1. Call to Order: President Bill Bowerman called the meeting to order at 2:30 p.m. and welcomed and recognized guests.

2. Approval of Minutes: The Faculty Senate Minutes dated November 10, 2009 and the General Faculty and Staff Minutes dated December 16, 2009 were approved as distributed (The December Faculty Senate meeting was canceled).

3. "Free Speech": None

4. Special Order of the Day: Elaine Richardson explained and provided handouts regarding the Alcohol and Other Drugs Task Force. Questions and answers were then exchanged.

5. Committee Reports:

   1) Senate Standing Committees


   b. Welfare Committee: Chair Linda Li-Bleuel stated that the Committee did not meet in December but briefly explained the November and December Committee Reports dated November 17, 2009 and January 12, 2010, respectively (Attachments).

   c. Scholastic Policies Committee: Committee member, Wayne Goddard, for Chair Vic Shelburne, noted that the Committee met on November 17, 2009 but not in December.

   d. Research Committee: Chair Lesly Temesvari stated that Committee is addressing how proposals are chosen for submission (to be limited or go forward) on campus; post-doctorate hiring procedures; uniformity among colleges regarding University consulting policies and special security clearances. Dvora Perahia will chair this Committee in Dr. Temesvari’s absence to undertake a Fulbright Scholarship in Italy during the next semester.
Policy Committee: Chair Jeremy King noted the Committee met on December 28, 2009 and submitted the Committee Report (Attached).

2) Other University Committees/Commissions
   a. Compensation Advisory Group – President Bowerman stated the this Group completed work on two policies related to the salary administration compensation on staff compensation. These policies were approved at the Administration Council. President Bowerman was tasked with getting the report out regarding these two policies.
   
   b. Joint Presidents Committee on Shared Governance – President Bowerman stated that the initial report was shared with the Faculty Senate Executive/Committee from which feedback was received. The final report will be brought to full Senate under New Business. Chair Bryan Simmons and University Legal Counsel Clay Steadman then explained the charge to the Committee which resulted in the final report.

6. President’s Report: President Bowerman:
   a. stated that the Salary Report will be distributed later this week;
   
   b. asked Senators to stay after today’s meeting to discuss with the Provost ideas for retention incentives for faculty across campus;
   
   c. noted that Grievance Board members and Grievance Counselors will be elected later during the meeting;
   
   d. stated that it is now time for nominations to be received for the Faculty Senate Officers of Vice President/President-Elect and Secretary and that elections will be held at the March Senate meeting; and
   
   e. stated that it is time to begin recruitment of new Faculty Senators and Alternates from respective colleges for Faculty Senate elections.

7. Old Business: None

8. New Business:
   a. Election to Grievance Board – The following faculty were elected or re-elected to serve on the University Grievance Board: Paul Dawson (AFLS); Linda Howe (HEHD); Linda Li-Bleuel (AAH), Jane Lindle (HEHD); John Meriwether (E&G), Lydia Schleifer (BBS), Kelly Smith (AAH); David Tonkyn (AFLS)
   
   b. Election as Grievance Counselor - The following faculty were elected to serve as Grievance Counselors: Curtis Simon (BBS) and Pradip Srimani (E&S).
   
   c. Proposed Faculty Manual Change – Evaluation of Teaching by Students – Senator Jeremy King submitted and explained the proposed change and there was much discussion (Attached). Senator Grubb moved to table until a committee is formed with the
Provost to move quickly to define evaluation criteria. Motion was seconded. Vote to table was passed. This committee will be comprised of members of the Faculty Senate Scholastic Policies Committee and the Provost and committee results will be presented to the Faculty Senate at the April, 2010 meeting.

d. Proposed Faculty Manual Change – Part V, 6.1.5 Grievance Materials – Senator Jeremy King submitted and explained the proposed change. There was no discussion. Vote to accept proposed change was taken and passed unanimously (Attached).

e. Proposed Faculty Manual Change – Part V, 6.1.9 Grievance Meetings – Senator Jeremy King submitted and explained the proposed change. There was no discussion. Vote to accept proposed change was taken and passed unanimously (Attached).

f. Proposed Faculty Manual Change – Senior Lecturer – Senator Jeremy King submitted and explained the proposed change. There was no discussion. Vote to accept proposed change was taken and passed unanimously (Attached).

g. Bryan Simmons, Chair of the Joint Presidents Committee on Shared Governance, submitted for acceptance the Final Report of this Committee, as explained earlier in the Senate meeting. There was no discussion. Vote to accept Report was taken and passed unanimously (Attached).

9. Announcements:
   a. Webb M. Smathers, Jr. is the 2009 recipient of the Class of '39 Award for Excellence.

   b. Next Executive/Advisory Committee meeting will be on January 26, 2010.

   c. Next Faculty Senate meeting will be on February 9, 2010.

10. Adjournment: 4:08 p.m.

C. Alan Grubb, Secretary

Cathy Toth Sturkie, Program Coordinator

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
   Faculty Senate – November 10, 2009
   General Faculty and Staff – December 16, 2009

3. "FREE SPEECH" PERIOD

4. SPECIAL ORDERS OF THE DAY
   Elaine Richardson and Joy Smith – Alcohol and Other Drugs Task Force

5. COMMITTEE REPORTS
   a. Faculty Senate Standing Committees
      Finance Committee – Senator Richard Figliola
      Welfare Committee – Senator Linda Li-Bleuel
      Scholastic Policies Committee – Senator Vic Shelburne
      Research Committee – Senator Lesly Temesvari
      Policy Committee – Senator Jeremy King
   b. University Committees/Commissions
      a. Compensation Advisory Group—Bill Bowerman
      b. Select Committee on Academic Lecturers – Bill Pennington
      c. Budget Accountability Committee – Antonis Katsiyannis

6. PRESIDENT'S REPORT

7. OLD BUSINESS

8. NEW BUSINESS
   a. Elections to University Grievance Board (secret ballot)
   b. Election as Grievance Counselor (secret ballot)
   c. Proposed Faculty Manual Change – Evaluation of Teaching by Students – Senator King
   d. Proposed Faculty Manual Change – Grievance Materials – Senator King
   e. Proposed Faculty Manual Change – Grievance Hearing Panels Meetings – Senator King
   f. Proposed Faculty Manual Change – Senior Lecturer – Senator King

9. ANNOUNCEMENTS
   a. Executive/Advisory Committee – January 26, 2010 – 2:30 p.m. – 205 Cooper Library
   b. Next Faculty Senate Meeting – February 9, 2010 – 2:30 p.m. – Madren Center

10. ADJOURNMENT
Clemson University follows national guidelines for alcohol safety and is also a part of a network that links resources within South Carolina.

In addition, Clemson University created the following campus-specific programming for alcohol safety:

- policies and procedures, i.e., Medical Alcohol Amnesty Policy (MAAP)
- alternative events
- prevention efforts and peer education for freshmen
- campus and community collaboration through the Clemson Community Coalition and the Alcohol and Other Drugs Task Force
- specialized initiatives within Student Affairs under the Dean of Student Life's Office to facilitate programming, research and marketing (i.e., EMpower Clemson and Redfern's Health Promotion).

Clemson has developed a five-year harm reduction plan. Below is a snapshot of collected outcomes used to prepare this plan.

The Good News

Positive findings in correlation with alcohol safety programming:

- The Office of Community and Ethical Standards reports a decline of 27 percent in alcohol violations for all students from fall 2007 to fall 2008.
- For the first time in two years, Fraternity and Sorority Life reported no chapter-wide alcohol violations for spring 2009.
- After exposure to the peer-delivered Alcohol Skills Training Program (ASTP) for freshmen, high-risk drinking did not increase (ASTP three-month follow up, fall 2008).
- 12 students used the MAAP from spring 2009 to fall 2009.

Protective Behaviors:

- The number of students that refused a drink offer increased from 70 percent to 72 percent from 2008-09 (Core survey data).
- Clemson student service organizations reported a total of 50,000+ hours of volunteer time for the 2008-09 academic year (community service logs).
- A total of 13 residence halls reported that they used the safety resource information (Student Government records).
And Numbers that Concern Us

Alcohol Consumption Comparisons from 2008-09 (Core survey data):

- average number of drinks per week rose from 6.4 to 7.3
- high-risk drinking rate rose from 48 percent to 55 percent
- drinking and driving rate rose from 29 percent to 32 percent
- number of females that consumed five or more drinks per sitting within the past two weeks rose from 37 percent to 51 percent.

2009 New Peer-Led Initiatives:

- Friends of Ben (former Sigma Nu brothers who were friends with Ben Sprague)
- GAMMA (Greeks Advocating the Mature Management of Alcohol)
- Think Ahead Campaign (transportation options for late night).
**Clemson Alcohol Safety Framework**  
**Fall 2009 Status Report**  

**Area of Strategic Individual Student Student Groups Campus Community State/National Programming**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Policies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Counseling and Psychological Services</strong></td>
<td><strong>Increased funding for counseling services; increased number of counselors</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Escort Service</strong></td>
<td><strong>Student Escort Service</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Health Services</strong></td>
<td><strong>Student Health Services</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enforcement Team</strong></td>
<td><strong>State and Other Drug Task Force; Alcohol &amp; Drug Enforcement Team</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Host Laws</strong></td>
<td><strong>Underage Drinking Task Force; Social Host Laws</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental Living/Learning Communities</strong></td>
<td><strong>Environmental Living/Learning Communities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Coalition</strong></td>
<td><strong>Community Coalition</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E-Check Up To Go (e-CHUG)</strong></td>
<td><strong>E-Check Up To Go (e-CHUG)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prevention</strong></td>
<td><strong>Prevention</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Bolded items denote sustained programs.**

[www.clemson.edu/empower]
Recent Issues

- Leave/Subbing
  - Cindy Pury spoke to the Welfare Committee about leave/subbing issues in her department
  - Erik Flemming from HR was also present to help us with any issues concerning leave policies
  - Welfare Committee, Cindy Pury, and Erik Flemming all agreed that perhaps something general should be stated in the Faculty Manual concerning leave, as an information resource
    - In the case of planned leave (e.g. maternity), many chairs and faculty do not fully understand FMLA (Family Medical Leave Act)
    - Many do not realize that everyone has the right to take FMLA and are fearful of doing so—perhaps if there was a place faculty/chairs could refer to, there would not be as much uncertainty and hesitation
      - Perhaps a list of people who are eligible for leave—criteria—could be listed?
    - List of possible compensation for subs as a guidance to chairs, budget permitting—again, general in wording
      - Overload compensation?
      - Course reduction in the future?
      - Professional development funds?
      - Accommodations made in the goals
    - Perhaps HR can send out information concerning FMLA, similar to emails concerning sexual harassment?

- Phase-out Retirement
  - Erik Flemming from HR helped answer our questions
  - Apply for it through HR—employee must meet with HR
  - Retire, then become rehired in a temporary position—forgo the permanent position
  - Same rights, voting privileges, etc. as if full-time
Welfare Committee will meet on 1/19. Will discuss the following:

- **Parking**
  - Parking services has proposed that CU retirees pay for parking. Vanessa Weston from Parking Services will come to the next Welfare Committee meeting on Jan. 19 to discuss this. We have also invited someone from the Emeritus College to participate in this discussion.

- **Leave**
  - We will begin to draft a statement regarding leave for the Faculty Manual, hopefully making leave options clearer to faculty.

**ANNOUNCEMENT**

- **H1N1 Shots**
  - Clemson faculty and staff members can receive the H1N1 flu vaccination Wednesday, Jan. 13, at Redfern Health Center. The injections will be available from 8:30 to 11:30 a.m. and 12:30 to 4 p.m. in the downstairs classroom at the health center.

  The vaccination is free and no appointment is necessary.
• Must first be eligible for retiree insurance—anyone who retires from CU will be on retiree insurance, not just people who opt for the phase-out plan
  o Retiree Eligibility
    a. If in South Carolina Retirement System (SCRS), at least 55 years old with 25 years of state service or any age and 28 years of state service.
    b. If in SCRS, 60 years old with at least 5 years of state service.
    c. If in an Optional Retirement Program (ORP), 59.5 years old regardless of years of state service.

  o Funded Retiree Insurance Eligibility
    Employees who leave employment when they are eligible to retire (see eligibility criteria above) and have at least 10 years of earned service with an employer that participates in the state insurance program. The last 5 years of employment must be in a full-time, permanent position with no breaks in service.

• Parking
  • Parking services has proposed that CU retirees pay for parking. Vanessa Weston from Parking Services will come to the next Welfare Committee meeting on Jan. 19 to discuss this. We will also invite someone from the Emeriti College to participate in this discussion as well.

