faculty members whose responsibilities include teaching as well as non-teaching assignments are established on a percentage basis.

Courses are assigned to faculty by the department chair on the basis of established departmental procedures. Factors taken into consideration include: departmental needs, faculty expertise, faculty preferences for particular teaching assignments, faculty schedules, and the nature and extent of nonteaching workloads.
Proposed Changes:

B. Work Load

Each department must have written procedures for assignment of workload. These written workload procedures will be included as an Appendix to the Department’s Bylaws. The written procedures will be developed by the Departmental Advisory Committee or the Department as a whole, voted on by the Faculty, and per the same procedure as adoption of Departmental Bylaws, will be approved by the Department Chair, Dean of the respective College, and the Provost. The procedures must be reviewed by the Department at least every 2 years. Specifically, each Department will include in these procedures, allocation of credit hour equivalency for all activities that a faculty member may undertake in teaching, research, service/extension, and administrative appointments. Workload assignments for faculty on non-teaching appointments and librarians are made on the basis of particular tasks to be accomplished or periods to be covered. Workload assignments will directly correspond with categories and reporting mechanisms of the Faculty Activity System and will be based on a 4 block system per semester. Individual workload assignments for faculty will also be reported on a percentage basis. A faculty members workload for the year will be determined prior to approval of Faculty Activity System goals by department chairs, and will be provided in writing to the faculty member by the chair.

Faculty workload may include any combination of teaching and research assignments; service to the department, school, college, and the university; and/or other professional activities. The standard workload assignment at Clemson University is 12 credit hour equivalents for each of the two regular semesters. The particular workload assignment of an individual faculty member may, for a number of reasons, vary from department to department and even within departments.

Workload is assigned to faculty by the department chair on the basis of written departmental procedures. Factors taken into consideration include: departmental needs, faculty expertise, faculty preferences for particular teaching assignments, faculty schedules, and the nature and extent of nonteaching workloads, depending upon the staffing situation in a given department each year. Faculty research, whether funded or unfunded, may be assigned as credit hour equivalents based on written procedures. Service assignments (e.g., committee work, administrative duties, advisory responsibilities, public service) may also be assigned as credit hour equivalents based on written procedures. Departmental procedures should address issues such as teaching graduate courses, off-campus courses, distance learning courses, course development, or unusually large classes as considerations in workload credit hour equivalency allocation.
PART VI. THE UNIVERSITY'S ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE

G. The Department Chairs

Department Chairs are generally responsible for the activities of their departments, for which they are accountable to the school director and/or to the dean of the college. Their primary responsibility is to ensure the quality of the teaching, research, and public service program and its delivery within their departments while continuing to engage in their own teaching, scholarship, and public service activities. Department chairs represent their departments in relations with other departments and schools and with the deans and other administrative officers of the university. In exercising leadership in the improvement of departmental programs and of the departmental faculty, a chair is expected to take initiatives to report that unit’s needs and advocate its goals and plans.

A department chair’s specific functions include:

- ensuring implementation of departmental policies and procedures involving peer evaluations; recommending faculty appointment, reappointment, tenure, promotion, termination, and dismissal; negotiating with prospective faculty;
- monitoring departmental implementation of Affirmative Action policies and procedures;
- annually evaluating each member of the department’s faculty and participating in the evaluation of staff; developing budgets in concert with school directors and college deans and allocating such funds for instructional and other purposes;
- hearing informal faculty grievances and cooperating in formal grievance procedures;
- supervising the department’s program of instruction, including curriculum, scheduling, faculty workload, and departmental research and public service;
- ensuring that students’ rights are preserved; supervising the advising of departmental majors and graduate students;
- monitoring student evaluation of instruction, courses, and programs;
- providing leadership in student recruitment, student advising, and student placement;
- coordinating and supervising summer school programs and freshman/transfer orientations;
- making recommendations concerning applications for professional travel and sabbatical leave;
- arranging meetings of the departmental faculty; meeting with the departmental advisory committee and appropriate constituent and advisory groups for the discipline;
- establishing accreditation and ad hoc departmental committees; and
- carrying out other such duties as shall be assigned by the school director and/or the dean of the college or as set down in university policy, or in collegiate bylaws, school or departmental bylaws.

Department chairs serve at the pleasure of their respective school directors and collegiate deans, who formally evaluate the performance in office of chairs reporting to them before the end of the chair’s second year in office and every fourth year thereafter. In making recommendations for reappointment, deans will transmit the results of the faculty evaluation of the chair and confer with the Provost before renewing the appointment. All chairs of academic departments hold faculty rank.
Proposed Changes:

G. The Department Chairs

Department Chairs are generally responsible for the activities of their departments, for which they are accountable to the school director and/or to the dean of the college. Their primary responsibility is to ensure the quality of the teaching, research, and public service program and its delivery within their departments while continuing to engage in their own teaching, scholarship, and public service activities. Department chairs represent their departments in relations with other departments and schools and with the deans and other administrative officers of the university. In exercising leadership in the improvement of departmental programs and of the departmental faculty, a chair is expected to take initiatives to report that unit’s needs and advocate its goals and plans.

A department chair’s specific functions include:

- ensuring implementation of departmental policies and procedures involving peer evaluations; recommending faculty appointment, reappointment, tenure, promotion, termination, and dismissal; negotiating with prospective faculty;
- monitoring departmental implementation of Affirmative Action policies and procedures;
- annually evaluating each member of the department’s faculty and participating in the evaluation of staff; developing budgets in concert with school directors and college deans and allocating such funds for instructional and other purposes;
- hearing informal faculty grievances and cooperating in formal grievance procedures;
- supervising the department’s program of instruction, including curriculum, scheduling, faculty workload, and departmental research and public service;
- ensuring that the written faculty workload procedures are agreed upon and reviewed by departmental faculty;
- ensuring that students’ rights are preserved; supervising the advising of departmental majors and graduate students;
- monitoring student evaluation of instruction, courses, and programs;
- providing leadership in student recruitment, student advising, and student placement;
- coordinating and supervising summer school programs and freshman/transfer orientations;
- making recommendations concerning applications for professional travel and sabbatical leave;
- arranging meetings of the departmental faculty; meeting with the departmental advisory committee and appropriate constituent and advisory groups for the discipline;
- establishing accreditation and ad hoc departmental committees; and
- carrying out other such duties as shall be assigned by the school director and/or the dean of the college or as set down in university policy, or in collegiate bylaws, school or departmental bylaws.

Department chairs serve at the pleasure of their respective school directors and collegiate deans, who formally evaluate the performance in office of chairs reporting to them before the end of the chair’s second year in office and every fourth year thereafter. In making recommendations for reappointment, deans will transmit the results of the faculty evaluation of the chair and confer with the Provost before renewing the appointment. All chairs of academic departments hold faculty rank.
Academic Eligibility Policy Committee: Lead David Tonkyn
David was SP’s representative on this committee. The policy has been rewritten and is pending final approval. The major change is students new to Clemson will have three semesters instead of two to complete before they may be suspended.

Acceptance into Major and Graduation
We were asked to consider the statement on page 28 of the Undergraduate Announcements, under the section entitled “Special Requirements,” which states: “Candidates for graduation must be officially accepted in the major in which they are applying for a degree no later than the term prior to submitting the application.” Apparently there have been times when this policy has not been followed, though Mr. Smith indicated that this is not a common occurrence.

Our recommendation was to leave the policy in place but modify it to state: “Candidates for graduation must be officially accepted in the major in which they are applying for a degree no later than the date applications for diplomas are due.” The Executive/Advisory Committee raised no objections to this.
Members: Debbie Willoughby, Lydia Schleifer, Vic Shelburne, Kinly Sturkie, Jeff Appling, Berinthia Allison, Chris Wood. Stan Smith, Ben Boone (student), Emily Barrett (student), Katie Henson (student), Harry McIntyre (student), Bill Surver, President of Faculty Senate, Pat Smart, Chair.

This select committee was formed in the Fall of 2010 by Dr. Bill Surver, who served as President of the Faculty during the 2010-2011 academic year. The committee consists of representatives from the faculty, academic administration, human resources, and students. The purpose of the committee was to examine the potential effects on faculty and students related to the modified summer calendar. The calendar includes one long summer session, 2 regular sessions of 5 weeks each and 4 mini sessions each lasting approximately 3 weeks. The modification does not introduce a new model as departments have offered summer courses with various schedules for many years.

We have met on a monthly basis and have received input from all members of the committee. Several issues were raised by the committee. One of the most notable was the cost of summer school per credit hour at Clemson and subsequent effect on summer enrollment. Comparisons of cost with several peer universities and local Tech programs, Clemson's fees are considerably higher. Institutions and summer school fees compared included (but, not limited to) the following:

- University of Florida -at $127.00/credit hour in state ($707.00/ch out of state)
- NC State - $129/ch instate ($637/ch out of state)
- UGA - $203/ch instate ($882/ch out of state)
- UVa $250/ch instate ($860/ch out of state)
- USC-Col $391/ch instate ($1,040/ch out of state)
- Tri County Tech $140/ch instate ($287/ch out of state)
- Greenville Tech $174/ch instate ($318/ch out of state)
- Clemson $467/ch instate ($1,087/ch out of state)

In most cases, summer school fees were somewhat lower than "regular academic" term fees.

The committee decided to conduct an informal survey of undergraduate students at Clemson relating to student decision making and motivation relating to enrollment at Clemson for summer courses. Ben
Boone, Academic Affairs Chair of the Undergraduate Student Senate, suggested that the students run the survey. Input to the survey was provided and approved by Provost Helms, Brett Dalton, Clemson CFO, Debbie Jackson, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, Jeff Appling, Associate Dean of Undergraduate Studies, Dale Layfield, and David Knox, Director of Assessment. Results from the survey are expected to be in by the end of April.

Another issue discussed at length was the notion of a 3rd semester and how it would impact faculty salaries, student major options, department obligations to students, faculty workload and research and faculty governance. In general, there was great concern about this issue, however it was felt that a good sense of whether or not student enrollment would increase as a response to the modified schedule was needed as a basis from which to begin to address the impact of a 3rd semester. Although, the general opinion was that unless student summer school fees are reduced significantly, summer school enrollment may decline.

In summary, it was felt that the work of this committee should continue. The results of the survey would enlighten the discussion regarding enrollment, fees and the subsequent potential of a 3rd semester. The committee was strongly opposed to the idea of having a third semester, especially as a substitute for the traditional semesters, and felt that academic programs should run in Fall and Spring.

Respectfully submitted,

Pat Smart, Chair

Faculty Senate Select Committee on Academic Calendar with Summer Alternatives
Ad Hoc Committee on the Status of Lecturers

2010-2011 Final Report

Members
Paul Dawson, Sandy Edge, Linda Howe, Beth Kunkel, Meredith Morris, Todd Schweisinger, Daniel Warner (chair), and Leslie Williams.

Activity
The activities this year started with the chair attending the Ninth meeting of the Coalition of Contingent Academic Labor that was held at the Université Laval in Québec City, Canada. The participants were higher education faculty from Canada, Mexico, and the United States, and the vast majority of the participants were contingent faculty, both full time and part time, along with a handful of tenured faculty. The participants represented 26 unions, 15 labor federations, and 7 Confederations.

The most significant presentations and discussions at the conference revolved around the report by the American Association of University Professors. This AAUP report, entitled “Tenure and Teaching-Intensive Appointments” was circulated as a draft at the conference and was officially released on Labor Day. The report begins:

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.

The AAUP report goes on to point out:

By 2007, almost 70 percent of faculty members were employed off the tenure track. 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.