• Printing
  • I met with Brent Emerson from the President’s Office. The IT Task Force has put forth a proposal to reduce printing volume on the CU campus.
    o Fall 2010, students will only be allowed a certain amount of printing; if they go over their allotment, they will be charged
    o Faculty/administration/staff will not be affected; so far it has been proposed that software will be implemented to keep track of printing volume
Faculty Senate Finance Committee Report
December 2009

The Committee did not formally meet over the holidays but Committee activities were happening.
Submitted by: Senator Figliola

Task 1: Compensation Report Study (Lead: Clarke)

The Compensation Report for 2008-2009 will be released in early January. It includes recommendations made by the Committee and adopted by Administration for improved communication about raise rationales. The Committee will review the information. The 2008-2009 year was only to include raises due to change of duties and faculty retention adjustments. We encourage input on its content. We will continue to receive input on how to further improve this Report for 2009-2010.

Task 2: University Budget Flow Chart (Lead: Figliola)

The University Budget Accountability Committee met 12/01/2009 and meets again in January. The December meeting discussed the basics of money flow with the University CFO, including restricted versus unrestricted funds and gray (interplay) areas inbetween. More to come in the future as we begin to look at actual funds.

One item of interest deals with auxiliary revenue enterprises (housing, food services, bookstore, sports,...). These enterprises are provided campus space and exclusive contracts but must be self-supporting (operating costs, capital improvements, debt service). They pay 6% overhead on gross revenues.

Task 3: Compensation Strategy (Lead: Simon)

No report.
FACULTY SENATE BUDGET ACCOUNTABILITY COMMITTEE
MONTHLY MEETING MINUTES
ANTONIS KATSIYANNIS, CHAIR
December 1, 2009-Provost’s Conference Room

Present: Doris Helms, Provost; Brett Dalton, CFO; Wickes Westcott, Director, Institutional Research; Antonis Katsiyannis, Richard Figliola, Chair, Finance Committee; Tim Drake, staff senate president

CU Budget Overview-Brett Dalton, CFO
CU budget consists of
  Unrestricted
    E & G, PSA
    Tuition and fees
    Department generated revenue-contract courses;
    Auxiliary—Red Fern, Housing, Food services, Athletics...ALL self supported)
  Restricted funds
    Grants-GADS, faculty release
    Donations
    Stimulus funds-4 million for tuition trelief/10 million for Lee Hall renovation

Flow of Money to Colleges
  College Base (e.g., salaries) plus
    Lab Fees -50% to colleges/ 50% for BIG projects (e.g., nursing lab)
    Department Revenues —contract courses, camps
    Indirect costs
    Summer School
    Differential tuition

Budget Trends-state support is decreasing; department generated funds on the increase; PSA-In the past, pesticide product registration fees and applicator license fees were increased to cover operational costs of these and other associated programs. Due to a substantial decrease in state appropriations, the Department of Pesticide Regulation is considering the implementation of additional fees that will enhance the agency's ability to support most programs with generated revenues.

Next meeting-January 19, 2009 at the Provost’s conference Room.
Faculty Senate Policy Committee Report

8 December 2009 Meeting

Committee members present: Denise Anderson, Claudio Cantalupo, Scott Dutkiewicz, Jeremy King, Hong Luo, Kelly Smith, Pradip Srimani

Special guests: Bonnie Holaday, Fran Mcguire, Pat Smart, Cathy Sturkie

Respectfully submitted by: Jeremy King

The committee met in the balmy bowels of the bookstacks of Cooper Library to tackle a continuingly full agenda:

1. The committee continued its ongoing (never ending?) discussion of representation on the Graduate Council for interdisciplinary graduate programs housed within the Graduate School. Our special guest Bonnie Holaday provided context for these discussions and answered questions regarding issues surrounding such representation. The committee finally attained a unified sense that while most (but not all) ID program faculty members are members of Colleges having representatives on the Graduate Council, the programs themselves merit representation that is currently lacking. The committee further concluded that such representation is best achieved by direct membership on the Graduate Council rather than via another body such as the Graduate Advisory Committee. Senator Anderson will work to secure the endorsement of the Graduate Council for ID program representation, and to seek their feedback about whether such representation should be as a voting member or ex officio in nature.

2. The committee continued discussion on Part III, Section E of the Faculty Manual defining special faculty ranks. These discussions are one part of a larger effort addressing the issue of lecturer non-reappointment. The committee was uniformly satisfied with most of a draft revision of the first paragraph of Part III; the committee believes this draft will support the independent efforts of the Research Committee in simplifying the special faculty appointment process for post-doctoral fellows. However, the specific wording concerning time spent in faculty ranks counting (or not) towards the probationary period of a future tenure-track appointment raised a host of issues that split the committee. The consensus of the committee was that flexibility regarding the use of such time is desirable, but the committee could not agree on the language that would best effect that flexibility without unintended undesirable consequences. Fran McGuire will kindly lend his expertise to the Committee in drafting an additional sentence or two that might satisfy the committee as a whole.

3. The committee reviewed a draft revision to the Faculty Manual, coming from Scholastic Policies, regarding student evaluation of teaching. The committee endorsed a revised draft
that will be sent to the E/AC for endorsement. At the same time, the committee recognized that the evaluation of teaching remains a difficult issue—in terms of methodology and practice of such evaluation, as well as the role of Chair discretion in performing evaluation/selecting evaluation instruments, faculty rights/freedom in providing evaluation artifacts, the separate role of a TPR committee in such evaluations, and the weights attached to various evaluation instruments. The Policy Committee, upon the kind suggestion of Fran McGuire, informally endorsed the idea of asking the Provost to appoint a small ad hoc task force or committee to develop guidelines for best practices in teaching and evaluating teaching. Senator King will coordinate with Senator Victor Shelburne (Scholastic Policies Chair) to consider bringing such a proposal forward to the Provost.

4. The committee reviewed drafts of 2 proposed revisions to the Faculty Manual, brought forward by the Grievance Board, concerning the Grievance process. The first revision mandates that the Hearing Panel for GP II processes provide all parties with copies of materials contained in or referred to in the original grievance petition. The second revision allows the Hearing Panels to hold additional meetings amongst themselves to finalize recommendations, and then forward these recommendations to the Provost within 10 days of their final meeting. The committee endorsed these revisions, agreeing with the experience and insight of the Grievance Board that they would improve the grievance process. The revisions were forwarded to the E/AC for consideration.

5. The committee reviewed a draft revision to the Faculty Manual regarding Senior Lecturer appointments. A proposed revision was brought to the committee by the Provost after consultation with College Deans, who recommended that such appointments be made upon recommendation of Chairs in concert with TPR committees (instead of Advisory committees). The final draft approved by the committee and going forth to the E/AC also contains language making it more difficult to use Senior Lecturer positions for administrative appointments.
Proposed Faculty Manual Change

Part 9, Section D, #11 (Evaluation of Teaching by Students)

Current Wording:

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

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

- Self-assessment of teaching
- Peer review of teaching
- Student assessment of instruction
- Summary of statistical ratings from student assessment of instruction will become part of the personnel review data.

Evaluation of teaching by peers, learning objectives, and examinations by peers or supervisors, evaluation of course materials, learning objectives, and examinations by peers or supervisors, discussion of course materials, learning objectives, and examinations by peers or supervisors, or self-assessment of teaching, is mandatory for all instructors at both the undergraduate and graduate levels.

Student assessment of instruction is mandatory for all instructors at both the undergraduate and graduate levels.

Conduct the evaluation

The instructor will announce to the students that completed forms will not be examined until course grades have been submitted. It is required that instructors leave the room while forms are being completed by students. A student proctor will conduct the evaluation.

Summary of statistical ratings from student assessment of instruction will become part of the personnel review data.

Current Wording:

11. Evaluation of Teaching by Students. The university provides a standard form that meets the minimum requirements of best practices for student evaluation of teaching faculty.
Proposed Changes:

11. Evaluation of Teaching by Students

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

Student assessment of instruction is mandatory for all instructors at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. Before the last two weeks of the semester, the instructor must activate the on-line evaluation and then inform the students that the evaluation should be completed by the end of the semester. These forms will be distributed in every class near the end of the semester. The instructor will announce to the students that completed evaluation forms will not be examined or reviewed until course grades have been submitted. If instructors use class time for the on-line evaluation, it is required that instructors then leave the room during the evaluation while forms are being completed by students. A student proctor will conduct the evaluation.

Student assessment of instruction is mandatory for all instructors at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. Summary of statistical ratings from student assessment of instruction (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 (usually for six years) copies of all summaries of statistical ratings and all student comments for the purpose of verification. Summary of statistical ratings from student assessment of instruction would be available to department chairs through the data warehouse but the actual responses from students (including comments) would not be available unless the faculty member opted to submit them.

Faculty may also opt to make available additional information regarding their teaching. Other evaluation methods which must be given at least equal weight in the teaching evaluation process include:

- Peer evaluations of teaching by peers or supervisors,
- Course materials, learning objectives, and examinations by peers or supervisors,
- Evaluation of course materials, learning objectives, and examinations by peers and supervisors,
- Peer evaluations of teaching by peers or supervisors,
- Course materials, learning objectives, and examinations by peers or supervisors,
- Evaluation of course materials, learning objectives, and examinations by peers and supervisors.

The following are additional evaluation methods that may be used in addition to the above:

- In-class visits by peers or supervisors,
- Peer evaluations of teaching by peers or supervisors,
- Course materials, learning objectives, and examinations by peers or supervisors,
- Evaluation of course materials, learning objectives, and examinations by peers and supervisors.

The university's standard form is designed to be completed by students and not by faculty members. The form must be approved by the Scholastic Policies Committee of the Faculty Senate. Faculty may develop supplemental questions to the university's standard form, but these supplemental questions must be approved by the Scholastic Policies Committee of the Faculty Senate. The university provides a standard form for student evaluation of teaching that is used by all programs.
Final Proposed Wording (with changes):

1. Student Evaluation of Teaching.

The university provides a standard form that meets the minimum requirements of best 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 student evaluation data (including statistical summaries) 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 student comments will not be available unless an instructor opts to submit them.

The university will retain (usually 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 should also involve other evaluation results, not just the summary of statistical ratings from student evaluation data. These evaluation results may include any of the following:

- Evaluation of course materials and examination of student responses, by peers and/or supervisors.
- Instructor-developed question statistical summaries, with instructor approval.
- In-class or post-class visitation by peers and/or supervisors.
- Peer assessment of teaching effectiveness.
- Instructor-developed question summaries.
- Exit interviews/surveys with recent graduates and alumni.
- Additional criteria as appropriate to the discipline.

Rationale for changes:

This section has been rewritten to address the current evaluation procedure, which uses an online form. The revisions also provide three important clarifications: the difference in chair access to university-developed questions versus instructor-developed questions; the right of a course instructor to make his/her evaluation question summaries and all comments available to his/her chair; and the role of the university in maintaining the evaluation database. Finally, the revisions establish that student comments are optional possible criteria for evaluation of teaching if the instructor elects to make them available.
Proposed Faculty Manual Change

Part V, Section 6.1 (Grievance Hearings), #5

Current Wording:

5. Both parties shall be permitted to offer evidence and witnesses pertinent to the issue. The Provost (or the President if the Provost is a named party) shall, so far as possible, assist the hearing panel in securing the cooperation and attendance of witnesses and named parties and shall make available documents and other evidence under her/his control. Those persons requested to testify are strongly encouraged but cannot be compelled to testify. When the hearing may be expedited and the interest of the parties shall not be substantially prejudiced, any part of the evidence may be received in written form. All written evidence submitted by all parties to the grievance hearing in a Category I petition must be received by the chair of the hearing panel not less than seven weekdays prior to the date set for the hearing; any material received after that date may be excluded by the hearing panel at its discretion. For Category II, written material can be received any time during the hearing process. Documentary evidence may be received in the form of copies or excerpts if the original is not readily available. Irrelevant, immaterial, or unduly repetitious evidence should not be included. If an objection is made to any evidence being offered, the decision of the majority of the panel shall govern.