The collective bargaining organizations represented at the COCAL IX meeting have focused almost exclusively on redressing the economic difficulties encountered by contingent faculty. However, the AAUP position focuses on the broader needs of the entire university. The AAUP supports the restoration of the true tenure process. The AAUP report has been studied by this Ad Hoc Committee, has been circulated to the Faculty Senate, and is available online at:

During the first semester, the chair interviewed most of the participants of the 2009-2010 Senate Select Committee on Best Management Practices in Support of Academic Lecturers. He also discussed the issues of Contingent Faculty with the Provost and several past and present Faculty Senators with a view toward enhancing the proposal of the Select Committee to bring it more in line with the AAUP guidelines.

The Ad Hoc Committee began meeting weekly after the start of the current semester. The committee reviewed the report from the 2009-2010 Select Committee, the AAUP report, and data generated by the Office of Institutional Research. The committee discussed a broad outline for modifying the current tenure and promotion practices at Clemson in order to bring our process more in line with the AAUP guidelines. Members of the committee elicited feedback from colleagues and administrators, and this feedback was discussed at subsequent meetings. The committee met on March 2, 2011, and endorsed the attached Draft Proposal on Contingent Faculty and the Tenure Process.
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 Lecturers 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.
Tenure and Teaching-Intensive Appointments (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 fulltime 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 has risen sharply. 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. 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. 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. Mindful that their working conditions are their students' 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 the privilege of those who are, have been, or soon will 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 lecturership" 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 infrastructure is to bundle the employment and economic securities that activist faculty on contingent appointments are already winning for themselves with the rigorous scrutiny of the tenure system. The ways in which contingent teachers and researchers are hired, evaluated, and promoted often bypass the faculty entirely and are generally less rigorous than the intense review applied to faculty in tenurable positions.

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, 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 tenureeligible 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.

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 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.

Appendix A: Conversion Practices and Proposals

Some institutions have already taken steps to convert contingent faculty positions to the tenure track. At 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.

Pennsylvania 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 have sometimes 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 nontenure-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.wmuaaup.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 fulltime 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.
Tenure and Teaching-Intensive Appointments (2010)

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 onetime 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 faculty, 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 lecturers 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 instructors 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 university 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 tenureline assistant professors and before all tenured faculty. 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 bargaining 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 relating 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 represented 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/aaup_2007-11.pdf.

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 professor to adjunct professor. After teaching approximately half time for three years (specifies vary by campus and unit) and successfully completing a review by full-time members of their department or
program, adjuncts are eligible 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 discharge or suspend an adjunct whose term appointment 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.

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 (reduced or separated) if courses are assigned to tenurestream faculty or graduate students teaching in the department of their major.

Vancouver Community College

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.
Layoff and recall rights:

- All layoffs are by reverse-accrued seniority, not by full- or part-time status.
- 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.

The collective bargaining agreement does not have explicit provisions on academic freedom.

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

- All faculty have full voting rights in departments, including the right to elect and be elected as chair (in the latter case, the person is converted to full-time regular status).
- Term and regular faculty have the same right to vote for and be elected to all statutory college governance bodies.
- 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.

Marya Besosa (Spanish), California State University, San Marcos
Marc Bousquet (English), Santa Clara University Co-chairs, Committee on Contingency and the Profession
Lacy Barnes (Psychology), Reedley College
Cary Nelson (English), University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
Marcia Newfield (English), Borough of Manhattan Community College, City University of New York
Jeremy Nienow (Anthropology), Minneapolis Community and Technical College and Inver Hills Community College
Karen G. Thompson (English), Rutgers University, consultant

The Subcommittee

Endnotes

1. With respect to faculty tenure, the Association holds to the following tenets: (1) with the

http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/comm/rep/teachertenure.htm?PF=1
- 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
exception of brief special appointments, all full-time faculty appointments should be either tenured or probationary for tenure (________); (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); (4) tenure-line positions can be part time as well as full time (Regulation 13 of the Recommended Institutional Regulations); (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 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, 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.

3. As of 1970, roughly three-fourths of all faculty were in the tenure stream and 78 percent of all faculty were full-time; in 1969, only 3.2 percent of full-time appointments were nontenurable. Among all full-time appointments in 1969, teaching-intensive faculty (with nine or more hours a week of teaching) outnumbered research intensive faculty (with six or fewer hours a week of teaching) in a ratio of 1.5:1, accounting for 60 percent of the total number of full-time appointments. See Jack H. Schuster and Martin J. Finkelstein, The American Faculty: The Restructuring of Academic Work and Careers (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2006), 41 (Table 3.2, "American Faculty by Employment Status, 1970–2003"); 174 (Table 6.1, "Non-Tenure-Eligible Faculty, 1969–1998"); 97 (Table 4.4, "Ratio of High to Low Teaching Loads among Full-Time Faculty, 1969–1998").

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.).

5. "__________ (compiled by the AAUP).


10. For part-time contingent faculty, the AAUP’s 2006 addition to its Recommended Institutional Policies 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.”

American Association of University Professors
1133 Nineteenth Street, NW, Suite 200
Washington, DC 20036
Phone: 202-737-5900 Fax: 202-737-5526
RESOLUTION CONFERRING
the Distinction of Honorary Faculty Senator
to
Thomas Michael Keinath, Dean Emeritus

FS11-04-1 P

WHEREAS, Dean Tom Keinath has always respected and believed in the importance of Faculty and its impact on students and the future of Clemson University;

WHEREAS, Dean Keinath has respected and believed in the importance of the Faculty Senate and its involvement in the governance structure of Clemson University;

WHEREAS, Dean Keinath more often than not attended and participated in Faculty Senate meetings;

WHEREAS, Dean Keinath always had the foresight to search the Faculty Manual and/or contact the Faculty Senate President or the Faculty Manual Editorial Consultant when Faculty Manual questions arose; and

WHEREAS, Dean Keinath has for many years served as the Administrative Grievance Counselor for his colleagues helping to prepare them for their role in the Grievance process

RESOLVED, That the 2010-2011 Clemson University Faculty Senate proudly confers the distinction of Honorary Faculty Senator to Dean Emeritus Thomas Michael Keinath for his belief in the Faculty Senate and the spirit of shared University governance.

Passed by the Faculty Senate
on April 12, 2011.
Campaign for the Future of Higher Education

More than seventy faculty leaders from universities, four-year institutions, and community colleges in twenty-one states, including many AAUP leaders, met in Los Angeles in January at the invitation of the California Faculty Association. There were tenure-track and contingent faculty, faculty from collective bargaining units and those from settings without collective bargaining, and there were faculty from various national affiliates (AAUP, AFT, and NEA) and independents. The purpose was to hold a first-of-its-kind discussion on how to construct a positive counter-narrative in the national debate over the future of American higher education at a time when public higher education is at great risk. The mission of this grassroots campaign is twofold: to ensure that affordable quality higher education is accessible to all sectors of our society in the coming decades; and to ensure that faculty, students, and our communities, not just administrators, politicians, foundations, and think tanks, have a voice to guarantee that “reforms” to higher education are good for students, for the quality of education, and for the public good. Participants agreed on seven principles (below) that should guide the development and assessment of policy and practice in higher education. They also agreed to identify April 13 as a national day of taking class action in support of higher education, with faculty organizing various actions at the local level. A formal launch of the campaign will take place in a press conference at the National Press Club on May 17.

What Can You Do?

Although the campaign is in its early stages, we know already that its success depends on widespread participation by faculty and other constituencies (students, civil rights groups, community groups, organized labor) who care about the future of higher education. We need to build buzz about the campaign, its principles, and its formal launch. Please help by:

- Planning an action on April 13, and letting us know the details so that we can help publicize and promote these events nationally. This can be as big as a campus demonstration or teach-in, or as small as hanging fliers with information about the situation in your state or on your campus. For more ideas, see the California Faculty Association website. Please let us know what you have planned so we can get the word out: gbradley@aaup.org.
- Talking to your friends and neighbors about the importance of higher education. The time to take action is now. Too often, a reluctance to engage in political conversation means that people outside the academy may not be aware of the work that happens on campus or of threats to quality higher education posed by political agendas.
- Write to your local newspapers and legislators about the value of higher education, public funding for education, and the other principles listed below.
- Let others on your campus know about this campaign.
Message to the Faculty Senate

Dear Senators:

As a former senator, an emeritus Faculty member, and perhaps a thorn in the side of the Administration and even some of you, I would like to share some thoughts about current events at Clemson that I believe to be very pertinent to your mandate as Faculty representatives and to the University at large.

In my opinion, Clemson is living a dichotomy, a contradiction in terms, and much more importantly, a dangerous page in its history as far as the 2020 Plan is concerned. The dichotomy is the splitting of Clemson into two mutually destructive parts, one desirous of fame and the other fully cognizant of the lying going on to obtain that fame. A contradiction in terms because "investing" and "divesting" are economic actions equivalent to "buying" and "selling." These terms are not university terms. They are business-world terms. And their applications in the world of education are dangerous. They are dangerous for one very simple reason: the role of Education in society is not essentially materialistic ... even if high levels of Education often result in material rewards. The essential role of Education in society is social, i.e. mutually beneficial without regard to material possessions. In short, Education's primary role is the safeguard of Democracy, not the creation of material wealth. And the expenditure of communal wealth (taxes) to ensure the primacy of Education is, among the various expenditures of communities, the most important.

So I come before you today to complain about you. Because I fear that you have sorely neglected your mandate to defend Education, at all costs. The Faculty Senate has, in fact, in the Charter of Clemson University, absolutely no real power. Nothing in the power structure of Clemson University recognizes any realistic veto power of any kind in so far as the Faculty Senate is concerned. You can issue votes of no-confidence all day long without any statutory possibility of having any effect. And I think most of you know this.

What you can do, however, is stand up and say that you think something is wrong. You conducted a Faculty survey three years ago that massively criticized President Barker's Top Twenty program and its devastating affect on morale at Clemson. That survey had a more than forty-percent participation rate on the part of the Faculty. Surveys with a ten-percent participation rate are considered very valid. Your leadership downplayed the message of that survey. Your leadership chose to "communicate" with the Administration instead of confronting it. You gingerly voted a remonstrance about administrative salaries. But you have, essentially, done nothing.

Shame on you! Isn't that any easy sentence to pronounce? No, senators, I think you have to stand up and face the fact that you have been horribly ineffectual in doing anything to truly represent your constituencies. The Faculty at Clemson University is, in its vast majority, afraid of doing anything. Perhaps it is afraid that it will be fired. And you have willingly participated in the creation of that fear. It is time for you to act. It is time for you to protect the people who have elected you. It is time for you to be yourselves, no matter what the consequences.

John C. Bednar, Professor Emeritus
1. **Call to Order:** The Faculty Senate Meeting was called to order at 2:36 p.m. by President Daniel D. Warner, and guests were recognized and introduced.

2. **Approval of Minutes:** The Faculty Senate Minutes dated April 12, 2011 were approved as written.

3. **“Free Speech”:** None

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

5. **Committee Reports:**
   
a. **Senate Committees:** At the direction of President Warner, the five Faculty Senate Standing Committees met during the full Senate meeting for fifteen minutes. At the conclusion of this session, the Chairs summarized what transpired during their meetings.

   - **Finance** – Member Susan Chapman stated that this Committee will meet soon.

   - **Welfare** – Chair Denise Anderson stated that this Committee will continue its work on child care and the state retirement system in addition to other items that come to it.

   - **Research** – Chair Dvora Perahia stated that this Committee will continue work on the issues of the intellectual property policy, internal competition for grants, number of proposals, GADs, workload (research versus teaching), the quality of graduate students for research, and conflict of interest relating to start-up companies.

   - **Scholastic Policies** – Chair Bob Horton stated that this Committee will work on issues, such as scheduling, online exams, faculty work assignments, academic integrity and grade inflation.

   - **Policy** – Chair Sean Brittain stated that the Committee will work on the issues of social media policy, the definition of “regular faculty,” and review of the title, Professors of the Practice.

   b. **University Commissions and Committees:**
c. Faculty Senate Select Committees:

Academic Calendar Select Committee – Chair Pat Smart noted that the Committee is addressing how the new schedule will impact faculty and students.

Lecturers – Chair Jeremy King noted that the Committee membership is now being assembled. The Committee will look at the reports from the past two years and address the recommendations for possible implementation. The Committee may utilize the reorganized Open Forum and micro surveys in order to seek information from faculty.

Teaching Effectiveness – Chair Jane Lindle noted that the charge to this committee will include broader aspects of teaching effectiveness than student evaluations including new federal requirements for “evidence of learning.”

6. Old Business: None

7. New Business:
   a. After receiving two-thirds vote of the Senate to bring the issue to the floor for consideration, Senator Brittain, submitted for approval and explained the proposed Faculty Manual Change, V. Grievance Procedures J.2. Appeals. There was no discussion. Vote to approve change was taken and passed.

   b. President Warner asked Secretary Scott Dutkiewicz to read aloud the Resolution to Honor Clayton Steadman (Posthumously), General Counsel of Clemson University (2004-2010). Following the reading, President Warner submitted the Resolution for approval. There was no discussion. Vote to approve resolution was passed unanimously (FS1105-1 P).

8. President’s Report: President Warner:
   a. thanked everyone for their assistance and participation in this morning’s Faculty Senate Orientation;

   b. shared information from meetings on which he has membership: individual meetings with President Barker, Four Presidents Meetings; Academic Council, individual meetings with the Provost and the Compensation Advisory Group. He also met with the Board of Visitors recently;

   c. emphasized the need for communication especially in year one of the 2020 Roadmap;
d. explained his thoughts for reorganizing the Open Forum from a paper publication to an online opportunity for communication among faculty. The draft guidelines will be shared with the Executive/Advisory Committee later in May;

e. stated the policy that working papers developed by the Senate should always be marked “draft” and that committee chairs need to follow this practice. Approved items are no longer drafts;

f. noted that the Faculty Senate will begin to use shorter, targeted opinion polls rather than a survey every several years in order to retrieve information from faculty and for better communication.

g. stated that in order to continue efforts for better communication, senator and alternates should display “Faculty Senator” door signs. Lead senators from each college need to meet with the Dean and organize senatorial representation to each department.

9. Announcements:
   a. Next Executive/Advisory Committee Meeting – May 31, 2011
   b. No Executive/Advisory Committee Meetings in June or July, 2011
   c. Next Faculty Senate Meeting – June 14, 2011

10. Adjournment: President Warner adjourned the meeting at 3:34 p.m.

   [Signatures]

   Scott Dutkiewicz, Secretary

   Cathy Toth-Sturkie, Program Coordinator

Absent: M. Morris, D. Layfield (B. Surver for), R. Hewitt, C. Cantalupo, X. Hu, J. Meriwether, R. Figliola (P. Srimani for), A. Katsiyannis (S. Timmons for)
MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
JUNE 14, 2011

1. Call to Order: The Faculty Senate Meeting was called to order at 2:34 p.m. by President Daniel D. Warner.

2. Approval of Minutes: The General Faculty & Staff Minutes dated May 12, 2010 were approved as corrected. The Faculty Senate Minutes dated May 10, 2011 were approved as written.

3. “Free Speech”: None

4. Committee Reports:
   a. Senate Committees:
      Finance – No report.
      Welfare – No report.
      Research – No report.
      Scholastic Policies – No report.
      Policy – President Warner stated that this Committee had met and will bring an item to the Senate under New Business later in the meeting.
   b. University Commissions and Committees: None
   c. Faculty Senate Select Committees:
      Budget Accountability – No report.
      Academic Calendar Select Committee – Chair Pat Smart noted that the Committee will reconvene in August.
      Lecturers – No report.
      Teaching Effectiveness – Chair Jane Lindle noted that the Committee is awaiting a formal charge.”

5. Old Business: None

6. New Business:
   a. President Warner submitted for approval and explained the proposed Faculty Manual Change, Part II. F.2. Regular Faculty. Following discussion vote to approve change was taken and unanimously passed.

7. President’s Report: President Warner:
   a. provided an update on the health of Esin Gulari, Dean of the College of Engineering & Science;
   b. noted that there is a serious effort on the part of the Administration involving compensation. (see
http://www.clemson.edu/oirweb1/fb/OIRWebpage/analyses.htm#oak for Faculty Market Oklahoma Surveys);

c. noted that the Executive/Advisory Committee approved the new Open Forum Guidelines which will be included in the Faculty Senate Handbook.

d. stated that he had attended the funeral of Board of Trustee member, Les McCraw, on behalf of the Faculty Senate. He reminded the Senate of impressive Clemson’s Trustees are; how they are very strong Clemson supporters and that we are thankful for that kind of support.

At the invitation of President Warner, Provost Doris R. Helms stated that times are busy preparing for the upcoming Board of Trustees meeting in July. The Trustees will address issues regarding workload, compensation, the 2020 Plan and the budget for the Plan with a positive view to the future. A few results of these discussions will be expounded upon in August. The Provost noted that good wishes may be sent to Dr. Gulari’s home address (not to the hospital).

8. **Announcements:**

   a. No Executive/Advisory Committee Meetings in June or July, 2011

   b. Next Executive/Advisory Committee Meeting – August 2, 2011 (then August 30, 2011)

   c. Next Faculty Senate Meeting – August 16, 2011

9. **Adjournment:** President Warner adjourned the meeting at 3:08 p.m.

   [Signature]

Scott Dutkiewicz, Secretary

[Cathy Teth Sturkie, Program Coordinator]

Proposed change to definition of "Regular Faculty" in Part II, section F.2 of the Faculty Manual.

Rationale: Confusion regarding who is and who is not a regular faculty member reigns, thus it is necessary to define the regular faculty more explicitly. Representatives from the Policy committee (Jane Lindle, Scott Dutkiewicz, Sean Brittain, and Bill Pennington) met May 10 during the faculty senate meeting and agreed to redefine regular faculty based on how they are reviewed. A regular faculty member is one reviewed by her Department Chair (or equivalent) using the Form-3 process. A faculty member with an administrative appointment is one who should be evaluated under Part VI, Section J. The qualifier "should" is used because there is some concern that some academic deans and associate deans may not be evaluated properly.

Original:
F. Terminology
Several categories of “faculty” are used throughout the Manual. Unless otherwise specified, the following definitions apply:

1. Faculty--Faculty as defined in the constitution (Part VIII of this Manual). It includes tenured and tenure-track faculty with appointments of instructor through full professor. It does not exclude those with administrative appointments, such as the president, the provost, and deans.

2. regular faculty -- Same as above, except that it excludes those with administrative appointments (fully described in Part III, section D of this Manual).

3. special faculty - Includes those who have been hired under the various titles for special faculty (fully described in Part III, section E of this Manual).

4. faculty -- a generic term including all of the above.

Alteration:
F. Terminology
Several categories of “faculty” are used throughout the Manual. Unless otherwise specified, the following definitions apply:

1. Faculty--Faculty as defined in the constitution (Part VIII of this Manual). It includes tenured and tenure-track faculty with appointments of instructor through full professor. It does not exclude those with administrative appointments, such as the president, the provost, and deans.

2. regular faculty -- Same as above, except that it excludes those with administrative appointments (fully described in Part III, section D of this Manual). All Faculty as defined in the Constitution of the Faculty of Clemson University (Part VIII of the Faculty Manual) with the exception of those holding Nonacademic Administrative appointments as described in Part VI Section K or Academic Administrative appointments who should be evaluated under Part VI Section J (Review of Academic Administrators) of the
Faculty Manual. The Regular Faculty ranks are described in Part III, section D of this Manual.

3. special faculty - Includes those who have been hired under the various titles for special faculty (fully described in Part III, section E of this Manual).

4. faculty -- a generic term including all of the above.

Final Draft:
F. Terminology
Several categories of “faculty” are used throughout the Manual. Unless otherwise specified, the following definitions apply:

1. Faculty--Faculty as defined in the constitution (Part VIII of this Manual). It includes tenured and tenure-track faculty with appointments of instructor through full professor. It does not exclude those with administrative appointments, such as the president, the provost, and deans.

2. regular faculty -- All Faculty as defined in the Constitution of the Faculty of Clemson University (Part VIII of the Faculty Manual) with the exception of those holding Nonacademic Administrative appointments as described in Part VI Section K or Academic Administrative appointments who should be evaluated under Part VI Section J (Review of Academic Administrators) of the Faculty Manual. The Regular Faculty ranks are described in Part III, section D of this Manual.

3. special faculty - Includes those who have been hired under the various titles for special faculty (fully described in Part III, section E of this Manual).

4. faculty -- a generic term including all of the above.
The 2011-2012 Faculty Senate began work on April 12. There are several good reasons to start the Senate year at this time rather than the beginning of the fiscal year or the beginning of the Fall semester. However, I discovered one highly motivating reason that I had not considered before – graduation. In addition to signing the 61 certificates for the Faculty Scholastic Achievement Award and announcing the names of these students at graduation, I was also fortunate to attend the Calhoun Honors College Awards ceremony. The program included a short summary of each student’s achievements while at Clemson, and as each student walked across the stage at the Brooks Center this summary was read to the audience. After listening to this impressive list of achievements, I was really pumped about how well Clemson is doing, both in the quality of the students and the opportunities that are being provided to them.

(Copies of those programs will be given to the Board Members.)

As a key part of the Faculty Senate’s role in representing the general faculty, one of the most important objectives is to promote discussion. This is particularly important during this first year of the 2020 Roadmap. We will be building on the steps taken last year, particularly making sure that every department has an identified senator from the college as their initial point of contact.

As a new effort, we are moving the Open Forum, a venue for the faculty to express their opinions, from an out-of-date printed format to an electronic format. Essays will be published - with a minimum of editorial review - on the Faculty Senate Web page and will be available to all members of the Clemson Community.

In 2008-2009 the Faculty Senate conducted a detailed survey of the faculty. Professor Christina Wells presented a review of this survey to the Executive/Advisory committee at its initial meeting. She also presented the same review to the new faculty senators during their orientation meeting. Some of the key issues identified in that survey will continue to be addressed by the Faculty Senate. In addition, we plan to conduct one or more short surveys that target specific issues during the coming year.

The Faculty Senate has five standing committees – Finance, Policy, Research, Scholastic Policy, and Welfare. In addition, the Senate has authorized the Budget Accountability Committee and three ad hoc committees.

1. The Finance Committee, chaired by Senator Richard Figliola from Mechanical Engineering, will continue to review the format of the salary report and will also explore questions that track specific funding paths, such as lab fees and indirect
costs. Some of these questions are particularly relevant in connection with the new “divest to invest” program.

2. The Policy Committee, chaired by Senator Sean Brittain from Physics and Astronomy, will continue to scrutinize and wordsmith all proposed changes to the Faculty Manual. It will also serve as a primary interface between administrative and academic policies.

3. The Research Committee, chaired by Senator Dvora Perahia from Chemistry, will continue work on the issues of the intellectual property policy, the internal competition for grants, the number of proposals, GADs, workload (research versus teaching), the quality of graduate students for research, and the conflict of interest relating to start-up companies.

4. The Scholastic Policies Committee, chaired by Senator Bob Horton from Teacher Education, will work on issues, such as scheduling, online exams, faculty work assignments, academic integrity and grade inflation.