Proposed Changes:

5. Both parties shall be permitted to offer evidence and witnesses pertinent to the issue. The Provost (or the President if the Provost is a named party) shall, so far as possible, assist the hearing panel in securing the cooperation and attendance of witnesses and named parties and shall make available documents and other evidence under her/his control. Those persons requested to testify are strongly encouraged but cannot be compelled to testify. When the hearing may be expedited and the interest of the parties shall not be substantially prejudiced, any part of the evidence may be received in written form. All written evidence submitted by all parties to the grievance hearing in a Category I petition must be received by the chair of the hearing panel not less than seven weekdays prior to the date set for the hearing; any material received after that date may be excluded by the hearing panel at its discretion. For Category II, written material can be received any time during the hearing process. In the interests of fairness, the Hearing Panel will make every effort to provide, in a timely manner, all named parties with copies of documents submitted or referred to in the original Petition that the Panel deems material to their decision. Documentary evidence may be received in the form of copies or excerpts if the original is not readily available. Irrelevant, immaterial, or unduly repetitious evidence should not be included. If an objection is made to any evidence being offered, the decision of the majority of the panel shall govern.
Final Wording (with changes):

5. Both parties shall be permitted to offer evidence and witnesses pertinent to the issue. The Provost (or the President if the Provost is a named party) shall, so far as possible, assist the hearing panel in securing the cooperation and attendance of witnesses and named parties and shall make available documents and other evidence under her/his control. Those persons requested to testify are strongly encouraged but cannot be compelled to testify. When the hearing may be expedited and the interest of the parties shall not be substantially prejudiced, any part of the evidence may be received in written form. All written evidence submitted by all parties to the grievance hearing in a Category I petition must be received by the chair of the hearing panel not less than seven weekdays prior to the date set for the hearing; any material received after that date may be excluded by the hearing panel at its discretion. For Category II, written material can be received any time during the hearing process. In the interests of fairness, the Hearing Panel will make every effort to provide, in a timely manner, all named parties with copies of documents submitted or referred to in the original Petition that the Panel deems material to their decision. Documentary evidence may be received in the form of copies or excerpts if the original is not readily available. Irrelevant, immaterial, or unduly repetitious evidence should not be included. If an objection is made to any evidence being offered, the decision of the majority of the panel shall govern.

Rationale for Changes: The Grievance Board believes that a fundamental sense of equity in the grievance process suggests that any documentation included with or referred to in the original Petition should be shared with all Respondents. The proposed change effects this provision. At the same time, the Grievance Board believes that any other documentation presented to Hearing Panels during the testimony phase of the Grievance process should not be shared with named parties.
Proposed Faculty Manual Change

Part V, Section 6.1 (Grievance Hearings), #9

Current Wording:

9. Within ten weekdays of the final hearing for either category, the panel shall submit its findings and recommendations to the Provost along with appropriate documents and records. In the event the Provost has been recused from a decision making capacity, the findings and recommendations shall be submitted to the President. The majority vote shall be the recommendation forwarded to the Provost by the hearing panel. The findings and recommendation must be submitted only to the Provost within ten weekdays after conclusion of the hearing.

Proposed Changes:

9. Within ten weekdays of the final meeting of the Hearing Panel (for either Grievance Procedure I or II petitions), the panel shall submit its findings and recommendations only to the Provost along with appropriate documents and records. In the event the Provost has been recused from a decision making capacity, the findings and recommendations shall be submitted to the President. The majority vote shall be the recommendation forwarded to the Provost by the hearing panel. The findings and recommendation must be submitted only to the Provost within ten weekdays after conclusion of the hearing.

Final Wording (with Changes):

9. Within ten weekdays of the final meeting of the Faculty Senate Advisory Committee (for Grievance Procedure I petitions) or Hearing Panel (for Grievance Procedure II petitions), the panel shall submit its findings and recommendations only to the Provost along with appropriate documents and records. In the event the Provost has been recused from a decision making capacity, the findings and recommendations shall be submitted to the President. The majority vote shall be the recommendation forwarded to the Provost by the hearing panel.

Rationale: The Grievance Board believes that experience clearly shows that hearing panels invariably need a final meeting, beyond the final hearing, amongst themselves in order to draft the findings and recommendations to be submitted to the administration. The change provides for such a meeting and still ensures that the panel’s findings/recommendations are submitted in a timely fashion.
Proposed Faculty Manual Change
Part III, Section E, #8 (Senior Lecturer)

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

Proposed Wording:
8. Senior Lecturer. After six years of satisfactory performance a lecturer may be reclassified as a senior lecturer. Equivalent experience at Clemson, such as that obtained in a visiting position, may be counted. A department chair, with the concurrence of the department’s advisory tenure-promotion-(re)appointment committee, may recommend an individual to the college dean who makes the appointment. Senior lecturers may be offered contracts ranging from one to three years with the requirement of one year’s notice of non-renewal before July 15 termination. Senior Lecturers can not have administrative duties beyond those of regular faculty. This rank is not available to faculty with greater than 50% administrative assignment.

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

Rationale: The concurrence of a TPR committee seems more appropriate than the concurrence of an advisory committee for the senior lecturer appointment. The term “non-renewal” is substituted for “termination” since the latter has a specific meaning (related to institutional contingencies and financial exigencies) in the Faculty Manual. Finally, the change related to making the senior lecturer appointment unavailable to individuals with duties inconsistent with those of regular faculty will further tighten the use of this position for administrators.
SHARED GOVERNANCE

As a matter of law, final authority and responsibility for Clemson University is vested in its Board of Trustees. This authority is explicitly set forth in the Last Will and Testament of Thomas Green Clemson and the subsequent Act of Acceptance adopted by the S. C. General Assembly. The Board may delegate authority, in whole or in part, to other officers and bodies within the University for the purpose of assuring effective management. However, any such delegation of authority should be reflected in Board policy, resolution or other official action for it to have any force or effect.

Clemson University values and practices the concept of shared governance in the form of transparency, communication and accountability among its Board of Trustees, administration and faculty. The University believes that the exercise of its collective intelligence enables it to make the best decisions and that seeking consensus about decisions enhances unity and creates a stronger University. Shared governance reflects a commitment on the part of the University to work together in a collegial and transparent manner to achieve the goals of the University. The University will utilize consistent and common processes to implement the principle of shared governance. This approach reflects the trust which all members of the University have for each other.

Shared governance requires transparency, communication and accountability at all levels of decision-making within the University. The form of expressing shared governance will vary from situation to situation, as the circumstances of each situation vary, but the concept of shared governance should be applied consistently. Similarly, the level or degree of participation in a particular decision by the Board, the administration and the faculty will depend upon the facts of that situation, the rights and interests involved, and the particular expertise required.
MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
FEBRUARY 9, 2010

1. Call to Order: President Bill Bowerman called the meeting to order at 2:30 p.m. and welcomed and recognized guests.

2. Approval of Minutes: The Faculty Senate Minutes dated January 12, 2009 were approved as distributed.

3. "Free Speech": Robbie Nicholson (Lack of Childcare at Clemson University); Bryan Simmons (Suggestions for Recyclable Float Waste) and John Bednar (Total Compensation of Administrators, Contract Laborers at Clemson, and the Administration’s Position on Tenure).

4. Special Orders of the Day: Michelle Piekutowski (New Policy of Compensation Plan for Faculty and Staff), Jamey Lowdermilk (Clemson’s National Teach-In on Climate Change), Larry LaForge (Current Challenges in the Responsibility Areas of Academic Integrity, Rules Compliance and Student-Athlete Welfare), Becky Bowman (Vickery Hall Services), Terry Don Phillips and Bill D’Andrea (Economical Impact on IPTAY Donation and Ticket Sales).

5. Presentation and Slate of Faculty Senate Officers
   a. The Slate of Officers was presented by the Executive/Advisory Committee of the Faculty Senate.

   Vice President/President-Elect: Alan Grubb
       Dan Warner
   Secretary: Meredith Futral
       Linda Howe

   The floor was opened for nominations. There being none, nominations were closed until the March Faculty Senate meeting.

   b. Statements of interest were then received by candidates for office.

6. Committee Reports:
   1) Senate Standing Committees

b. **Welfare Committee**: Chair Linda Li-Bleuel submitted and briefly explained the Committee Report dated January 12, 2010 (Attachment).

c. **Scholastic Policies Committee**: Chair Vic Shelburne, submitted and briefly explained the Committee Report dated January 15, 2010 (Attachment).

d. **Research Committee**: Chair Dvora Perahia stated that the Committee will meet with Michelle Pietkutowski regarding the hiring of post-doctoral students and that other issues the Committee is addressing concern security clearances of graduate students; the possibility of one well-defined, uniform consulting policy; and overhead regarding computer office equipment.

e. **Policy Committee**: Chair Jeremy King and submitted the Committee Report date January, 2010 (Attached).

2) **Other University Committees/Commissions**

a) **Compensation Advisory Group** – this Group will meet next week.

b) **Academic Lecturer’s** – Chair Bill Pennington will come to the Senate next month to present proposals from this Committee.

c) **Budget Accountability Committee** – Chair Antonis Katsiyannis submitted and explained the Committee Report dated January 28, 2010 (Attachment).

d) **Grievance Activity Reports** – Vice President/President-Elect Bill Surver submitted and explained the Grievance Categories I and II Activity Reports (Attachments).

7. **President’s Report**: President Bowerman:

1) told the Faculty Senate that he had received a phone call from an individual from Penn State who praised Clemson University for not withdrawing the athletic scholarship from the student football player who recently suffered a severe stroke.

2) regarding the definition of transparency, informed the Senate that he has participated in many meetings this year with administrators and has yet to run into any case where a question of any administrator has not been answered.

3) shared his response with the Senate to President Barker when he asked what it was like to be the Faculty Senate President: that his role is to defend whatever is in the University and the Faculty Senate rules and to work on problems together. President Bowerman further noted that all departments and colleges need to look at bylaws to be certain they are reflective of what practices are at all levels of the University and the *Faculty Manual*.

8. **Old Business**: None
9. **New Business:**
   a. **Proposed Faculty Manual Change** – Honorary Degree Committee and the University Advisory Committee on Naming Land and Facilities – Senator Jeremy King submitted and explained the proposed changes as one. There was no discussion. Vote to accept proposed change was taken and passed (Attached).

   b. **Proposed Faculty Manual Change** – Institutional Biosafety Committee and Use of Recombinant DNA, Biological and Chemical Hazards – Senator Jeremy King submitted and explained the proposed changes as one. There was no discussion. Vote to accept proposed change was taken and passed unanimously (Attached).

**Announcements:**
   a. Alan Schaffer Faculty Senate Service Award Nominations are due to the Faculty Senate Office on February 16, 2010.
   b. Janie Hodge was appointed by President Bowerman to be the Faculty Senate representative to the Americans with Disabilities Act Task Force.
   c. Next Executive/Advisory Committee meeting will be on February 23, 2010.
   d. Next Faculty Senate meeting will be on March 9, 2010.

10. **Adjournment:** 4:08 p.m.

   C. Alan Grubb, Secretary

   Cathy Toth Sturkie, Program Coordinator

### Academic Dashboard for Clemson Athletics

#### Four-Year Data - UPDATED NOVEMBER 2009

**NCAA GRADUATION SUCCESS RATE (GSR)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NCAA Division I Universities*</th>
<th>Top 10 NCAA Public Universities*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MEN:</strong></td>
<td>Median</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WOMEN:</strong></td>
<td>Median</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowing</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NCAA ACADEMIC PROGRESS RATE (APR)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NCAA Division I Universities*</th>
<th>Top 10 NCAA Public Universities*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MEN:</strong></td>
<td>Median</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball</td>
<td>974</td>
<td>972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>929</td>
<td>946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track</td>
<td>947</td>
<td>972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td>955</td>
<td>951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf</td>
<td>981</td>
<td>992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer</td>
<td>966</td>
<td>974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming</td>
<td>963</td>
<td>983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>973</td>
<td>975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WOMEN:</strong></td>
<td>Median</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>964</td>
<td>968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track</td>
<td>959</td>
<td>982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowing</td>
<td>992</td>
<td>985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming</td>
<td>974</td>
<td>990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>979</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FEDERAL GRADUATION RATE (FGR)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NCAA Division I Universities*</th>
<th>Top 10 NCAA Public Universities*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MEN:</strong></td>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>Median</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball</td>
<td>-38</td>
<td>-36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>-61</td>
<td>-41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track</td>
<td>-21</td>
<td>-5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td>-18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer</td>
<td>-17</td>
<td>-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WOMEN:</strong></td>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>Median</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowing</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

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

Notes: Denotes that Clemson is above (or equal to) the midpoint of the peer group.

Clemson's Institutional Federal Graduation Rate is 77% for the entering classes of 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002. All GSR, APR, and FGR data for this report were compiled from public information available at www.ncaa.org.
Task 1: Compensation Report Study (Lead: Clarke)

The Faculty/Administrator/Staff Salary Report for 2008-2009 was released in early January. Senator Clarke is reviewing the information on the list and will prepare a presentation for the Senate. Senator Clarke will also continue to work on other suggested changes to future reports, such as including total compensation.

Task 2: University Budget Flow Study (Lead: Figliola)

The University Budget Accountability Committee met 12/01/2009 and meets again January 28. A presentation by the University CFO to the Senate on basic budget flow is planned later this Spring.