5. The Welfare Committee, chaired by Senator Denise Anderson from Parks, Recreation and Tourism Management, will continue its work on child care. It will also examine the possibilities of regulatory relief relative to the state retirement system, which could be valuable tool for retention.

6. The Budget Accountability Committee, chaired by Senator Antonis Katsiyannis from Teacher Education, will continue to work with CFO Brett Dalton to keep the Faculty Senate informed about the budget and the budget process. Reports from this committee as well as the “Budget 101” presentations have been invaluable to the Faculty Senate’s understanding of how Clemson University finance really works. I personally want to thank Brett for his willingness and openness in working with this committee.

7. The Status of Lecturers Committee, chaired by Senator Jeremy King from Physics and Astronomy, will review the reports from the past two years and address the recommendations for possible implementation. The Committee will probably utilize the reorganized Open Forum and micro surveys in order to seek information from faculty.

8. The Teaching Effectiveness Committee, chaired by Jane Lindle from Educational Leadership, will develop detailed guidelines for the various assessments of teaching effectiveness proposed for the faculty manual. This committee will also examine the new federal requirements for “evidence of learning.”

9. The Academic Calendar Select Committee, chaired by Pat Smart from Parks, Recreation and Tourism Management, will be addressing how the new Summer Calendar will impact faculty and students.

I firmly believe that the Board of Trustees, the Administration, and the Faculty all want what is best for the University, but we have different perspectives. The role of shared governance is to balance these different approaches.

In 1997 the previous administration encouraged the Faculty Senate to incorporate the following sentence into the Faculty Manual. “A recommendation to confer tenure for an assistant professor must be accompanied by a favorable recommendation for promotion
to associate professor." The avowed reason was that this strengthened the tenure requirements. The practical reason was that this reduced the caseload in the Provost’s office. Whatever the reason, it was a mistake. By linking tenure and promotion it oversimplified the tenure process, which in turn caused an imbalance that helped lead to a situation in which 28% of our faculty are lecturers. They do not routinely undergo peer review, do not receive opportunities for professional development, do not enjoy the guarantee of academic freedom, and cannot engage in long range curriculum development for their colleges. This needs to be remedied in order to satisfy accreditation guidelines, but more importantly to provide our students with the best possible faculty. Correcting this particular imbalance will be my primary goal this year. A proposed approach to this issue was developed by the committee that I chaired last year, and this proposed approach has met with the approval of the Provost. However, since this affects tenure, it will require a lot of work from several committees and a lot of discussion by the general faculty.

A closely related issue to obtaining the best faculty for our students is the issue of retention. Three important items regarding retention are: child care, pension options, and compensation.

- In the 2008-2009 survey, child care was not a major concern of the faculty at large. However, it was a significant concern to younger faculty, and younger female faculty were twice as concerned as their male counterparts.
- The tenure process means that new faculty must allow for the possibility of moving to another institution. This means that they invariably choose TIAA for their pension program. The current regulations do not provide them an opportunity to convert to the South Carolina program once they have completed the typical six year tenure process. This needs to be examined and perhaps be a subject for regulatory relief.
- Other states with stronger educational commitments are recovering from the financial collapse faster than South Carolina. The Board’s goal of achieving the 60 percentile in salary is laudable and maybe even necessary, but it is a tremendous challenge.

As we embark on the 2020 Roadmap I am looking forward to a very active year, and I am honored to represent the faculty of this institution and to work with a board that so clearly places such a high value on Clemson University, its students, its staff, and its faculty.
THERE WAS NO FACULTY SENATE MEETING IN JULY, 2011
Call to Order: The meeting was called to order by President Dan Warner at 2:33 p.m. and guests were welcomed and recognized.

Approval of Minutes: The Faculty Senate meeting Minutes dated June 14, 2011 were approved as written.

“Free Speech”: None

Special Order of the Day: Arlene C. Stewart, Director of Student Disability Services. Stewart reviewed the policies and services provided by Student Disability Services. The Faculty Accommodation Letter constitutes a proof of disability; the letter is intended to begin a conversation between the faculty and student about how interventions can be provided. Stewart summarized the various disabilities encountered by her office, and typical interventions employed. She pointed out Clemson’s policy on Universal Design. While most interventions are not complicated to implement, her office is available for consultation. Stewart turned the presentation over to Sutton Fain-Schwartz, senior, who commented on her experience at Clemson relating to disability services.

President Warner thanked Marvin Carmichael, from the Office of the President, for his work on faculty retention issues. Warner stressed the importance of attending Convocation, since newly tenured and promoted faculty will be acknowledged, and each honored individual will be given a copy of The High Seminary, vol. 1, by Dr. Jerry Reel.

New faculty orientations are being held by the colleges. The Senate is available for support to orientations. Other incentive efforts for faculty will be the provision of football tickets, and tickets to arts programs at the Brooks Center.

Committees:

a. Faculty Senate Committees
   1) Finance Committee – Chair Richard Figliola stated that the committee will meet on Aug. 23, and will be looking at compensation reporting, how student fees are assessed and applied, and, the matter of the fringe benefits rate that is charged for temporary foreign scholars.

   2) Welfare Committee – No report.

   3) Scholastic Policies Committee – Chair Bob Horton stated that the committee will meet on Aug. 23.
4) **Research Committee** – Chair Dvora Perahia stated that the committee works by email; issues under discussion include intellectual property, consulting agreements, single submission of grant proposals, maximizing the use of research instrumentation, workload, and quality of graduate students. The committee will use a team approach to deal with this range of issues, with a face-to-face meeting scheduled for the first week of September.

As a point of information, Dr. Karen Burg is the new interim Dean of the Graduate School.

5) **Policy Committee** – Chair Sean Brittain stated that the committee will meet tomorrow, Aug. 17, and will begin deliberation on the evaluation of faculty with administrative appointments, social media guidelines, intellectual property policy, and the policy for the hiring of deans.

b. **Ad hoc Faculty Senate Committees**

1) **Budget Accountability Committee** – Antonis Katsiyannis will continue as chair; Warner stated that there will be a proposal going to the Policy Committee to make this ad hoc committee a standing committee.

2) **Ad hoc Academic Calendar Select Committee** – Chair Pat Smart stated that the committee did not meet in the summer, due to the diverse constituency of the committee, but will reconvene in September.

3) **Ad hoc Committee on the Status of Lecturers** – Chair Jeremy King has formed a seven-person committee and awaits a charge from the President.

4) **Ad hoc Committee on Teaching Effectiveness** – Chair Jane Lindle is also waiting for a charge from the President.

c. **University Committee/Commissions**: President Warner explained that the Faculty Manual defines faculty service on these committees and commissions. Faculty who serve on such committees have an opportunity to report to the Senate.

6. Old Business: none

7. New Business: none

8. **President’s Report**: President Warner touched on various developments, most of which have occurred over the summer.

   a. A proposal will be going to the Provost’s Office next Monday which could discontinue the use of the term “lecturer” for non-teaching personnel.
b. The legislative audit of PSA is not a direct concern of the Senate; however, President Warner requested that senators report to him about any administrators in their college who are coming up for evaluation and when the evaluation is scheduled.

c. The influence of foundation interests on the selection and evaluation of faculty has been dealt with in the Faculty Manual. C. Bradley Thompson from the Institute for the Study of Capitalism will visit with the Executive/Advisory Committee on August 30.

d. The Faculty Senate is more easily accessible from the University’s website, with a drop-down from Faculty/Staff on the home page.

e. The Board of Visitors is appointed by the Board of Trustees and provides input to the Board; the Board of Trustees met in April and July; the gender composition of the Board includes the first appointed woman and the first woman life member.

f. Warner explained the 49-director Clemson University Foundation, (and foundations) and the Will to Lead campaign.

g. He also summarized the ACC Academic Progress Report for the Clemson Football program.

h. He described the Staff Development Program (SDP). Anne McMahan Grant is the new faculty representative to this program.

i. The workload recommendations that came from the Ad hoc Committee on Workload, completed last year has been relayed to the Provost; it is now being reviewed by chairs, and will eventually return to the Policy Committee.

j. He discussed compensation. The 2.2% allocated for compensation is for merit raises, not “across the board” raises or attempts to deal with salary compression. A RFP for a compensation consulting team has been put forth.

k. Warner responded to the matter of some faculty-related issues surfacing first in the press; in this regard chairs of committees must follow the practice to water-mark “draft” on any reports, minutes, and work items. Only accepted reports, minutes, policies, and resolutions that are approved by a vote of the Senate constitute public documents.

9. Announcements

a. The call for nominations for the Class of ’39 Award for Excellence is due on October 18, 2011 to the Faculty Senate Office.
b. Be sure to attend the Academic Convocation at 9:00 a.m., August 23, 2011 at the Brooks Center; March with the Senate! Gather at about 8:15 a.m. in Brackett Atrium.

c. Next Executive/Advisory Committee meeting will be held on August 30, 2011 in the Executive Boardroom of the Madren Center.

d. The next Faculty Senate meeting will be held on September 13, 2011 at 2:30 p.m. at the Madren Center.

10. Adjournment: 3:49 p.m.

Scott Dutkiewicz, Secretary

Cathy Toth Sturkie, Program Coordinator

Absent: Anderson, Chen, Leininger (Mowrey for), Marinescu, Pennington (Srimani for), Tissera (Moore for), Tonkyn
1. **Call to Order:** The meeting was called to order by President Warner at 2:37 p.m. and guests were welcomed and recognized.

2. **Approval of Minutes:** The Faculty Senate meeting Minutes dated August 16, 2011 were approved as written, as were the Academic Convocation Minutes dated August 23, 2011.

3. **“Free Speech”:** None

4. **Special Orders of the Day:** Debra Jackson, Office of Assessment, provided an update of the certification part of the SACS process; noted that a Quality Enhancement Plan Committee will be chaired by Bill Surver and that an ETS Profile will be created to look at student education competencies. Dr. Jackson also noted that two surveys are forthcoming: one regarding “Great College To Work For”; the other focusing on tenure and tenure-track faculty. She also asked that if units are sending out surveys, to please contact her office so that efforts are not duplicated and so that results can be shared.

Brandon Hall, CCIT, explained that the current contract for the campus telephone book would not be continued and that CCIT was exploring options for next year's campus telephone book. These options ranged from a printed phone book in the current style to a totally online phone book. Mr. Hall solicited and received numerous questions and recommendations for this effort.

Michele Piekutowski, Interim Director of Human Resources, announced that a plan for changing the title of “lecturer” has been resolved and will become effective in December, 2012. More appropriate titles will be given to non-teaching lecturers.

5. **Committees:**
   a. **Faculty Senate Committees**
      1) **Finance Committee** – For Chair Richard Figliola, Senator Susan Chapman submitted and highlighted the Committee’s Report dated August 23, 2011.
      2) **Welfare Committee** – Senator John Meriwether submitted and briefly explained the Committee Report dated September 1, 2011.
      3) **Scholastic Policies Committee** – Chair Bob Horton submitted and briefly explained the Committee Report dated August 23, 2011.
4) **Research Committee** – Chair Dvora Perahia submitted and briefly explained the Committee Report dated August, 2011.

5) **Policy Committee** – Chair Sean Brittain submitted and briefly explained the Committee Report dated August 17, 2011.

b. **Ad hoc Faculty Senate Committees**

1) **Budget Accountability Committee** – No report.

2) **Ad hoc Academic Calendar Select Committee** – No report.

3) **Ad hoc Committee on the Status of Lecturers** – Chair Jeremy King stated that he received the charge to the Committee and is collecting schedules for the first meeting.

4) **Ad hoc Committee on Teaching Effectiveness** – Chair Jane Lindle stated that she received the Committee’s charge and that an organizational meeting will be held on Monday.

c. **University Committee/Commissions:**

6. **Old Business:** None

7. **New Business:** None

8. **President’s Report:** President Warner reported on the following activities since the last meeting

a. He had received several positive comments regarding the recognition of the newly tenured and promoted faculty at the Academic Convocation.

b. He attended the Four Presidents (Faculty Senate President, Staff Senate President, Graduate Student Body President, and Undergraduate Student Body President) meeting with President Barker. The biggest concern expressed in that meeting was that staff do not have an opportunity, as students do, for assistance during dire situations.

c. He attended the meeting of the President’s Cabinet.

d. He met with President Barker at their monthly one-on-one meeting and indicated that he felt that a larger “adult focused” restaurant – a “Faculty Club” – could promote networking between faculty in different departments and would be beneficial for faculty retention. President Barker indicated that this had merit and initiated a discussion on possible locations.
9. Announcements
   a. Nominations for the Class of '39 Award for Excellence are due on October 18, 2011 to the Faculty Senate Office.
   b. The Benefits Fair (at which the Faculty Senate will have a table) will be held on October 4, 2011.
   c. Next Executive/Advisory Committee meeting will be held on September 27, 2011 in the Executive Boardroom of the Madren Center.
   d. The next Faculty Senate meeting will be held on October 11, 2011 at 2:30 p.m. at the Madren Center.

10. Adjournment: 3:49 p.m.

Scott Dutkiewicz, Secretary

Cathy Toth Sturkie, Program Coordinator

2011-12 Faculty Senate Finance Committee
Report

Meeting: September 20, 2011, 2:30 – 3:10 PM in Room 215 Fluor Daniel Building

Present: Senators Figliola, Chapman

The following items were brought to the floor and discussed:

1. Compensation report: Senator Chapman reported that faculty performance raise and bonus letters are expected in October. Salary increases below 10% may not have explanations attached for inclusion in the Annual Faculty/Staff Compensation report.

2. University Budget Accountability: The Committee met the week of September 12 but Senator Figliola was unable to attend due to travel to attend a family funeral. BAC will report.
   - The Finance Committee had raised the question on the issue of student fees (process to put them into effect, and amounts, accounting, and use of collected monies). The BAC discussed some of the fees but this will be explored more fully this term by Finance.

Finance Committee Membership for 2011-12:

Senators Figliola (Chair), Chapman, Hewitt, Starkey
Minutes
Welfare Committee Report October, 2011

The next meeting will be November 10th in 284C Lehotsky.

1. Regulatory Relief/Faculty Education on Retirement benefits to include 403(b) regulations. John Leininger has met with HR on the issue, committee awaiting final report.

2. Child care and Board of Visitors involvement. Denise Anderson to attend Women's Commission meeting October 12th for meeting on issue.

3. Benefits fair involvement. Catalina Marinescu coordinated Faculty Senate table at benefits fair. Faculty traffic is always slow at the fair which is attended by more staff than faculty. Dan Warner and Denise Anderson also represented the Senate at the fair.

4. Faculty retention to possibly include welfare related questions as part of exit interviews. Assigned to John Meriwether and Tom Dobbins, discussion to be held at November meeting.

Submitted by Denise Anderson, Chair, October 6, 2011
FACULTY SENATE SCHOLASTIC POLICIES
Agenda for September 20, 2011: 2:30 – 4:45

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)

Attending: All committee members. In addition, Gail Ring, Alesia Smith, Logan Roof, Stan Smith, Jan Murdoch, and Jeff Appling attended.

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.

E-Porfolio. Guest: Gail Ring
We were asked to consider how E-Porfolios could be made more meaningful and incorporate greater involvement from faculty. Gail presented the history of the indicators for the E-Porfolio and told us that we are now getting to a position where departments will be receiving feedback on their programs; this can be used to learn valuable information about what students are learning. In other words, with our indicators now fixed, the evaluation of the portfolios can focus on student learning and not on making adjustments to the indicators and rubrics. Also, faculty members can apply to be part of the summer evaluation team (and will be compensated for doing so). Scholastic Policies does not have any issues to pursue in regard to the E-Porfolios. We have asked that Gail and those overseeing the E-Porfolios share information with faculty so that they can see the benefits that the program can have for their programs.

Academic Integrity: Lead Kelly Smith. Guest: Alesia Smith
This is a continuation from last year. We had indicated we want to continue to discuss academic integrity, including whether or not planning to cheat is a violation and violations not tied directly to a course. Alesia Smith, from the Office of Community and Ethical Standards, gave us an overview of their responsibilities and examples of situations with which they deal. They have dealt with situations where students sell exams or study guides to other students, for example, and Alesia discussed the range of options at their disposal. She said she would be happy to hear cases about planning to cheat as well. Jeff Appling mentioned that he could inform faculty who come to him of the options available to them. We will continue to discuss this issue.

Faculty Textbook Compliance – Leads: Naren and Xiaobo
Below is a draft from Naren and Xiaobo.

Faculty members may use the academic books they published as teaching materials as they see fit, provided it is approved in compliance with S.C. Ethics Act and other professional standards. Faculty members shall not use their books in class for profit purposes, nor can they sell their books directly
to students as required class reading materials. It is recognized that books or other academic works published by academic presses are not for profit and royalties for the authors are kept at minimum, hence compensation from the publishers shall remain with the authors and it is at their discretion as they see best use. The Department, College, and University shall respectively develop a reporting system for authors to report their compensations exceeding a certain amount or for full disclosure.

We discussed the possibility of collecting data to determine how much money might be involved and whether faculty may be in violation of the Ethics Act or at the least appearing to have a conflict of interest. Horton will contact Erin Swann and Jane Gilbert to discuss the legal perspective on collecting data.

Course Substitutions
Horton will serve as Scholastic Policies' representative on 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.

Consideration of Policy for Awarding of Degrees Posthumously
Does a student need to be currently enrolled to receive a degree posthumously? Is there a difference if a student just doesn't enroll or withdraws because of illness that leads to death? Is there a “slippery slope” we need to avoid? We discussed this and will continue to do so. Stan Smith will determine what other ACC schools are doing and Kelly Smith will craft his views of the policy.

Agreements with GTC & TCTC – Hap Wheeler
We have 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. These courses do not have to go on TCEL, but we discussed different options for how to get them transferred easily. Hap Wheeler crafted a draft, which we discussed. Discussion centered on changing Clemson courses to the 200-level if these same courses are being taught at the tech schools. There were other concerns raised about the use of these courses at other schools and whether this might open a door we shouldn't open. Horton will get back with Hap to see if there is a compelling reason for changing policy. In any case, approvals must come through the curriculum committees.

Grade Entry
The issue is that an instructor has to enter every single grade into the system before saving any grades, and the system can time out, causing the loss of all data; the system doesn’t restart its clock after each entry. Stan Smith did some investigating about this concern, but will go further to see if the timer could be set to a longer period before the system turns off.

Attendance Policy
This is a continuation from last year. A committee has been formed to address this and Bob Horton has been asked to serve on it.

We also discussed a related issue; we have some “phantom students,” those who enroll in classes to obtain financial aid, but never attend. The university has been asked to be more
assertive about this. Faculty should be made aware that there are students who enroll to gain benefits but do not attend; Clemson can be forced to pay for this type of fraud.
Present: Brittain (chair), Lindle, Pennington, Katsiyannis, Layfield, Dutkiewicz; ex-officio: Warner, King, McGuire, Smart, Sturkie

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. Social Media Guidelines. Comment on this items by email.
2. 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.
3. Policy of hiring Chairs. 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.
4. 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.
5. 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 and will be voted on by Senate.
6. 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).
7. Comment on issues about the creation of administrative positions and selection of faculty for overload assignments by email.
8. Program termination/RIF. The issue remains as to what a “program” is for this policy.
9. Title IX issues. Allegations of sexual harassment (once one becomes aware of them) must be reported. Allegations must go to Access and Equity first. This is probably not a policy matter; appeal is available through the grievance process.
10. Dutkiewicz asked about the President’s Commission on Sustainability: text was prepared for inclusion in the Manual by the 2010-2011 Policy Committee, but what came of it? McGuire will investigate.

Next meeting will be held October 20, 2011, 2:30 p.m.

Submitted by Scott M. Dutkiewicz, member and Faculty Senate Secretary, Sept. 28, 2011
FACULTY SENATE BUDGET ACCOUNTABILITY COMMITTEE
MONTHLY MEETING AGENDA
ANTONIS KATSIYANNIS, CHAIR
September 15, 2011; 3:30-4:30, 206 Sikes Hall

Present: Brett Dalton, Jeremy King, Dan Warner, Wickes Wescott

1. Fees

The CFO reported that, in the past and currently, it is difficult for his office to follow the flow of funds after they are disbursed to other budget centers (such as colleges). Current efforts are underway to explore more granular tracking.

The CFO reminded the committee that most universities think about fee/tuition revenue on the basis of average costs. I.e., there is probably no student whose cost to educate is exactly the tuition and fees charged. Rather, such an amount is based on an average cost. This and the probabilistic nature of costs and enrollment lead to rounded cost figures for fees.

It was also noted that faculty and Departments establish fees—not all values originate with the Administration. Faculty members share a responsibility for ensuring equitable and accurate pricing of lab fees, etc.

Lab fees are approved by Dean and the Provost’s Advisory Council. There is, however, a significant responsibility placed on Departments and their faculty to ensure that fees are reasonable, appropriate, and well-justified. The CFO performs a cursory check on such requests. In the past when the CFO has found justifications murky or uncertain, this has been called to the Provost’s attention, and has sometimes resulted in downwardly-revised requests.

Conclusions/Actions: CFO Brett Dalton will update the BAC with student fee overviews and flow of fund information. The CFO’s office is happy to work with the Senate to address questions about specific fees or issues. At present, questions about how such fees are used after being disbursed to budget centers are best answered by those in the budget center.

2. Academic Software funding

The BAC briefly discussed the issue of academic software license funding. It is unclear whether the budget center for such items should be CCIT or operational units (Departments and colleges). If the latter, the possibility of “lab fees” for non-lab courses using such software was discussed.
Conclusions/Actions: The BAC believes the academic software funding question is a good one for the newly rejuvenated Academic Technology Advisory Council to address in the coming year. CFO Brett Dalton will provide the BAC with a listing of all courses that charge lab fees.

3. Salary Report:

The BAC expressed consensus that provision of information about justification for salary increases should, if at all possible, occur during the review process and not on the back end of the process. The BAC understands that the current electronic system allows collection of information during the review process, but that such information is not always provided in a timely manner.

This year's salary report presents new issues due to the wider consideration of performance-based increases than in recent years. The President and BOT did not require that detailed information concerning justification for such increases be entered into the salary report for increases <=10%. Because most performance raises this year will be <10%, the burden would fall on the Departments and Colleges to provide such justifications. The BAC was unclear as to what value the significant efforts of Department Chairs and Colleges (who would be responsible for entering such detailed justification information) would actually provide given the widespread review of faculty for performance-based raises this year.

Conclusions/Actions: The BAC recommends that the salary report contain any granular justification information for increases >10%. Such information is available inasmuch as it is required for Presidential approval of such increases. Last year, such information was also available but seems to have been inadvertently truncated in the salary report. The BAC will work to remedy this in this year’s report.
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
The 2011-2012 Academic Year was officially kicked off with the Victor Hurst convocation on Tuesday, August 23. This year the convocation recognized the newly tenured and promoted faculty. In addition to being recognized on stage they were given a Clemson University lapel pin and a copy of Jerry Reel’s “The High Seminary,” the history of Clemson University from 1889 to 1994. I have received several positive comments regarding this addition to the convocation proceedings, and I commend the administration for taking this and other innovative steps that should help improve faculty retention.