We are continuing discussion on the overhead and trademark royalty money flow on-campus. Revenue generating enterprises, such as athletics, must be self-supporting (operating costs, maintenance, capital improvements, debt service). They pay ~6% overhead on gross revenues. Trademark royalties are handled by the Athletic Department. Gross royalties are about $1M per year. About 15% of this is for non-athletic trademarks, or about $150,000 per year. We will continue study.

Task 3: Compensation Strategy (Lead: Simon)

This subcommittee spent time this month reviewing a study on compensation at Universities and CEO pay. A report is attached.
This month, Curtis Simon presented a paper on the determinants of public university CEO pay and length of service. Public university CEOs earn about 50% of what measurably comparable private university CEOs earn, but have longer average tenures. The differential is consistent with the notion that public university CEOs have less independence of action, and thus are held to less strict standards for retention in their post.

The two most important determinants of public university CEO pay are FTE enrollment and revenue per student. No research of which we are aware has tried to link either pay or retention of the CEO to performance. Such measures may be difficult to develop, for university rankings and reputations are enduring, making it difficult to examine the effects of, say, cracking the top 20 by some measure of quality.

Senator Simon also presented some new data on public university CEO and administrator pay from the Chronicle of Higher Education, which has released data for the 2008-09 academic year. Here are some data for the Carolinas and Georgia:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Inst</th>
<th>CEO</th>
<th>public</th>
<th>private</th>
<th>car</th>
<th>house?</th>
<th>retir/def com</th>
<th>total</th>
<th>remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Clemson</td>
<td>Barker</td>
<td>$222,422</td>
<td>$172,344</td>
<td>$1,588</td>
<td>house</td>
<td>$29,232</td>
<td>$425,586</td>
<td>state-provided car</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>SC Tech Sys</td>
<td>Russell</td>
<td>$162,859</td>
<td>$30,164</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$15,048</td>
<td>$208,071</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>USC Col</td>
<td>Pastides</td>
<td>$265,000</td>
<td>$270,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$535,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>B. Carolina</td>
<td>Ballard</td>
<td>$315,000</td>
<td>$12,413</td>
<td></td>
<td>house</td>
<td>$28,522</td>
<td>$355,935</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>NC State</td>
<td>Oblinger</td>
<td>$420,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>UNC Chapel Hill</td>
<td>Thorp</td>
<td>$418,150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$41,208</td>
<td>$461,208</td>
<td>state-provided car</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA</td>
<td>UGA System</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>$425,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$72,000</td>
<td>$497,000</td>
<td>state-provided car</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA</td>
<td>UGA (proper)</td>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>$255,516</td>
<td>$125,203</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$19,400</td>
<td>$404,159</td>
<td>state-provided car</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA</td>
<td>GIT</td>
<td>Peterson</td>
<td>$424,500</td>
<td></td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$197,638</td>
<td>$634,138</td>
<td>relocation allow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA</td>
<td>GA State</td>
<td>Becker</td>
<td>$515,100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$19,400</td>
<td>$534,500</td>
<td>relocation allow</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen, President Barker's pay is comparable to that received by the CEO of UNC State, and markedly below that received by the CEO at Georgia Tech.

Senator Simon also presented data on the mean earnings of administrators by occupation, by school type. The mean CEO pay at a PhD-granting university was $410,000 in 2008-09. Provost pay at the same type of institution averaged $262,000, or about 64% that of the CEO. For purposes of comparison, Provost Helms's 12-month salary was $270,389 in the most recent salary report. How does her pay compare with the average? President Barker's ratio of retirement to public plus private compensation is 7.4%. If we inflate Provost Helms's salary by the same factor, and compute the ratio of her compensation relative to President Barker's total compensation, we arrive at a figure of 68%, slightly higher than the average in the data. (Curtis notes that one must be careful when arriving at conclusions because the ratio of averages is rarely equal to the average of ratios.)

A more complete picture of the earnings distribution across administrative ranks is provided by this chart, which shows earnings at each rank divided by mean CEO pay.
FACULTY SENATE WELFARE COMMITTEE REPORT
LINDA LI-BLEUEL, CHAIR
MEREDITH FUTRAL, VICE-CHAIR

MEMBERS: YANMING AN, LINDA HOWE, MICHELLE MARTIN, CHRIS PIPER, WAYNE SARASUA,
WAYNE STEWART

1/12/2010

Welfare Committee will meet on 1/19. Will discuss the following:

- Parking
  - Parking services has proposed that CU retirees pay for parking. Vanessa Weston from Parking Services will come to the next Welfare Committee meeting on Jan. 19 to discuss this. We have also invited someone from the Emeritus College to participate in this discussion.

- Leave
  - We will begin to draft a statement regarding leave for the Faculty Manual, hopefully making leave options clearer to faculty.

ANNOUNCEMENT

- H1N1 Shots
  - Clemson faculty and staff members can receive the H1N1 flu vaccination Wednesday, Jan. 13, at Redfern Health Center. The injections will be available from 8:30 to 11:30 a.m. and 12:30 to 4 p.m. in the downstairs classroom at the health center.

The vaccination is free and no appointment is necessary.
FACULTY SENATE SCHOLASTIC POLICIES COMMITTEE
MONTHLY MEETING MINUTES
January 15, 2010: 1 PM (402 Tillman Hall)

SCHOLASTIC POLICIES COMMITTEE
Vic Sherburne, Chair – (AFLS) present
Sean Brittain (E&S) present
Wayne Goddard (E&S) present
Bob Horton (HEHD) present

Topic 1 - Course Redemption Policy
Lead: [Horton]

Review Course Redemption policy and consider a recommendation to allow C grade redemption (D and F only in present policy).

The recommendation of the Scholastic Policies committee was not approved by the Faculty Senate Exec/Advisory Committee at its meeting in December. The Scholastic Policies committee will not continue to pursue this.

Topic 2 - Availability of Comments on Student Evaluation of Instructors for Chairs
Lead: [Shelburne]

The revised language of Section IX-6 2009 Faculty Manual was sent to the Policy Committee and revised again. However, it was tabled to no later than April at the January Faculty Senate meeting due to concerns of the Provost. Apparently, a joint committee of faculty (Scholastic Policies members?) and administrators will be appointed to address these concerns and make recommendations so to finalize the wording which will more specifically outline ways which faculty can demonstrate teaching effectiveness.

Topic 3 - Winter Semester
Lead: [Goddard]

Goddard noted the committee on which he serves to address this issue has a specific proposal in review. If that committee recommends a Winter semester, Scholastic Policies will review and make a recommendation.

Topic 4 - Make Fall Break a permanent date in October—not a November date in election years
Lead: [Goddard]

No action

Topic 5 - General Education
Lead: All
React to Gen Ed proposals as needed.

A request by Senate President Bill Bowerman that the question be asked at the Council of Undergraduate Studies as to the reason and charge for the establishment of College level Undergraduate curriculum review committees. Shelburne will do so at the next Council meeting—note that the council has not met since November so this remains to be done.

**Topic 6 - Lab Fees**—concern on how they are distributed within and among colleges and within the University as a whole.

Lead: [Brittain]

Brittain has responses from all five deans about how lab fees are distributed within colleges and that report is attached as an Addendum.

We note that the main issue is the retention of 50% of the lab fees by the Provost office and its reallocation. The Scholastic Policies committee members believe that the lab fees should go back only to those departments which generate them and on a dollar-for-dollar basis BUT the committee also recognizes that large equipment purchases may be intermittent. **Therefore, the committee re-affirms that lab fees should be used for the purpose they were collected.** And we note that this year, the 50% hold back from the Provost’s Office is being sent back to the Deans for their redistribution. It is unclear however if this is being redistributed to the colleges based on generation of the funds. The Scholastic Policies Committee is handing this issue off to the Faculty Senate Finance Committee for its review.

**Topic 7- SACS (Southern Association of College and Schools) reaccreditation and e-portfolio**

Shelburne brought up concerns about the upcoming SACS reaccreditation process and the tremendous amount of time that faculty might be expected to spend so to generate the expected documentation. Given all the recent cutbacks (including non-replacements) in faculty/staff hiring, it is perhaps very much in order to question the SACS organization. Specifically, is there a “SACS-lite” which could save the University both time and money but still bring about the desired result, i.e., reaccreditation?

E-portfolio in relation to the SACS accreditation was discussed. The Scholastic Policies committee recommends that its close association with the reporting needs of the assessment and reaccreditation process be reviewed. Our committee (and we suspect that many faculty believe likewise) does not view e-portfolio as anything more than an advanced form of a resume, that is, a purely mechanical process which would be best pursued as part of a senior seminar or similar capstone course if at all. We do not know of any significant research that indicates the e-portfolio contributes to students’ understanding of and appreciation for general education.

*Our next meeting will be Tuesday Feb 16 at 2 PM in 420 Tillman Hall*

Meeting adjourned at 1:45
Addendum:

Lab Fee Responses from Deans:

Larry Allen:
Our policy is to return all lab fees to the units. I do not retain any funds in the Dean’s Office. Each unit is instructed to use the funds specifically to refurbish supplies and equipment related to the lab courses and/or to support expenses related to field trips and other educational experiences beyond the traditional classroom experience.

Claude Lilly:
We get 50% of the lab fees from the Provost as part of our base budget (she keeps the other 50% for end-of-year maintenance projects). For the 50% we receive, we determine which department generated these fees and allocate 100% of those amounts to those departments. As far as I know, there are no specific college policies on how lab fees should be spent, but I believe each dept chair knows that lab fees are to be spent for the purposes for which they were charged.

Constantcio Nakuma for Chip Egan (AAH):
The first level of allocation of student lab fees (unless there is a special exemption of which I am not aware) is a 50-50 split between the Provost Office and the College that hosts the programs and courses generating the fee. According to this formula, then, the college of AAH receives $37.50 for a $75 lab fee that a student pays for taking Spanish 104, for example. The Provost retains $37.50.

Prior to the 2003-2004 academic year, the college’s share of lab fee revenue was allocated entirely into a general college fund and none of that money went to the department. Some changes happened at that point to produce the second level of allocation within the college.

Starting in the 2003-2004 academic year, after a budget cut that drained departments of critical instructional resources, there were increased demands from lab-fee-generating departments to have some of the lab fee money allocated to the department in order to maintain the labs in reliable operating condition. (For example, the language lab at Clemson was still operating on analog signals and cassette tapes when even high school language labs had upgraded to digital equipment). The college of AAH, under the previous dean (Dean Schach), established a formula at that time for sharing “new” lab fee revenues with the departments. The distinction between “old” and “new” was not literal and needs some explaining.

Basically, all existing courses at that point that had a lab fee component were considered “old” courses and were to continue to generate lab revenue that was allocated entirely to the college fund. Any new courses developed from that point onwards with a lab fee component would then, logically, belong in the “new” category, but logic did not necessarily prevail. For example, in Languages, the category of “new” was stripped from the 104 course series in Spanish, German and French, even though they were created then as new courses. The dean determined that including them in the “new” course category would cause the college to lose a lot of revenue, because the “old” 101-102 course sequence was being eliminated from the regular semester offerings. The first set of “new lab fee courses” were offered starting in January 2004.

The previous dean decided that sharing of the lab fee revenue would happen ONLY with the “new” lab fee courses BUT NOT with the revenue from the “old” courses. The proportional share of department to college was established as 70-30 (i.e. the department gets 70% of the 50% that the college receives for ONLY the “new” lab fees).

Dean Egan asked me to respond to you because he had already asked me to review this policy and make recommendations to him on how to change it so that lab fees flow through to the departments that generate them, without adversely affecting the overall financial health of the college.

“What rules govern how the money is spent.”
You may want to check on this information with the Provost directly, but my understanding is that the Provost’s 50% lab fee revenue share is redistributed to lab-hosting departments university-wide through the “Lab Infrastructure Funding” competition to be used on relatively large-scale lab renovation/maintenance projects that would not otherwise be possible.
Departments that receive a share of the lab fee revenue they generate through the “new” courses are advised to spend it on activities directly related to lab instruction, maintenance, and upgrades. I have no knowledge of this advice being documented anywhere in writing within the college, but I do know that I received this advice verbally when I was chair of the department of languages, and I assume that the same advice was given to the other chairs, too.

“Are there written policies guiding the distribution of lab fees and their use?”
None that I have seen. For the distribution of 70% to the department and 30% to the college, chairs were informed verbally at a meeting by Dean Schach that that would be the distribution. The college business officer was then charged to implement the policy. Again, please keep in mind that sharing DOES NOT APPLY TO ALL LAB FEES BUT ONLY TO the subset of fees generated by courses categorized as “NEW.”

Howie Roach for Esin Gulari (CoES):
Attached please find a copy of the 3 year history of Lab Fees for the College of Engineering and Science. The table represents the 50% of the lab fees that are given to the college and subsequently passed down to the individual departments. Although I am not aware of a Policy that exists for of Lab Fees, our procedure is to pass these down, dollar for dollar (90% based on block funding and then a 10% true up) to the department. The departments have been instructed to use these fees for their labs renovation, miscellaneous equipment and lab operations.