Although classes started the day after the convocation, the faculty started working the week before with class preparations, department and college meetings, etc. In particular, the Faculty Senate held its first meeting on August 16.

The Faculty Senate has five standing committees – Finance, Policy, Research, Scholastic Policy, and Welfare. In addition, the Faculty Senate has authorized four ad hoc committees – the Budget Accountability Committee, the Status of Lecturers Committee, the Teaching Effectiveness Committee, and the Academic Calendar Select Committee. The duties of these committees were presented in the July report. At this point all the committees have been meeting and moving forward with their agendas for this year.

About three years ago the Faculty Senate noted that the title of Lecturer was a Faculty rank that was being used for non-faculty positions. This was brought to the attention of the administration. A survey was conducted and approximately 100 people were identified as Lecturers with no faculty duties. Those people were officially recognized with the interim title of Non-teaching Lecturer. Human Resources then began the negotiating process to determine the appropriate state titles or in some cases to develop new state approved titles. Earlier this semester HR notified all non-teaching lecturers of their new titles and informed them that the title of non-teaching lecturer would no longer be used after this year. Although it took a while, this accomplishment underscores the effective working relationship between the Faculty and the Administration.

As President Barker enunciated, Clemson has moved back on offense. The first step was the issuing of 2.2% merit raises that went into effect at the beginning of October. Every effort was made to make this process as transparent as possible. The vice-presidential review last year of all the departments played a key role, as did the monthly meetings of the Compensation Committee. The preliminary indications are that, while not everyone is happy, there does seem to be a general understanding how the process was done and why.
We are beginning to implement the 2020 Roadmap and this will entail a large number of new hires in both administration and faculty. A significant stumbling block in the past has been the occasional failure to set up the selection committees in accordance with the rules approved by Board of Trustees. The Faculty Senate Policy Committee is looking at how we might make that portion of the Faculty Manual clearer. In addition, the Faculty Senate is taking a proactive role in working with the Deans and other administrators to insure that these selection committees satisfy the needs of the units involved as well as the intent of the rules to insure adequate faculty input. As we move forward on the cluster hires and other senior hires, the emphasis on interdisciplinary research will make these collaborations even more important.

As we embark on the 2020 Roadmap I am looking forward to a very active year, and I am honored to represent the faculty of this institution and to work with a board that so clearly places such a high value on Clemson University, its students, its staff, and its faculty.
PROPOSED FACULTY MANUAL CHANGE

Part VII. B.2.e Graduate Fellowships and Awards Committee

Current Wording: Non-voting members are the director of financial aid or designee and an assistant/associate Dean of the Graduate School (chair).

Revised language: 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.

Rationale: Provost Helms has requested that we change section VII.B.2.e of the Faculty Manual defining the Graduate Fellowships and Awards Committee. At present an assistant/associate dean of the graduate school is required to chair the committee. They are unable at present to do this task and would like to broaden the pool of associate/assistant deans that can fill this position.
MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE
OCTOBER 11, 2011

1. Call to Order: The meeting was called to order by President Dan Warner at 2:38 p.m. While guests were welcomed and recognized, several senators received flu shots from Sullivan Center staff.

2. Approval of Minutes: The Faculty Senate meeting Minutes dated September 13, 2011 was approved as written.

3. “Free Speech”: None

4. Special Orders of the Day: Jill Evans, Executive Director of Pickens County Habitat for Humanity, provided an update of the Faculty and Staff Senates Habitat House. She thanked the Senate for its patience as construction was delayed. The structure built during Homecoming will be moved to Quail Circle, Central in early to mid-November and finish work will begin. Evans and President Warner re-signed the Habitat Covenant, which updates the Faculty Senate financial commitment of $5,000 over three years commencing today. Volunteer workers should anticipate a safety waiver by email. There will also be waivers at the jobsite.

Drs. Webb Smathers and Fran McGuire, both Class of ’39 Award for Excellence recipients, encouraged senators to submit nominations for this prestigious award by the due date of October 18. Please contact Cathy Sturkie if there are questions about the application process.

5. Committees:
   a. Faculty Senate Committees
      1) Finance Committee – Chair Richard Figliola, Senator submitted and highlighted the Committee Report dated September 20, 2011.

      2) Welfare Committee – Chair Denise Anderson submitted and briefly explained the Committee Report dated October 6, 2011.

      3) Scholastic Policies Committee – Chair Bob Horton submitted and briefly explained the Committee Report dated September 20, 2011.

      4) Research Committee – No report.

      5) Policy Committee – Chair Sean Brittain submitted and briefly explained the Committee Report dated September 28, 2011.
b. Ad hoc Faculty Senate Committees

1) **Budget Accountability Committee** – Chair Antonis Katsiyannis reported on the Committee’s September meeting. Issues discussed were student fees, the academic software fee, and the Salary Report. Senators discussed the matter of lab fees. The Chair encouraged senators to email the Committee with any questions.

2) **Ad hoc Academic Calendar Select Committee** – Chair Pat Smart is reconvening the Committee, since the goals for this Committee have changed. There are nine applicants for the Summer School Director position; more are encouraged to apply.

3) **Ad hoc Committee on the Status of Lecturers** – Chair Jeremy King stated that the Committee has met twice. The topics discussed revolve around job security and performance evaluation. He stated the goal was to reduce the thoughts of the Committee to writing, providing a basis for a meeting with lecturers.

4) **Ad hoc Committee on Teaching Effectiveness** – No verbal report. See minutes dated October 4, 2011 for a Committee roster and summary of its projected products.

c. **University Committee/Commissions**: Susan Chapman reported about the Bookstore Advisory Committee. All faculty must update the Bookstore on required or recommended textbooks for all courses. This policy is supported by a federal law for undergraduate courses. There is a small number of faculty that still does not participate. Timely reporting also affects the buyback of textbooks. See also her Oct. 10, 2011 document, which contains the necessary forms.

The Vice President for Faculty Development search has 19 applicants. President Warner encouraged those on such search committees to report to the Senate.

6. **Old Business**: None

7. **New Business**: Policy Chair Sean Brittain presented a *Faculty Manual* change to Part VII. B.2.c, Graduate Fellowships and Awards Committee. New language allows the Graduate Dean to have the option to appoint assistant or associate deans other than those in the Graduate School to this Committee. The change was approved.

8. **President’s Report**: President Warner stated that:

a. Provost Helms is recovering from surgery;

b. The Clemson University Foundation has received three major donations. The Will to Lead Campaign is now at $534 million of the $600 million goal. This will support 300 scholarships and contribute to the support of 93 faculty positions.
c. President Barker is favorable about the concept of a venue for faculty to network. In this connection, Aramark is forming focus groups for students and faculty. If you have an opportunity to join a faculty group, please do so.

d. He reported on the Compensation Committee meeting. Thirty-four percent of faculty/staff did not receive merit raises. The average of 2.5 percent is dubious mathematically; a better reporting is forthcoming.

e. He commented on the three essential principles of selection committees in the Faculty Manual when faculty are present on such committees: faculty must be a majority, that faculty elect faculty, and the faculty that elects them must constitute the group closely affected by the appointment that results from the search.

f. Warner also encouraged involvement in the COACHE Survey, emanating from Harvard University, on faculty job satisfaction.

9. **Announcements**

a. Nominations for the Class of '39 Award for Excellence are due on October 18, 2011 to the Faculty Senate Office.

b. Next Executive/Advisory Committee meeting will be held on October 25, 2011 in the Executive Boardroom of the Madren Center.

c. The next Faculty Senate meeting will be held on November 8, 2011 at 2:30 p.m. at the Madren Center.

10. **Adjournment:** 3:34 p.m.

Scott Dutkiewicz, Secretary

Cathy Toth Sturkie, Program Coordinator

FACULTY SENATE SCHOLASTIC POLICIES
Agenda for October 25, 2011; 1:00

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)

Attending: Northcutt, Tissera, Tonkyn, Logan Roof, and Horton

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.

Agreements with GTC & TCTC
We have 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. Follow-up: After the Scholastic Policies meeting, this was discussed at the Executive Advisory Committee, where it was determined that this was not an issue for Faculty Senate but for the Curriculum Committees.

Faculty Textbook Compliance – Leads: Naren and Xiaobo
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.

Other Issues
We briefly discussed the criteria for the awarding of posthumous degrees and the issue of final exam schedules for online courses, though we did not take action or vote on proposals. We will continue the discussion of these and the other issues on our agenda at our next meeting, November 15.
Faculty Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Teaching Effectiveness  
Tuesday, 1 November 2011  

Agenda Annotated with Minutes  

Also two attachments to the Minutes  
(1) Report to the Committee on the Value of Student Comments (Werts, 2011)  
(2) Proposed Wording Changes to the Faculty Manual  

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

Guest Speaker: Werts  

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
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 online 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 online 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. except an instructor opts to submit them. 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.

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

Rationale:

The Committee received an updated report reviewing the literature on the value of student ratings and comments in the summative evaluation of teaching. Student ratings tend to be regarded as satisfaction measures of course experiences and not accurate reports of either 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, requires more substantive evidence than self-reports of perceived satisfaction. Given the complexities of measuring learning and teaching effectiveness, no single source should outweigh any other source. Finally, the literature on the value of student comments repeatedly cautions that raw 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 comments of any value in either summative or formative evaluation processes.

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 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.
Student Evaluation of Teaching: What Value are Written Comments?
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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, Ragupathi, 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 (Abd-Elrahman 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 (Saldana, 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, and 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, and 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

---

\(^1\) 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. Alhilja & Fresko, 2009; Ory et al., 1980) that a Pearson Product Moment Correlation was used.
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.

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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Proposal to change the Charge for the University Assessment Committee

Part VII, Faculty Participation in University Governance; Section D., Committees Reporting to the Vice-President for Academic Affairs and Provost

Current Wording:

§ 2. University Assessment Committee provides leadership and assistance in developing and overseeing a program of evaluation and feedback to enhance the effectiveness of the university. The committee develops and recommends university-wide assessment policies, assists in developing assessment procedures that meet accepted standards for data collection and analysis, reviews assessment procedures for consistency with goals and objectives, reviews results of assessment activities and recommends improvements, reviews the progress of the university in implementing assessment activities, reviews all assessment reports and coordinates the preparation of annual reports for the State Commission on Higher Education, strives to ensure that assessment information is not misused, and monitors the effects of assessment to ensure that assessment results are used in subsequent planning activities.

Members of the Assessment Committee with three-year terms include: two representatives from each college and one from the library appointed by the respective deans, two representatives from different areas of administration and advancement appointed by the Vice President for Administration and Advancement, one representative appointed by the Dean of Undergraduate Studies, and two representatives from student affairs appointed by the Vice President of Student Affairs; one representative appointed by each of the following: the Athletic Director, the Dean of the Graduate School, the Vice President for Agriculture, Public Service and Economic Development and the Vice President for Research. Two undergraduate students are appointed by the Vice President for Student Affairs for two-year terms. A representative of the Faculty Senate, one college dean appointed by the Council of Academic Deans, and one graduate student appointed by the Dean of the Graduate School serve one-year terms. The directors of assessment and of planning are ex-officio, nonvoting members. The head of institutional research and other nonvoting members, recommended by the committee and appointed by the Provost for one-year terms, serves as resource persons for the committee. The committee elects its own chair for a one-year term from among the faculty and administrative representatives. The vice-chair is elected annually by the committee and will succeed the chair the following year. The chair remains as a member of the committee for the year following his or her tenure as chair. The three members, chair, vice-chair and former chair, do not count against allocations from the colleges.