Tom Scott (CAFLS):
When CAFLS receives its half of lab fees from the Provost’s office, the fees are sent to the departments according to the amounts generated by each respective department. In cases where the other half is returned, the fees are directed to infrastructure use per Provost’s approval.
The Policy Committee met on 19 January 2010 to continue its discussions and concerning several ongoing and new items on its continuingly full agenda:

1. Bill Marcotte, the current Chair of the Institutional Biosafety Committee, appeared before the Policy Committee to answer questions concerning proposed changes to 2 Parts of the Faculty Manual related to the IBC and requirements for PIs utilizing recombinant DNA, biochemical agents/toxins, etc. The proposed changes, advocated and crafted with the assistance of Tracy Arwood (Office of Research Compliance) and Bill Marcotte, were motivated by the change of scope of the IBC mission in January 2009. The Policy Committee approved changes to the 2 salient Parts of the Faculty Manual, and forwarded these to the E/AC for consideration.

2. The Committee continued discussions related to perceived needed changes in Part III, Section E, #6 of the Faculty Manual related to the definition and non-reappointment of Lecturers. Michelle Piekutowski, acting Director of Human Resources, kindly appeared before the committee to answer its lingering questions about Lecturer appointments, benefits, and position processing in the context of the HR/payroll system. Having assured itself that the proposed changes would not deleteriously affect or complicate the terms of appointment and benefits of Lecturers, the committee approved changes to the Faculty Manual primarily which are hoped to clarify the length of appointment and notification of non-reappointment of Lecturers. The proposed change also includes language about Lecturer administrative duties designed to further inhibit the hiring of administrators under special faculty titles. The approved changes were forwarded to the E/AC for consideration.

3. The Committee continued consideration of changes to the introductory paragraph of Part III of the Faculty manual describing special faculty ranks. The Committee was satisfied with a new draft of the proposed change that stipulated that hires where special faculty members move to a regular faculty rank must follow canonical personnel practices/procedures contained in Part IV of the Faculty Manual. The Committee also discussed and decided to endorse mandating that appointment titles must be those defined/described in Part III of the Faculty Manual in order to curtail the use of extraneous and confusing titles. The full body
of changes to the introductory paragraph of Part III was approved by the Committee and forwarded to the E/AC.

4. Senate President Bill Bowerman appeared before the committee to introduce 3 items of new business. Time only allowed for consideration of one of these items dealing with the Honorary Degree and Naming Committees, which have been separated by the Board of Trustees into two separate committees. The single structure in the current Faculty Manual has hindered the appointment of a Chair of one of the committees. President Bowerman encouraged the Policy Committee to propose changes to the Faculty Manual reflecting the 2-committee structure adopted by the BOT so that the appointment of both committees could be completed at the February 2010 Board of Trustees meeting. In order that the important work of these committees and the business of the University can proceed in an orderly fashion, the Policy Committee approved these changes and forwarded them to the E/AC.

However, the Committee expressed concern that the proposed approved wording restricting student representation to undergraduates on the University Advisory Committee on Naming Land and Facilities may be a short-sighted continuation of the (most likely inadvertent legacy) practice that seems to ignore the role and importance of graduate students at the University. Rather than delay the establishment and operation of this committee, the Policy Committee asked Senate President Bowerman to bring this issue before both the Four Presidents group and the BOT for input and/or comment. The Policy Committee believes the issue of student representation on the Advisory Committee (and probably other committees established by the Faculty Manual) needs to be revisited in future, with special attention accorded to graduate student representation.

The Policy Committee anticipates that Senate President Bowerman will return to its February meeting to discuss two additional timely proposed changes to the Faculty Manual, including the appointment of administrators.
# Clemson University Grievance Board

## Grievance Procedure Activity

### Category I Petitions

**January, 2009 through January, 2010**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</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>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing Panel Grievance Recommendations Supported By Provost</td>
<td>0</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, 2009 through January, 2010

Total Number of Grievances: 7

Grievances Found Non-Grievable by Grievance Board: 2
Grievances Found to be Grievable by Grievance Board: 5
Not Yet Determined Grievable Or Non-Grievable: 0
Grievances In Process: 2
Suspended Grievances: 0
Withdrawn Grievances: 0
Petitions Supported by Hearing Panel: 2
Petitions Not Supported By Hearing Panel: 3
Hearing Panel Grievance Recommendations Supported By Provost: 3
Provost Recused: 0
Grievances Decided by President: 1
Presidential Decisions Supporting Petitioner: 0
Grievances Appealed to Board of Trustees: 0
Male Petitioner(s): 4
Female Petitioner(s): 3

GRIEVANCE ACTIVITY BY COLLEGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FACULTY SENATE BUDGET ACCOUNTABILITY COMMITTEE

Present: Doris Helms, Provost; Brett Dalton, CFO; Wickes Westcott, Director, Institutional Research; Antonis Katsiyannis, Richard Figliola, Chair, Finance Committee; Tim Drake, staff senate president

F & A Recoveries (formerly “indirects”)

E & G Unrestricted Budget Development
Office of Distance education

Summer School Bulk goes to colleges

Centers/Institutes

CU Budget General Principles
Budgetary authority ultimately resides with VPs

Incentive and self generated activity driven by departmental activity

CU does not control budgets at the “line item” level

Brett Dalton (CFO) will be presenting CU’s Budget in the March Senate meeting.
CU Budget Overview - Brett Dalton, CFO

F & A Recoveries (formerly “indirects”) - there are differences in allocations for “non centers” (PI, Department, Dean, Vice President for Research) and “centers/institutes” (center, Vice president for research; also a fixed amount goes back to E & G).

E & G Unrestricted Budget Development
- Office of Distance education (bulk of revenue goes to Colleges)
- Departmental sales, services...(100% to colleges)

Summer School Bulk goes to colleges (61%); also to undergraduate studies, library, and the remainder to the E & G budget

Centers/Institutes - Intent to have majority of centers/institutes being self sufficient within 3 years (funding - for example, a variable combination of base support from Clemson and self generated funds)

CU Budget General Principles
- Budgetary authority ultimately resides with VPs
- Incentive and self generated activity driven by departmental activity
- CU does not control budgets at the “line item” level

Committee
Committee members agreed that transparency in budgetary matters is critical in all aspects of Budget, including F & A, centers/institutes, and lab fees

There must be a balance between VP autonomy and institutional goals/priorities

Next Meeting
Trends in College budgets for the past 3 years
Trends in funding for centers/institutes of the past 3 years
University level projects funded by the Lab fees (last 3 years)
F & A funds under VPR-Expenditures for the past 3 years

Brett Dalton (CFO) will be presenting CU’s Budget in the March Senate meeting.
MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
MARCH 9, 2010

1. Call to Order: President Bill Bowerman called the meeting to order at 2:35 p.m.; informed the Senate that President Barker would speak at the meeting when he arrived and welcomed and recognized guests.

2. Approval of Minutes: The Faculty Senate Minutes dated February 9, 2010 were approved as distributed.

3. "Free Speech": None

4. Special Orders of the Day: Jan Murdoch, Dean of Undergraduate Studies, presented information on the new Student Information System and explained the plan for implementation of this system.

Beth Jarrard, Public Information, informed the Senate about “Inside View,” another new means of communication on campus. This new op ed column is an opportunity for faculty and staff to share points of view on issues of interest.

5. Election of Faculty Senate Officers
   a. Statements of interest were then received by candidates for office. The floor was opened for additional nominations. Linda Howe (HEHD) requested that her name be added to the list of candidates for Vice President/President-Elect.

Vice President/President-Elect: Alan Grubb
Linda Howe
Dan Warner

Secretary: Meredith Futral
Linda Howe

The floor was opened for nominations. There being none, nominations were closed.

b. A statement of interest was then received by Candidate Howe.
The election of Faculty Senate officers was held by secret ballot.

6. **Excerpts of Remarks by President Barker:** President Barker spoke to the Faculty Senate in an effort to continue the process of communication to talk about the budget and the planning process to move forward. President Barker explained that the present budget and future budget projections necessitate the development of another plan. Questions and answers were then exchanged.

7. **Committee Reports:**
   1) **Senate Standing Committees**
      a. **Finance Committee:** Chair Rich Figliola submitted and explained the Finance Committee Report dated January, 2010 (Attachment).
      b. **Welfare Committee:** For Chair Linda Li-Bleuel, Senator Wayne Stewart submitted and briefly explained the Committee Report dated February 16, 2010 (Attachment).
      c. **Scholastic Policies Committee:** Chair Vic Shelburne, submitted and briefly explained the Committee Report dated February 18, 2010 (Attachment).
      d. **Research Committee:** Chair Dvora Perahia submitted and briefly explained the Faculty Senate Research Committee Report Academic Year 2009-2010 (Attachment).
      e. **Policy Committee:** Chair Jeremy King and submitted the Committee Report date February 15, 2010 (Attached).

   2) **Other University Committees/Commissions**
      a) **Compensation Advisory Group** – President Bowerman reported that this Group has not met since the last Senate meeting.
      b) **Academic Lecturer’s** – No report.
      c) **Budget Accountability Committee** – Chair Antonis Katsiyannis submitted and explained the Committee Report dated February 22, 2010 (Attachment) and announced that Brett Dalton, Chief Financial Officer of Clemson University, will present “Budget 101” immediate following today’s meeting. All are invited.
      d) **Grievance Activity Reports** – Vice President/President-Elect Bill Surver submitted and explained the Grievance Categories I and II Activity Reports (Attachments).

8. **President’s Report:** President Bowerman:
   1) told the Senate that the Board of Trustees has passed the Shared Governance Statement. The statement will be incorporated with the Board of Trustees Manual and the Faculty Manual.
2) told the Senate that since there is no recognition for faculty who are tenured or promoted, the Administration has approved that they will be celebrated at Convocation in August.

3) informed the Senate that the “State of Clemson” speeches by presidents of the governance bodies will become an annual event.

9. Old Business: None

10. New Business:
   a. Proposed Faculty Manual Change – Part VII. Section B.3 Committees Reporting to the Vice Provost for International Affairs – Senator Jeremy King submitted and explained the proposed change. There was no discussion. Vote to accept proposed change was taken and passed unanimously (Attached).

   b. Proposed Faculty Manual Change – Part III. Section E.6 Lecturer – Senator Jeremy King submitted and explained the proposed change. Discussion was held. Motion was made to postpone until the April Senate meeting and was seconded. Vote to postpone was taken and passed unanimously (Attached).

   c. Proposed Faculty Manual Change – Part III. Section E. 1st Paragraph Special Faculty Ranks – Senator Jeremy King submitted and explained the proposed change. Much discussion was held. Motion was made to include institutes/centers throughout this paragraph and was seconded. Vote on amended change was taken and passed unanimously. Motion was then made to send this proposed change back to Policy Committee to work on the language in regard to institutes and centers and to postpone until the April Senate meeting. Vote to postpone was taken and passed (Attached).

11. Announcements:
   a. The Alan Schaffer Faculty Senate Service Award recipient for this year is Holley Ulbrich.
   b. Senate Alternate Scott Dutkiewicz noted that faculty would receive an email requesting feedback from Kay Wall, Dean of the Libraries, regarding periodicals.
   c. Baseball will celebrate Staff Appreciation Day on March 23, 2010 and the Faculty Appreciation Day will be on March 24 at 6:00 p.m. President Bowerman will throw out the first pitch on March 24th.
   d. Next Executive/Advisory Committee meeting will be on March 30, 2010.
   e. Next Faculty Senate meeting will be on April 13, 2010.
   f. President Bowerman announced that Dan Warner was elected Vice President/President-Elect and Linda Howe, Secretary of the Faculty Senate for academic year 2010-11.