Proposed Changes:

§ 2. University Assessment Committee provides leadership and assistance in developing and overseeing a program of evaluation and feedback to enhance the effectiveness of the university. The committee develops and recommends university-wide assessment policies, assists in developing assessment procedures that meet accepted standards for data collection and analysis, reviews assessment procedures for consistency with goals and objectives, reviews results of assessment activities and recommends improvements, reviews the progress of the university in implementing assessment activities, reviews all assessment reports and coordinates the preparation of annual reports for the State Commission on Higher Education, strives to ensure that assessment information is not misused, and monitors the effects of assessment to ensure that assessment results are used in subsequent planning activities.

Rationale:

The purpose of Committees for Faculty Participation in University Governance is to serve as a policy deliberation and proposal body. The Office of Assessment has shifted its past practices of compiling reports on its work to an interpretation that the University Assessment Committee needs to participate in the creation of these reports as peer reviewers. Removal of the proposed language will help emphasize the policy role of the Committee.
Proposed Final Wording:

§ 2. University Assessment Committee provides leadership and assistance in developing and overseeing a program of evaluation and feedback to enhance the effectiveness of the university. The committee develops and recommends university-wide assessment policies, assists in developing assessment procedures that meet accepted standards for data collection and analysis, reviews assessment procedures for consistency with goals and objectives, reviews results of assessment activities and recommends improvements, reviews the progress of the university in implementing assessment activities, reviews and coordinates the preparation of annual reports for the State Commission on Higher Education, strives to ensure that assessment information is not misused, and monitors the effects of assessment to ensure that assessment results are used in subsequent planning activities. ...
1. **Call to Order:** The meeting was called to order by President Dan Warner at 2:35 p.m. and guests were welcomed and recognized.

2. **Approval of Minutes:** The Faculty Senate meeting Minutes dated October 11, 2011 was approved as distributed.

3. **Election of the Class of ’39 Award for Excellence:** The election for this Award was held by secret ballot and the ballots were counted by Scott Dutkiewicz and the Provost’s Designee, Pat Smart. Richard S. Figliola, Professor of Mechanical Engineering and Bioengineering was elected as the 2011 recipient of this prestigious award.

   An election was held for the Faculty Senate representative to the Selection Committee for the Thomas Green Clemson Award and Scott Dutkiewicz was elected to serve a four-year term.

4. **“Free Speech”:** None

5. **Committees:**
   a. **Faculty Senate Committees**
      1) **Finance Committee** – Chair Richard Figliola, stated that there was no formal meeting in October. The Committee will discuss a new issue with the Provost regarding the transparency of departmental budgets.

      2) **Welfare Committee** – Chair Denise Anderson informed this Senate that this Committee will meet soon to continue discussions on pending issues.

      3) **Scholastic Policies Committee** – Chair Bob Horton submitted and briefly explained the Committee Report dated October 25, 2011. Scholastic Policies developed and approved a form that has the curriculum committee approve texts or other course materials for which the instructor has a financial incentive. This was constructed at the recommendation of our legal department. This has been passed on to Policy Committee.

      4) **Research Committee** – No written report.
5) Policy Committee – Chair Sean Brittain stated that this Committee will address the Conflict of Interest Policy (latest draft dated 1995) and other issues on its agenda. Next meeting November 15, 2011.

b. Ad hoc Senate Committees
   1) Budget Accountability Committee – Chair Antonis Katsiyannis reported that the Committee has not met but that the next meeting will be December 1, 2011. The agenda will include the topic of student fees and the salary report.

2) Ad hoc Academic Calendar Select Committee – No written report.

3) Ad hoc Committee on the Status of Lecturers – Chair Jeremy King stated that the Committee will meet this Thursday. They have received feedback from Committee members and their peers that has helped form a first concept.

4) Ad hoc Committee on Teaching Effectiveness – Chair Janie Lindle highlighted the Committee Report dated November 1, 2011 and submitted and briefly explained informational documents.

6. Old Business: None

7. New Business:
   a. Policy Chair Sean Brittain submitted and explained a proposed Faculty Manual change, Part VII. D., University Assessment Committee. There was no discussion. Vote was taken and proposed change passed unanimously.

   b. Senator Susan Chapman provided an update on the Faculty Senate/Staff Senate Habitat for Humanity House. The first Saturday work at the house on Quail Circle in Central, SC was held on November 5th and was quite successful with twelve volunteers and one house leader on hand.

8. President’s Report: President Warner stated that:
   a. there will be a joint City/University 2012 Fall Rowing Event on Lake Hartwell; and
   b. young faculty have responded eagerly to the offer of free tickets to the Brooks Center for Nai-Ni Chen Dance Company.

9. Announcements: President Warner stated that:
   a. the Celebration of the Great Class of ’39 hosted by the Faculty Senate will be held on January 9, 2012 (invitations forthcoming).

   b. next Executive/Advisory Committee meeting will be held on November 29, 2011 in the Executive Boardroom of the Madren Center.
c. the next Faculty Senate meeting will be held on December 13, 2011 at 2:30 p.m. at the Madren Center.

10. **Adjournment:** 3:20 p.m.

Scott Dutkiewicz, Secretary

Cathy Toth Sturkie, Program Coordinator

MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE
DECEMBER 13, 2011

1. Call to Order: The meeting was called to order by President Dan Warner at 2:38 p.m. and guests were welcomed and recognized.

2. Approval of Minutes: The Faculty Senate meeting Minutes dated November 8, 2011 were approved.

3. "Free Speech": Ken Marcus, Professor of Chemistry, presented a topic entitled, “Take Care of What You Have...,” the gist of which was “Times have been tight, to little fault of the CU administration. Plans are being made for all forms of growth and hiring in the future. Students come and go, but what is the plan for reward and retention of the people that have made this University what it is today? What are the goals and what is the plan?”

4. Committees:
   a. Faculty Senate Committees
      1) Finance Committee – No report.
      2) Welfare Committee – The Committee Report dated November 10, 2011 was submitted and briefly explained by Chair Denise Anderson.
      3) Scholastic Policies Committee – Chair Bob Horton submitted and briefly explained the Committee Report dated December 6, 2011 (attached).
      4) Research Committee – Chair Dvora Perahia stated that this Committee is dealing with procedural issues on how proposals are being approved. The Clemson University Research Foundation will have experts define guidelines. Another issue is how to move to a democratic vote of associate deans in terms of hiring post docs. The Committee plans to meet with the Vice President of Research to bring up ongoing concerns.
      5) Policy Committee – Chair Sean Brittain noted two items that will come under New Business and stated that the Committee will meet tomorrow to discuss faculty authored textbooks and tenure and promotion guidelines process (the continuing problem of separate and independent letters, in particular).

b. Ad hoc Faculty Senate Committees
1) **Budget Accountability Committee** – Chair Antonis Katsiyannis submitted and briefly explained the Committee Report dated December 1, 2011 (attached).

2) **Ad hoc Academic Calendar Select Committee** – No report.

3) **Ad hoc Committee on the Status of Lecturers** – Chair Jeremy King noted that the Committee met this afternoon to discuss problems to bring to focus groups of Math lecturers, then to BBS lecturers, AAH and HEHD lecturers.

4) **Ad hoc Committee on Teaching Effectiveness** – Chair Jane Lindle highlighted the Committee Report dated November 29, 2011.

   c. **Athletic Council** – President Warner stated that Council met last week and the Guest Speaker was Interim University Legal Counsel, Erin Swann. Discussion was about the Grand Jury Report of the Penn State sexual abuse allegation against a former coach.

5. **Old Business**: None

6. **New Business**:
   a. Policy Chair Sean Brittain submitted and explained a proposed *Faculty Manual* change, Part IV. B (2). Affirmative Action Policies and Procedures for the Recruitment and Appointment of Faculty and Administrators [Department Chairs]. Following discussion vote to accept proposed change passed unanimously.

   b. Policy Chair Sean Brittain explained and submitted for endorsement the revised Social Media Guidelines (which include suggested changes made by the Policy Committee). Vote to endorse was taken and passed unanimously. The Office of Public Affairs will be notified of this endorsement.

7. **President’s Report**: President Warner stated that:
   a. eighteen students received the highest GPR;
   b. the Procurement Office is interested in reducing the number of campus vendors; and
   c. he has been meeting with candidates for the position of University Legal Counsel.

8. **Announcements**: President Warner stated that:
   a. Tony Cawthon, Professor of Leadership and Counselor Education, was elected as the Faculty Representative to the Board of Trustees.

   b. Cathy Sturkie and Angela Nixon provided an update on the Faculty Senate/Staff Senate Habitat for Humanity House. The next workday at the house is
scheduled for January 7, 2012 (Susan Chapman will be the House Leader.) Senators were encouraged to volunteer their physical talents and donations were also encouraged.

c. Professor Fran McGuire strongly stated his concern regarding the salary discrepancy between athletic coaches versus faculty and staff.

d. the Celebration of the Great Class of ’39 hosted by the Faculty Senate will be held on January 9, 2012.

e. next Executive/Advisory Committee meeting will be held on January 31, 2012 in the Executive Boardroom of the Madren Center.

f. the next Faculty Senate meeting will be held on January 10, 2012 at 2:30 p.m. at the Madren Center.

g. Much, much discussion regarding Professor McGuire’s concern regarding salary discrepancies and inequalities (Announcements #c above).

10. Adjournment: 3:58 p.m.

Scott Dutkiewicz, Secretary

Cathy T. Sturkie, Program Coordinator

Take care of what you have . . .

Over the last year or so, the Clemson administration has touted a move to the “offense”; correctly realizing issues of faculty and staff reward and retention. This basic concept has long been part of the operation model of the athletic department, but has never been vocalized relative to the heart and soul of the University operations. The concept of “divest to reinvest” was proposed as the mechanism to do so, based on the recognition that state funds would not be a practical way to address reward issues.

To the contrary, what we have seen over the last few months is more about growth of the family, than taking care of it. The announcement of numbers of early retirements across the campus was trumpeted with the comment that this would allow hiring of new faculty. The construction of the new architecture and biological sciences facilities is said to provide opportunities for growth into these areas, with coincident hiring of new faculty. Discussion is rampant toward potential increases in the student population, and what would be needed to address such increases; i.e. space, faculty, and staff.

Contrast these trends with the recent 2.2% across-the-board average raises for each business unit at the University. To what end would 2.2% in any unit be expected to reward and retain faculty and staff? Sure, 2.2% (on average) looks good relative to four years of 0%, but which presently-employed person feels rewarded. Who won’t entertain a better offer versus 2.2% and no in-stone plan for the future. (Be mindful that University policy is that all new faculty hires must be done at or above national averages.) Very simply, the Clemson administration took a pass in setting the recent raise policy. Are all business units equally excellent, or poor? Are all payrolls equally above, or below, their national peers? Yes something had to be done, but where is the plan that lets any member of the Clemson faculty or staff know that there are just-rewards in the offing for previous years of excellent performance?
To be sure, everyone presently employed at Clemson is here by choice, and is free to leave. But if this is truly a "Clemson family", why are we not taking care of our own? What about doing the right thing? On the other hand, the market forces card is constantly employed in the hiring and retention of administrators, coaches, and some faculty. The offensive coordinator of the football team just had his salary tripled, to keep him off the market after only one year of success! People presently employed at Clemson do enjoy a number of subtle benefits, but even in paradise you still get wet if the roof leaks. The right thing to do is to reinforce and protect a solid base. Before we expand the student population and payroll, let's prove that we can take care of what we have. Ultimately, if we are to lock arms and march forward to the future Clemson University, should not we all feel that own worth is validated in substance and not just word.