12. Adjournment: 4:43 p.m.
Absent: L. Temesvari, P. Dawson (P. Gerard for), H. Liu, M. LaForge, M. Futral (S. Dutkiewicz for)
MARCH 9, 2010

FACULTY SENATE AGENDA

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
   Faculty Senate – February 9, 2010

3. “FREE SPEECH” PERIOD

4. SPECIAL ORDERS OF THE DAY
   Jan Murdoch, Dean, Undergraduate Studies, Student Information System
   Beth Jarrard, Public Information Director, Inside View

5. FACULTY SENATE OFFICERS
   a. Statements by Officer Nominees
   b. Election of Faculty Senate Officers (secret ballot)

6. COMMITTEE REPORTS
   a. Faculty Senate Standing Committees
      Finance Committee – Senator Richard Figliola
      Welfare Committee – Senator Linda Li-Bleuel
      Scholastic Policies Committee – Senator Vic Shelburne
      Research Committee – Senator Dvora Perahia
      Policy Committee – Senator Jeremy King
   b. University Committees/Commissions
      a. Compensation Advisory Group—Bill Bowerman
      b. Budget Accountability Committee – Antonis Katsiyannis

7. PRESIDENT’S REPORT

8. OLD BUSINESS

9. NEW BUSINESS
   a. Proposed Faculty Manual Change – VII.B.3 Committees Reporting to Vice Provost for
      International Affairs – Senator King
   b. Proposed Faculty Manual Change – III.E.6 Lecturer – Senator King
   c. Proposed Faculty Manual Change – III.E. Special Faculty Ranks – Senator King

10. ANNOUNCEMENTS
    a. Announcement of the Alan Schaffer Faculty Senate Service Award Recipient
    b. Executive/Advisory Committee – March 30, 2010 – 2:30 p.m. – 205 Cooper Library
    c. Next Faculty Senate Meeting – April 13, 2010 – 2:30 p.m. – Madren Center
    d. Annual Spring Reception – April 13, 2010 (invitations forthcoming)

11. ADJOURNMENT

Following the meeting, Brett Dalton, Chief Financial Officer, will present “Budget 101”
(anyone interested may attend)
Faculty & Staff Web page

Visit the Faculty & Staff Web page for Inside News and University News
http://www.clemson.edu/faculty-staff

- Read and comment on the “Inside View” of colleagues.
- Share your point of view in “Inside View.” We’re looking for spirited, provocative essays on subjects that will promote enlightened discussion. We’re open to a broad range of topics — both serious and humorous — except for party politics and religion.
  http://www.clemson.edu/faculty-staff/inside-view-rules.html
- Peruse the “University News” section of the Web page for the latest news releases from Clemson’s Media Relations Department.
- Check out exciting university events listed on the online Master Calendar.
  Dozens of events every day at: http://www.clemson.edu/calendar
- Add your response to our weekly online poll.
- Review the list of newcomers, transfers/promotions and retirees.
- Peruse the classified ads. Submit your free ad.
- Submit non-university civic, school and church meetings, concerts and other activities to the “Announcement” section of Classified Ads
  http://www.clemson.edu/faculty-staff/classified-ad-submit.html
- Share your work-related or family photos.

Inside NOW

The weekly e-newsletter sent to all faculty and staff on Wednesdays.

Submit information by noon Tuesdays for possible

- Send items via e-mail to: Inside@clemson.edu
- Call Beth Jarrard, public information director for internal communications, at 656-3860, if you need to discuss a communication issue.
Inside View Guidelines

*Inside View* provides a forum for opinions and commentary from Clemson faculty, staff and students about issues that affect the university and this community — a written version of what is being discussed around the water cooler or coffee pot.

We're looking for spirited, provocative essays on subjects that will promote enlightened discussion. We're open to a broad range of topics — both serious and humorous — except for party politics and religion.

**Submitting an Inside View**

Make your point in 700 words or less. Submissions must be the writer’s original ideas.

Send your article electronically as a Word document attachment to Inside@clemson.edu.

Include your name, job title, department and daytime phone numbers where we can contact you.

You must be willing to be identified as the author. We do not publish anonymous or pseudonymous articles. We will edit all commentary pieces before they are published so that the articles conform to editorial styles and standards of readability. You will have an opportunity to review and approve the edited version before it appears on the Web page.

*Inside Clemson* reserves the right to reject articles it considers unsuitable, including those that violate university Web policies, contain false and malicious statements about individuals or include content that is inappropriate.
Faculty Senate Finance Committee Report
January 2010

Attending: Senators Clarke, Simon, Figliola

Submitted by: Senator Figliola

**Task 1: Compensation Report Study** (Lead: Clarke)

The Faculty/Administrator/Staff Salary Report for 2008-2009 was released in early January. Senator Clarke is reviewing the information on the list and will prepare a presentation for the Senate. Senator Clarke will also continue to work on other suggested changes to future reports, such as including total compensation.

**Task 2: University Budget Flow Study** (Lead: Figliola)

The University Budget Accountability Committee met 12/01/2009 and meets again January 28. A presentation by the University CFO to the Senate on basic budget flow is planned later this Spring.

We are continuing discussion on the overhead and trademark royalty money flow on-campus. Revenue generating enterprises, such as athletics, must be self-supporting (operating costs, maintenance, capital improvements, debt service). They pay ~6% overhead on gross revenues. Trademark royalties are handled by the Athletic Department. Gross royalties are about $1M per year. About 15% of this is for non-athletic trademarks, or about $150,000 per year. We will continue study.

**Task 3: Compensation Strategy** (Lead: Simon)

This subcommittee spent time this month reviewing a study on compensation at Universities and CEO pay. A report is attached.
Compensation Strategy Report

This month, Curtis Simon presented a paper on the determinants of public university CEO pay and length of service. Public university CEOs earn about 50% of what measurably comparable private university CEOs earn, but have longer average tenures. The differential is consistent with the notion that public university CEOs have less independence of action, and thus are held to less strict standards for retention in their post.

The two most important determinants of public university CEO pay are FTE enrollment and revenue per student. No research of which we are aware has tried to link either pay or retention of the CEO to performance. Such measures may be difficult to develop, for university rankings and reputations are enduring, making it difficult to examine the effects of, say, cracking the top 20 by some measure of quality.

Senator Simon also presented some new data on public university CEO and administrator pay from the Chronicle of Higher Education, which has released data for the 2008-09 academic year. Here are some data for the Carolinas and Georgia:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Inst</th>
<th>CEO</th>
<th>public</th>
<th>private</th>
<th>car</th>
<th>house/ret/def com</th>
<th>total</th>
<th>remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Clemson</td>
<td>Barker</td>
<td>$222,422</td>
<td>$172,344</td>
<td>$1,588</td>
<td>house</td>
<td>$29,232</td>
<td>$425,586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>SC Tech Sys</td>
<td>Russell</td>
<td>$162,859</td>
<td>$30,164</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$15,048</td>
<td>$208,071 state-provided car</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>USC Col</td>
<td>Pasteides</td>
<td>$265,000</td>
<td>$270,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$335,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>E Carolina</td>
<td>Ballard</td>
<td>$315,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$12,413</td>
<td>house</td>
<td>$28,522</td>
<td>$355,935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>NC State</td>
<td>Oblinger</td>
<td>$420,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$41,208</td>
<td>$461,208 state-provided car</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>UNC Chapel Hill</td>
<td>Thorp</td>
<td>$418,150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$15,732</td>
<td>$433,882 state-provided car</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA</td>
<td>UGA System</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>$425,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$72,000</td>
<td>$597,497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA</td>
<td>UGA (proper)</td>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>$255,516</td>
<td>$125,203</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$204,745</td>
<td>$604,864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA</td>
<td>GIT</td>
<td>Peterson</td>
<td>$424,500</td>
<td></td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$197,638</td>
<td>$634,138 relocation allow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA</td>
<td>GA State</td>
<td>Becker</td>
<td>$515,100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$19,400</td>
<td>$629,776 relocation allow</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen, President Barker’s pay is comparable to that received by the CEO of UNC State, and markedly below that received by the CEO at Georgia Tech.

Senator Simon also presented data on the mean earnings of administrators by occupation, by school type. The mean CEO pay at a PhD-granting university was $410,000 in 2008-09. Provost pay at the same type of institution averaged $262,000, or about 64% that of the CEO. For purposes of comparison, Provost Helms’s 12-month salary was $270,389 in the most recent salary report. How does her pay compare with the average? President Barker’s ratio of retirement to public plus private compensation is 7.4%. If we inflate Provost Helms’s salary by the same factor, and compute the ratio of her compensation relative to President Barker’s total compensation, we arrive at a figure of 68%, slightly higher than the average in the data. (Curtis notes that one must be careful when arriving at conclusions because the ratio of averages is rarely equal to the average of ratios.)

A more complete picture of the earnings distribution across administrative ranks is provided by this chart, which shows earnings at each rank divided by mean CEO pay.
We notice that CEOs earn less than chief administrators of health institutions, but more than other types of administrators.
Dr. Gary Powell presented EC parking recommendations; these were approved by the EC board (see attached).

Dr. Powell, Senators An, Piper and Li-Bleuel constructed a sentence to add to the Faculty Manual; this would help guarantee free parking for members of the EC and hopefully put this issue to rest (see attached).

New committee on child care was recently formed.
The Policy Committee met at 10AM December 9, 2009
Present were: Muriel Bishop, Gary Powell, Jerry Waddle, Dave Senn, and Shelley Fones.

Summary: Parking permits is an inexpensive way for Clemson University to support active Emeritus College members who are still participating in the life of the campus. Passes should be made available without charge to those who request them. The Director can coordinate requests for passes, but issuing them should be the responsibility of the Parking Services Office. In addition we recommended that additional data be gathered on parking issues for Emeritus Faculty and that our report be shared with relevant bodies on campus including the Faculty Senate and faculty members of the Parking Services Committee.

Background:
One of the most valued features provided by the Emeritus College for its faculty has been a free faculty parking permit that allows members to park on campus in faculty spaces. Gratis teaching, service on committees, research advising are greatly facilitated when parking is easy.

This past academic year, the Parking Advisory Committee was concerned about the number of Emeritus Faculty using faculty parking. Based on the initial survey carried out by the Emeritus College based on 45 responses, those using passes are teaching, continuing research, serving on committees visiting with colleagues, or using university facilities (library, Fike, etc.). However, less than half who responded parked more than once per week and almost as many were on campus only a couple of times per month. Further, our personal experiences suggest that many Emeritus are present on the campus only an hour or two when they park on campus during two or three visits per month. Thus the total impact of 650 Emeritus Faculty, who requested 154 passes for the Fall semester, on the use of the ca. 2,850 faculty spaces, is likely quite small.

While we can imagine abuses of this privilege, for example, by family members using Emeritus College passes to park on campus, we think those abuses are infrequent. Recall that these are Emeritus Faculty who have provided many years of service and who love this institution.

Recommendations:
1) We recommend that parking passes continue to be made available free to Emeritus Faculty as a way of rewarding those who have chosen to continue their valuable service to the university.

2) We recommend that the Director of the Emeritus College put a form on line for Emeritus Faculty to use for requesting annual parking permits. An e-mail can direct
faculty to this site. For those who choose not to use this site, access can be supplemented, by phone, or personal visits to the Emeritus College Office to make application. The Director can verify that the applicant is a member of the College. Those who will not be on campus with any regularity can be encouraged to park using a Visitor's Pass.

3) We recommend that a list of qualified applicants (from the electronic applications – above) be forwarded to the Parking Services Office by July 1 for passes to be issued by mail. They can check that the free pass is being issued to a faculty not being remunerated by the University [faculty employed will be expected to pay for parking].

4) We recommend that the College continue to collect data on how faculty use their passes and share this information with those on campus who are concerned with campus parking.

5) We recommend that Emeritus College Faculty be reminded of the special nature of their privilege and be trusted not to abuse that privilege. The signed statement to that effect is part of the application process.
Topic 1 - Make Fall Break a permanent date in October—not a November date in election years
Lead: [Goddard]

The University Calendar Committee has made a recommendation that a permanent change to mid-October be made. We concur with that decision and realize that it may cause schedule issues for fall 2010 if implemented immediately. Therefore, the committee goes on record as supporting implementation beginning in fall 2012 (fall 2011 already has a mid-October Fall Break).

Topic 2 - Availability of Comments on Student Evaluation of Instructors for Chairs
Lead: [Shelburne]

The revised language of Section IX-6 2009 Faculty Manual was sent to the Policy Committee and revised again. However, it was tabled to no later than April at the January Faculty Senate meeting due to concerns of the Provost. Apparently, a joint committee of faculty (Scholastic Policies members?) and administrators will be appointed to address these concerns and make recommendations so to finalize the wording which will more specifically outline ways which faculty can demonstrate teaching effectiveness. However, we have not been informed of any committee so we assume that the revisions proposed by the Policy Committee will come to the Senate floor at the March or April meeting.

Topic 3 - General Education
Lead: All

React to Gen Ed proposals as needed.

No action.

Topic 4 - Lab Fees—concern on how they are distributed within and among colleges and within the University as a whole.

Lead: [Brittain]
After receiving feedback from all the College Deans on procedures, this committee handed this issue off to the Faculty Senate Finance Committee for its review.

**Topic 5- SACS (Southern Association of College and Schools) reaccreditation and e-portfolio**

At the February Faculty Senate meeting, Shelburne brought up concerns about the upcoming SACS reaccreditation process and the tremendous amount of time that faculty might be expected to spend so to generate the expected documentation. The Provost responded that it would be a less labor-intensive process for faculty due to the way SACS has re-organized the reporting needs. We will take that at face value for now but we are still cautious about faculty time for this report especially with other similar reports (CHE reviews for example) which duplicate these efforts.

E-portfolio in relation to the SACS accreditation was discussed. The Scholastic Policies committee STILL recommends that its close association with the reporting needs of the assessment and reaccreditation process be reviewed in the future. The committee recognizes the close association between the e-portfolio and SACS accreditation and it may be too late to change for this reporting period. However, we recommend that after the present SACS reporting is completed, that e-portfolio commitment to SACS be reviewed. The Provost’s statements at the last Faculty Senate meeting defending the value of e-portfolio notwithstanding, this committee stands by its statement that we do not know of any significant research that indicates the e-portfolio contributes to students’ understanding of and appreciation for general education.

**Topic 6 – Recommendation for faculty speaker at 2010 (and beyond) New Student Convocation.**

Bill Bowerman asked that our committee make a recommendation about a faculty speaker at the 2010 New Student Convocation (as per a request from Rebecca C. Atkinson, Associate Director New Student & Sophomore Programs). For the last two years, the recipient of the Class of 1939 Award has been asked to do this. Shelburne made the motion that the most recent recipient of the Class of 1939 award be asked to speak (as a standard practice) and in the event that he/she cannot perform this function, that previous winners be asked (in any order). Failing that, nominations could come from the Senate. The motion passed.

*Our next meeting will be Tuesday March 23 at 2 PM in 116 McAdams (if the meeting is needed)*

Meeting adjourned at 2:20
During the 2009-2010 academic year the committee responded to new and continuing concerns of faculty members.

**Postdoctoral hiring procedures:** Faculty brought to the committee attention that time it has taken to hire postdoctoral fellows is long and the process is cumbersome. As a result, Clemson faculty members were not able to hire the best available candidates. The committee identified the current procedure, and has worked with Provost Helms and Ms. Michelle Piekutowski from Human Resources to simplify the procedure. The new procedure accounts for the temporary nature and the role of postdoctoral hires. It distinguishes hiring on different types of funds; distinguishing grant money from other funds. The needed chain of approvals is adjusted accordingly. Further discussions are currently on the way to ensure compliance with Access and Equity guidelines of the university.

**Internal procedures for selection of limited submission proposals:** (i.e. granting agencies and foundation calls that allow one or small number of proposals for any institution). The criteria and procedures for selection of proposals to advance to external competition were reviewed. The committee realized that the process is often based on across the board vote of administrators representing all colleges, independent of the topic of the proposal. This finding has lead to an ongoing discussion within the committee for improving the processes. With input from the VP for research as well as the associate deans for research of the different colleges, the committee is formulating suggestions to improve the process and enhance the competitiveness of proposals elected to compete externally.

**Challenges in Security Clearance of Researches:** Timely clearance for scholarly activities has been a challenge for several faculty members. In effort to assist faculty, we contacted the VP office for research and obtained the procedures, currently in place for sponsorship of clearance by the university as mandated by the Department of Defense. The process of university sponsorship for clearance is initiated as grants are awarded. For other scholarly activities, the sponsor of the activity has to initiate a request to the university to allow the university to sponsor the application. We have requested from the VP of Research that any non-classified information will be available to Clemson Faculty and have received a positive response.

**Consulting agreements:** The approval time of consulting agreements varies significantly from a prompt response to long periods. Lengthy approval process often jeopardizes the consulting opportunity. We found that Clemson University established a procedure for approval of long term consulting agreements which is presented on the web. In a discussion with Dr. Przirembel and Dr. Ballato, it became apparent that the same criteria are used to assess both short and long term agreements. There is an overall understanding that there is a need to modify the process for short term consulting.
Non-traditional awards. The committee has identified several non-traditional awards which require proposal writing. Among the awards identified are the use of variety of large instrument and facilities inclining telescopes, supercomputer grids; neutron and X-ray sources as well as fabrication facilities, and DOE centers for nano technology. These proposals are often submitted directly to the sponsor and are not recorded in the university sponsored program system. Their monetary value amounts to tens of thousands of dollars per day. These facilities provide the major research tool of some of Clemson faculty. The current system allows faculty to report granted proposals, but the overall significance of these proposals in terms of work loads and monetary value are lost. While we have identified some of these critical non-traditional awards, there is still a vital need to integrate them into the current system in a manner reflecting their value and required effort.

GAD: Following further data gathering across the university as well as external inquiries in peer institutions, the committee concluded that there is significant non-uniformity in GAG charging. Comparison to other universities is often limited and anecdotal since the implementation of the GAD policies and the use of these funds vary significantly. GAD payments required during the summer months continue to be a significant concern affecting the ability of faculty to support their students during the summer months. The committee will continue working with the administration to resolve specific issues that involve the GAD.
Report of the Faculty Senate Policy Committee
15 February 2010 Meeting

Committee members present: Senators Denise Anderson, Claudio Cantalupo, Scott Dutkiewicz, Jeremy King, Jane Lindle, Kelly Smith, Pradip Srimani

Special guests: William Bowerman, David Grigsby, Fran Mcguire, Pat Smart, Cathy Sturkie

The Policy Committee met on 15 January 2010 to continue its discussions concerning several ongoing and new items on its agenda:

1. David Grigsby, Vice Provost of International Affairs met with the Committee to discuss proposed changes to the Faculty Manual that would effect a reorganization of the committees reporting to the VPIA. The Committee was receptive to the consolidation of two of the committees (the current International Studies Curriculum and International Programs Coordination Committees) and the desire by the VPIA for the international coordination committees to have greater input from faculty. The proposed changes were approved by the Policy Committee and forwarded to the Executive/Advisory Committee.

2. The Committee was informed by Senator King that the proposed Faculty Manual changes related to Special Faculty Ranks and Lecturers, approved at the January 2010 Policy Committee meeting, were tabled/postponed by the Executive/Advisory Committee given concerns about the power of Department Chairs to make special faculty rank appointments without faculty input. Seeking comments and feedback, Senator King further informed the Committee of his intent to make an amendment to the proposed Faculty Manual change regarding Special Faculty Ranks in order to address this concern at the next E/AC meeting. This led to a wide ranging discussion concerning the need to receive faculty input on appointments for all special faculty ranks, the best means for faculty to secure rights to provide input on such appointments while not affecting hires of post-doctoral fellows, and the intersection of Department bylaws and the Faculty Manual. While the Committee did not, as a whole, conclude the proposed amendment was problematic, Senator King offered to abstract the discussion for the E/AC when it considers the items at its February 2010 meeting.

3. Faculty Senate President personally informed the Committee that the Board of Trustees have, themselves, elected not to restrict student representation on the newly defined University Advisory Committee on Naming Land and Facilities. Thus, the recent change to the Faculty Manual establishing/defining this committee must now be modified to be in accord with this decision. President Bowerman will propose such a change at a future Executive/Advisory Committee meeting.
4. Faculty Senate President Bowerman appeared before the Committee to discuss needed updates and revisions to Part VI, Section I of the Faculty Manual regarding the Selection of Other Academic Administrators. The Committee was presented with a rough preliminary draft of proposed changes provided by Faculty Senate President Bowerman, with input from President Barker, and modified by Senator King.

Before the draft could be considered in detail, a very vigorous and broad discussion ensued regarding the lack of parallel structure in the Faculty Manual regarding the description of administrative positions and the prescription to fill appointments to these positions, the faculty-related personnel responsibilities of administrators, and the definition of academic and/or non-academic administrators (who have differing access to the Grievance process). The discussion indicates that changes, while needed, will be very thorny inasmuch as they seemingly must simultaneously: create a parallel structure between the position descriptions and the appointment process, distinguish somehow between academic and non-academic administrators, secure the administration's offer to allow faculty input in the appointment of two additional Vice President positions currently defined as non-academic administrators in the current Faculty Manual, and allow flexibility for future administrations in making appointment to future administrative positions. The importance of these features and the need for changes was appreciated by the committee, but the optimal means to make such changes without unintended consequences was not immediately clear. The Committee will need to consider these difficult issues further in order to fulfill Faculty Senate President Bowerman's desire that the necessary changes appear in the 1 July 2010 version of the Faculty Manual.
CU Budget Overview - Brett Dalton, CFO
Trends in College budgets for the past 3 years - College funding has been increasing...

Trends in funding for centers/institutes of the past 3 years - A three year timeline towards self-sufficiency. Data were also provided by college/center over the past three years. Variability on level of support from E & G vs. external support vs. self generated across centers/institutes

University level projects funded by the Lab fees (last 3 years) - Big projects decided by college deans (e.g., nursing lab)

F & A funds under VPR - Expenditures for the past 3 years - Break down of expenditures over the past 3 years... Examples - investments in advanced materials, College research support, research division units, research compliance committees

Committee members agreed that transparency in budgetary matters is critical in all aspects of Budget, including F & A, centers/institutes, and lab fees

There must be a balance between VP autonomy and institutional goals/priorities

Need for coordination on CU priorities, specifically, the need for upgrading/building academic support - Lee Hall, Life Sciences building... For example, portion of "indirects" set aside on a yearly base to fund specific projects (i.e. academic infrastructure).
Proposed Faculty Manual Change

Part V, Section 6.1 (Grievance Hearings), #5

Current Wording:

5. Both parties shall be permitted to offer evidence and witnesses pertinent to the issue. The Provost (or
the President if the Provost is a named party) shall, so far as possible, assist the hearing panel in securing
the cooperation and attendance of witnesses and named parties and shall make available documents and
other evidence under her/his control. Those persons requested to testify are strongly encouraged but
cannot be compelled to testify. When the hearing may be expedited and the interest of the parties shall not
be substantially prejudiced, any part of the evidence may be received in written form. All written
evidence submitted by all parties to the grievance hearing in a Category I petition must be received by the
chair of the hearing panel not less than seven weekdays prior to the date set for the hearing; any material
received after that date may be excluded by the hearing panel at its discretion. For Category II, written
material can be received any time during the hearing process. Documentary evidence may be received in
the form of copies or excerpts if the original is not readily available. Irrelevant, immaterial, or unduly
repetitious evidence should not be included. If an objection is made to any evidence being offered, the
decision of the majority of the panel shall govern.

Proposed Changes:

5. Both parties shall be permitted to offer evidence and witnesses pertinent to the issue. The Provost (or
the President if the Provost is a named party) shall, so far as possible, assist the hearing panel in securing
the cooperation and attendance of witnesses and named parties and shall make available documents and
other evidence under her/his control. Those persons requested to testify are strongly encouraged but
cannot be compelled to testify. When the hearing may be expedited and the interest of the parties shall not
be substantially prejudiced, any part of the evidence may be received in written form. All written
evidence submitted by all parties to the grievance hearing in a Category I petition must be received by the
chair of the hearing panel not less than seven weekdays prior to the date set for the hearing; any material
received after that date may be excluded by the hearing panel at its discretion. For Category II, written
material can be received any time during the hearing process. In the interests of fairness, the Hearing
Panel will make every effort to provide, in a timely manner, all named parties with copies of
documents submitted or referred to in the original Petition that the Panel deems material to their
decision. Documentary evidence may be received in the form of copies or excerpts if the original is not
readily available. Irrelevant, immaterial, or unduly repetitious evidence should not be included. If an
objection is made to any evidence being offered, the decision of the majority of the panel shall govern.
Final Wording (with changes):

5. Both parties shall be permitted to offer evidence and witnesses pertinent to the issue. The Provost (or the President if the Provost is a named party) shall, so far as possible, assist the hearing panel in securing the cooperation and attendance of witnesses and named parties and shall make available documents and other evidence under her/his control. Those persons requested to testify are strongly encouraged but cannot be compelled to testify. When the hearing may be expedited and the interest of the parties shall not be substantially prejudiced, any part of the evidence may be received in written form. All written evidence submitted by all parties to the grievance hearing in a Category I petition must be received by the chair of the hearing panel not less than seven weekdays prior to the date set for the hearing; any material received after that date may be excluded by the hearing panel at its discretion. For Category II, written material can be received any time during the hearing process. In the interests of fairness, the Hearing Panel will make every effort to provide, in a timely manner, all named parties with copies of documents submitted or referred to in the original Petition that the Panel deems material to their decision. Documentary evidence may be received in the form of copies or excerpts if the original is not readily available. Irrelevant, immaterial, or unduly repetitious evidence should not be included. If an objection is made to any evidence being offered, the decision of the majority of the panel shall govern.