Times have been tight, to little fault of the CU administration. Plans are being made for all forms of growth and hiring in the future. Students come and go, but what is the plan for reward and retention of the people that have made this University what it is today?
Faculty Senate

Welfare Committee Meeting Minutes

November 10, 2011

Present: Denise Anderson (chair), John Leininger, John Meriwether, Tom Dobbins

Agenda items discussed at this meeting centered on retention and specifically a discussion of benefits for domestic partners in line with those offered by the University of Georgia, among other universities and colleges, brought to the committee by a faculty member. The committee agreed that prior to delving further into this topic Anderson would contact legal counsel to gain a sense of what might even be feasible at Clemson University with respect to extending benefits to domestic partners, specifically benefits that are not controlled at the state level. The discussion will continue in January as part of a wider discussion on faculty retention.
FACULTY SENATE SCHOLASTIC POLICIES
Minutes for December 6, 2011; 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)

Attending: Hu, Northcutt, Smith, Tissera, Tonkyn, Vyavahare, and Horton. Also guests Stan Smith, 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.

New Item – Leads: Xiaobo and Naren
We have been charged with reviewing the evaluation form used to evaluate teaching. Xiaobo and Naren have agreed to lead this effort. Horton will send an email out so that Linda Nilson and Wickes Westcott will be aware of our charge and we hope be part of the discussions. After they get the ball rolling, Xiaobo and Naren will also invite Linda and perhaps Wickes to a future SP meeting.

Final Exams – Lead: Julie Northcutt
After adding a sentence at the end, we agreed to the following which concerns policy for final exams. (Horton had also received some input from Barbara Hoskins.) We will forward this to Faculty Senate to see if they will endorse it and to Jan Murdoch, who had initiated the issue.

Current Wording:

Final Examinations
The standing of a student in his/her work at the end of a semester is based upon daily classwork, tests or other work, and the final examinations. Faculty members may excuse from the final examinations all students having the grade of A on the coursework prior to the final examination. For all other students, examinations are required in all subjects at the end of each semester, except in courses in which final examinations are not deemed necessary as approved by the department faculty.

Final examinations must be given or due on the dates and at the times designated in the final examination schedule, except in laboratory and one-credit-hour courses where the final exam will be given at the last class meeting.

Added Suggestions (from Registrar’s Office and Scholastic Policies Committee)
All courses (including online courses) that specify a standard day of the week and standard meeting time are assigned a final exam date and time during exam week. All courses that do
not specify a standard day of the week and standard meeting time are not assigned a final exam date and time, and the final exam must be given during examination week at a date and time announced by the instructor. This time should be stipulated 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 have considered an approved the following criteria for the awarding of a posthumous degree. We will forward these to the Faculty Senate and to the Undergraduate Council.

**CURRENT POLICY**

An undergraduate student may be awarded a degree posthumously on the recommendation of the faculty of the college concerned, subject to the following conditions:

- The student had at least a 2.0 grade-point ratio at the time of death
- Including credits scheduled in the term in which death occurred, the student a) had satisfied 75% of the degree requirements and b) met the residence requirement for a degree which requires that 37 of the last 43 credits presented for a degree be earned at Clemson.

**RECOMMENDED POLICY**

An undergraduate student may be awarded a degree posthumously on the recommendation of the faculty of the college concerned, subject to the following conditions:

1. The student had at least a 2.0 grade-point ratio at the date of last enrollment;
2. Including credits scheduled at the time of last enrollment, the student had satisfied more than 50% of the degree requirements;
3. Including credits scheduled at the time of last enrollment, the student completed at least 30 semester hours at Clemson; and
4. The student’s death occurred within two years of the date of last enrollment.

**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.

**Attendance Policy**

Tonkyn and Horton met with George Clay from Redfern and Amanda Macaluso from student government to determine if Redfern might excuse absences. Dr. Clay was very reluctant to do so, though did agree that he might be willing to participate in a trial. We have another meeting, along with a Redfern physician, scheduled for December 16.
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 have 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.
Present: Jeremy King, Richard Figliola, Wickes Westcott, Dan Warner, Doris Helms, Brett Dalton, Michelle Piekutowski, Jane Gilbert, Deb Charles, Mike Nebesky, Antonis Katsiyannis

Procurement (Strategic Sourcing)-emphasis on lowest total cost; fewer vendors; decrease staff time

Example-Office supplies about 2 million a year; savings from vendor about $700,000.

Aramack-15 year contract; 15% of revenues returned to the university; concerns should be voiced (Wilbur R. Graves is the contact for Aramack)

Option-Byways allows for option if a better price is found...

Salary report-Trends (Brett Dalton, CFO) –

Raises-$5,609,961 were available for 4,636 employees; 48% received a raise with an average of 1.88%. Among all groups (faculty, staff, administrators), faculty had the largest proportion of those receiving a raise with an average of 2.33%.

Bonuses-20% of faculty received one; 13% of administrators.

Students Fees-
Types-Undergraduate Full time & Part time/Graduate full time and part-time/Off campus and online (base academic fee, tuition, and other Debt and retirement); lab fees; activity fees (software license, medical, career, transit, technology); differential (Business College)-see http://www.clemson.edu/cfo/documents/budgets/student_fee_procedures.pdf

Lab fees (2011)-a summary of lab fees expenditures by college/department was circulated; amounts dispersed to colleges were “similar” to department expenditures (AAH-kept 30% for major projects...policy changed on July 2011)

Fall 2010-Lab Fees

The total number of undergraduate courses =(1795). The total number of undergraduate courses that charge lab fees=(370).
The total number of graduate courses = (833). The total number of graduate courses that charge lab fees = (69).
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:
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

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 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 & Recording Secretary
Part IV B (2) states regarding “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 (H) (I) page 40 of the manual, Departments (or equivalent units) will provide their dean with a list of 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.*

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.
OVERVIEW
The rapid growth and ease of use of social media technologies have made them attractive channels of communication. Social media can be a very effective way to communicate, promote, and brand Clemson University to multiple audiences across and outside of the university. However, social media can pose risks to the University’s confidential and proprietary information and can compromise compliance with rules, regulations and laws. This document is intended to help guide university employees in the use of social media for official university communications. These guidelines are not intended to apply to Internet and/or social media sites that have been created and are maintained by faculty and staff on their own time and without use of Clemson University technology or resources. However, many of the guidelines outlined in this policy would be good “best practices” for any social media interaction.

THINGS TO CONSIDER BEFORE ENGAGING IN SOCIAL MEDIA
Creating a successful social media page requires careful planning and resource allocation. Before you begin to use social media on behalf of Clemson University, please remember the following:

Keep in mind other Clemson University policies
This document does not affect other University policies that might apply to use of social media, including, but not limited to the Harassment policy, Computer Use policy, Workplace Violence policy and University Web Policy. If your use of social media would violate any of the Institution’s policies in another forum, it will also violate them in an online forum.

Get necessary approval
Before starting a social media site for your college, department, or unit, make sure you have approval from a supervisor or director of the college/department/unit. Only Clemson University employees authorized by their college, department or unit may be a content owner” or “administrator” for university social media websites. Social media accounts that are being set up to represent an overall Clemson University “voice” or initiative first must be approved through the office of Public Affairs.

Plan for having at least two administrators for every social media site
Having multiple content owners or administrators at all times for every social media application will ensure that the application can continue to thrive and be updated regularly even if one of the existing administrators changes jobs or leaves the university.
Prepare for the necessary time commitment
A social media site will only be effective if the administrators take the necessary
time to generate interesting and interactive content and build relationships with the
online community. While regular and timely updates and discussions are key to
building your community, please also keep in mind that you don’t want to overload
your audiences with too much information.

Make it easy for people to find your site
To maximize exposure and participation with your social media site you will want to
make it as easy as possible for people to find it when searching online. A couple of
suggestions on how to do this:

1. Use Clemson University in the title of the site, if possible
2. Try to avoid only using acronyms when naming your site
3. After your account has been set up, take two minutes to fill out the online
   form at http://www.clemson.edu/campus-life/social-media/
   so your site can be added to the social media directory page on clemson.edu
   and promoted through other university social media pages and accounts.

Use of Clemson University logos
If you are creating a social media site on behalf of Clemson University, please use
official logos and graphics that represent and adhere to the university brand
guidelines. These guidelines, including logo standards and usage, can be found at:
http://www.clemson.edu/campus-life/campus-services/creative-services/visual-
guide/

The office of Creative Service at Clemson can provide guidance with graphics and
design for your social media site.

Raising money via social networks
Charitable Contributions to or on behalf of the Clemson University Foundation or
any other 501(c)(3) organization whose mission is to support Clemson University,
cannot be solicited, nor can they be accepted, unless approved in advance by the
Foundation (http://www.clemson.edu/giving/cufoundations/).

POSTING ON BEHALF OF CLEMSON UNIVERSITY

Sharing Clemson University news, events or promoting faculty, staff and student
work through social media is an effective and low-cost way to engage various
audiences of the university. In addition to the general guidelines discussed above,
employees creating or posting on social media sites on behalf of Clemson University
should remember:

Be Accurate
Make sure you have all the facts before you post. All research, data reporting and
analysis made public on the Web should be verified for accuracy. Cite and link to your sources whenever possible. That is how you build the trust of your community.

**Realize your posts are public**
If you have any questions about the appropriateness of the material you are posting to a university social media site, please check with your supervisor. Also, as an employee of a public institution, Faculty, staff and student communications are subject to the South Carolina Freedom of Information Act.

**Keep confidential matters private**
Do not post proprietary information about Clemson University, including information about students, alumni or employees. Remember that most records related to students are protected from disclosure under the federal law known as the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA). Disclosing any personally identifiable student education records through social media sites is a violation of FERPA. Information collected in connection with research may be protected under a Nondisclosure Agreement, research protocol or other applicable law or agreement. Any protected information must not be disclosed through social media.

**Be transparent**
It should be obvious that you work for Clemson University if you are posting as part of your job. If you are posting as a representative of Clemson University, your posts are viewed as representing the views of Clemson University, so make sure to post responsibly and with respect to others in your community. Your posts directly reflect on the university.

**Responding to Negative Comments**
When you find yourself disagreeing with others, keep your comments appropriate and polite. If you find yourself in a position where the communication becomes antagonistic, avoid being defensive. Please be respectful of other's people's opinions. Having thoughtful discussions on important topics is a great way to build your community and is a very important aspect of having a successful social media site.

**Don't be afraid to ask for help**
If you receive a question you cannot answer or if you see incorrect information about Clemson University, contact the Office of Public Affairs (864-656-2061) for assistance. Contact the Office of Public Affairs if you having trouble creating or monitoring your social media site.
GRIEVANCE BOARD

At the January 10, 2012 Faculty Senate meeting, nine (9) persons will be elected to serve on the Grievance Board from the Colleges of:

AAH (needs two people)
AFLS (needs two people)
BBS (needs two people)
E&S (needs one person)
HEHD (needs two people)

The Grievance Board shall consist of members elected by the members of the faculty senate from a pool of nominees named by the Executive/Advisory Committee in a joint meeting, and from nominations made from the floor at the Senate election meeting. Members of the Grievance Board must be tenured Professors or Associate Professors, and shall be members, alternates, or former members of the Faculty Senate.

These Grievance Board members shall consist of a representative from the Library and two representatives from each college and their term of service shall be for two years. The Senate shall hold an election each January to replace and to permanently fill positions left vacant during the year. The Advisory Committee shall appoint the Chair of the Grievance Board.

The Board, through three and five-member Hearing Panels, hears grievances brought to it in accordance with Faculty Grievance Categories I and II. (see procedures, Part V, Faculty Manual).