Rationale for Changes: The Grievance Board believes that a fundamental sense of equity in the grievance process suggests that any documentation included with or referred to in the original Petition should be shared with all Respondents. The proposed change effects this provision. At the same time, the Grievance Board believes that any other documentation presented to Hearing Panels during the testimony phase of the Grievance process should not be shared with named parties.
Proposed Faculty Manual Change

Part V, Section 6.I (Grievance Hearings), #9

Current Wording:

9. Within ten weekdays of the final hearing for either category, the panel shall submit its findings and recommendations to the Provost along with appropriate documents and records. In the event the Provost has been recused from a decision making capacity, the findings and recommendations shall be submitted to the President. The majority vote shall be the recommendation forwarded to the Provost by the hearing panel. The findings and recommendation must be submitted only to the Provost within ten weekdays after conclusion of the hearing.

Proposed Changes:

9. Within ten weekdays of the final meeting of the Hearing Panel (for either Grievance Procedure I or II petitions), the panel shall submit its findings and recommendations only to the Provost along with appropriate documents and records. In the event the Provost has been recused from a decision making capacity, the findings and recommendations shall be submitted to the President. The majority vote shall be the recommendation forwarded to the Provost by the hearing panel. The findings and recommendation must be submitted only to the Provost within ten weekdays after conclusion of the hearing.

Final Wording (with Changes):

9. Within ten weekdays of the final meeting of the Faculty Senate Advisory Committee (for Grievance Procedure I petitions) or Hearing Panel (for Grievance Procedure II petitions), the panel shall submit its findings and recommendations only to the Provost along with appropriate documents and records. In the event the Provost has been recused from a decision making capacity, the findings and recommendations shall be submitted to the President. The majority vote shall be the recommendation forwarded to the Provost by the hearing panel.

Rationale: The Grievance Board believes that experience clearly shows that hearing panels invariably need a final meeting, beyond the final hearing, amongst themselves in order to draft the findings and recommendations to be submitted to the administration. The change provides for such a meeting and still ensures that the panel's findings/recommendations are submitted in a timely fashion.
Proposed Faculty Manual Change
Part VII, Section B, #3 (Committees Reporting to the Vice Provost for International Affairs)

Current Wording

a. International Studies Curriculum Committee. The International Studies Curriculum Committee develops and reviews course proposals for courses designated as international studies courses, and recommends approved international studies courses to the Undergraduate or Graduate Curriculum Committee for final consideration and approval. The Vice Provost for International Affairs chairs the committee, which is composed of one elected representative from each of the five colleges and the library. Nonvoting members are the Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Studies, the Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School, the Director of the Honors College, and the Director of Study Abroad.

b. International Programs Coordination Committee. The International Programs Coordination Committee coordinates information and recommends policies and plans for study abroad, international research opportunities, and international internship and co-op opportunities. The committee is chaired by the Vice Provost for International Affairs. Each member of the Provost's Advisory Council designates a senior faculty or staff representative from their respective areas to serve on the committee as appropriate.

c. International Services Coordination Committee. The International Services Coordination Committee coordinates information and reviews and recommends policies and plans for international student recruitment, admission and retention, financial aid, and academic support as well as international student affairs, immigration services, and tax and employment information for international students, scholars, faculty and staff. The committee is chaired by the Vice Provost for International Affairs. Each members of the Provost’s Advisory Council designates a senior faculty or staff representative from their respective areas to serve on the committee as appropriate.

Proposed Changes

a. International Studies Curriculum Committee. The International Studies Curriculum Committee develops and reviews course proposals for courses designated as international studies courses, and recommends approved international studies courses to the Undergraduate or Graduate Curriculum Committee for final consideration and approval. The Vice Provost for International Affairs chairs the committee, which is composed of one elected representative from each of the five colleges and the library. Nonvoting members are the Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Studies, the Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School, the Director of the Honors College, and the Director of Study Abroad.

b. a. International Programs Coordination Committee. The International Programs Coordination Committee coordinates information and recommends to the Vice Provost for International Affairs policies and plans for: study abroad; international research opportunities; international internship, and co-op, and service learning opportunities; international agreements, and other activities and opportunities related to the internationalization of the campus, and (2) develops and reviews proposals for international studies courses, and submits them to either the University’s Undergraduate or Graduate Curriculum Committee (as appropriate) for approval. The committee shall comprise the Vice Provost for International Affairs (non-voting Chair) and eleven voting members including an elected faculty representative from each of the five academic colleges, two student representatives elected by the Study Abroad Ambassadors from among its membership, a faculty or staff representative appointed by the Dean of Undergraduate Studies, a faculty or staff representative appointed by the Dean of the Graduate School, a faculty or staff representative appointed by the Vice President for Public Service Activities, and the Director of Study Abroad. Elected faculty representatives shall serve staggered two-year terms; all other members shall serve one-year terms which may be renewed by election or appointment. The committee is chaired by the
e. **International Services Coordination Committee.** The International Services Coordination Committee coordinates information and reviews and recommends policies and plans for international student recruitment, admission and retention, financial aid, and academic support as well as international student affairs, immigration services, and tax and employment information for international students, scholars, faculty and staff. The committee shall comprise the Vice Provost for International Affairs (non-voting Chair), and twelve voting members including an elected faculty representative from each of the five academic colleges, two representatives elected by the International Student Association from among its membership, a faculty or staff representative appointed by the Dean of Undergraduate Studies, a faculty or staff representative appointed by the Dean of the Graduate School, a staff member appointed by the Vice President for Student Affairs, the Director of International Student Services, and the Director of International Employment and Taxation. Elected faculty representatives shall serve staggered two-year terms; all other members shall serve one-year terms which may be renewed by election or appointment.

Final Wording

a. **International Programs Coordination Committee.** The International Programs Coordination Committee: (1) coordinates information and recommends to the Vice Provost for International Affairs policies and plans for: study abroad; international research opportunities; international internship, and co-op, and service learning opportunities; international agreements, and other activities and opportunities related to the internationalization of the campus, and (2) develops and reviews proposals for international studies courses, and submits them to either the University’s Undergraduate or Graduate Curriculum Committee (as appropriate) for approval. The committee shall comprise the Vice Provost for International Affairs (non-voting Chair) and eleven voting members including an elected faculty representative from each of the five academic colleges, two student representatives elected by the Study Abroad Ambassadors from among its membership, a faculty or staff representative appointed by the Dean of Undergraduate Studies, a faculty or staff representative appointed by the Dean of the Graduate School, a faculty or staff representative appointed by the Vice President for Public Service Activities, and the Director of Study Abroad. Elected faculty representatives shall serve staggered two-year terms; all other members shall serve one-year terms which may be renewed by election or appointment.

b. **International Services Coordination Committee.** The International Services Coordination Committee coordinates information and reviews and recommends policies and plans for international student recruitment, admission and retention, financial aid, and academic support as well as international student affairs, immigration services, and tax and employment information for international students, scholars, faculty and staff. The committee shall comprise the Vice Provost for International Affairs (non-voting Chair), and twelve voting members including an elected faculty representative from each of the five academic colleges, two representatives elected by the International Student Association from among its membership, a faculty or staff representative appointed by the Dean of Undergraduate Studies, a faculty or staff representative appointed by the Dean of the Graduate School, a staff member appointed by the Vice President for Student Affairs, the Director of International Student Services, and the Director of International Employment and Taxation. Elected faculty representatives shall serve staggered two-year terms; all other members shall serve one-year terms which may be renewed by election or appointment.
Rationale: The new Vice Provost of International Affairs (VPIA) has reviewed the committees reporting to him and found that 2 of the 3 current committees have only met a total of once during the past few years. Inasmuch as matters of course development have not and are not expected to be a substantial focus of the VPIA mission, the current International Studies Curriculum and International Programs Coordination Committees can be combined into a single committee for the sake of efficiency. The VPIA also desires more faculty and student input and advice than is being received now on matters coming before the committees. The changes mandate elected faculty and student representation on the committees to ensure more of such input. The elected faculty terms would be staggered in order to promote some degree of continuity of knowledge and experience from (academic) year to year.
Proposed Faculty Manual Change
Part III, Section E, #6 (Lecturer)

Current Wording:
6. Lecturer. 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. Full-time academic appointments shall be for one-year terms and may be renewed. (The termination date of appointments made for the full academic year shall be extended over the summer until the next academic year begins.) Notice of renewal or non-renewal must be provided before July 15 for the following academic year. After four or more years of continuous appointment as a lecturer, one year’s notice of non-renewal must be provided.

Proposed Wording:
6. Lecturer. This rank is assigned to individuals with special qualifications or for special having no administrative duties inconsistent with those of regular faculty in cases in which the assignment of other regular faculty ranks is not appropriate or possible. Full-time academic appointments are non-tenure track, shall be for one-year terms and may be renewed. (The termination date of appointments made for the full academic year shall be extended over the summer until the next academic year begins.) For the purposes of academic appointment and reappointment, a one-year term begins August 15 and ends May 15 although lecturers may be extended benefits over the summer. Notice of renewal or non-renewal must be provided before July 15 for the following academic August 15-May 15 term. After May 15 following completion of four or more one-year terms of continuous appointment as a lecturer, one year’s notice of non-renewal must be provided. No notice of non-renewal shall be required if a Lecturer resigns, is terminated, or is dismissed for cause (Part IV, section K).

Final Wording:
6. Lecturer. This rank is assigned to individuals having no administrative duties inconsistent with those of regular faculty in cases where the assignment of regular faculty ranks is not appropriate or possible. These academic appointments are non-tenure track, shall be for one-year terms and may be renewed. For the purposes of academic appointment and reappointment, a one-year term begins August 15 and ends May 15 although lecturers may be extended benefits over the summer. Notice of renewal or non-renewal must be provided before July 15 for the following August 15-May 15 term. After May 15 following completion of four or more one-year terms of continuous appointment as a lecturer, one year’s notice of non-renewal must be provided. No notice of non-renewal shall be required if a Lecturer resigns, is terminated, or is dismissed for cause (Part IV, section K).
Rationale: The changes accomplish several goals. First, they make clear that the lecturer designation is intended for those not in administrative positions; this will motivate the HR reclassification of numerous current administrators that currently occupy lecturer positions and prevent a return to this troublesome condition. Second, the changes mandate that lecturer appointments may only be made for academic year periods (Aug-May), which greatly simplifies the enumeration of service years. Personnel teaching just 1 semester per year or starting service mid-academic year or during the summer can be (temporarily) classified as a Temporary Lecturer, which is already defined in the Faculty Manual. Third, the changes provide explicit date of appointments. Fourth, the use of “full time” with lecturer is deleted inasmuch as it seems irrelevant, simplifies the nomenclature (one is either a Lecturer or is not a Lecturer), and acknowledges the value of these contingent employees regardless of how many courses they are teaching. Fifth, the changes clarify when 1-year notice of non-renewal must be given: after July 15 following completion of 4 (or more) consecutive Aug-May periods as a Lecturer. Sixth, the changes explicate the common sense notion that no notice of non-renewal should be required for any Lecturers that resign, are terminated, or dismissed for cause (all outlined in Part IV, Section K of the Faculty Manual).
Proposed Faculty Manual Change
Part III, Section E (Special Faculty Ranks), 1st Paragraph

Current Wording:
Appointments to special faculty ranks include visiting, adjunct, and part-time positions as well as the special ranks of lecturer and post doctoral research fellow in academic units that are under the jurisdiction of the Provost. Conditions of appointment must be fully detailed in the appointment letter. Such appointments may be renewable, but they do not normally carry any expectation of renewal, are not tenurable, and service in such ranks normally does not count towards the tenure probationary period. Special appointments do not carry voting privileges except as may be provided in relevant college/school/departmental faculty bylaws.

Proposed Wording:
Appointments to all special faculty ranks include visiting, adjunct, and part-time positions as well as the special ranks of lecturer and post doctoral research fellow in academic units that are under the jurisdiction of the Provost shall be made by the academic Department Chair or School Director with Department/School faculty approval if such approval is required by relevant Department/School or College bylaws. Prior to making an offer of appointment, the Department Chair or School Director must receive verification of the existence and sufficiency of the funding supporting the appointment from the appropriate Dean or the Provost. Conditions of appointment must shall be fully detailed in the letter of appointment letter, including at a minimum: the appointment rank, the department or school to which the academic appointment applies, and any remuneration to be paid to the special faculty member. Such Special faculty appointments are not tenurable and may be renewable, but they do not normally carry any expectation of renewal, although appointments may be renewed, are not tenurable, and Service in such special faculty ranks normally does not count towards the a regular faculty rank tenure probationary period. Appointment of an individual with a special faculty rank to a regular faculty rank must follow the personnel practices and procedures for appointment described in Part IV of the Faculty Manual. If the approved bylaws of the applicable department/school or college specifically provide such privileges, special faculty ranks have voting and membership privileges in department/school and college meetings and on department/school and college committees except those restricted to regular faculty in Part VII, Section K. Special appointments do not carry voting privileges except as may be provided in relevant college/school/departmental faculty bylaws. Special faculty ranks have voting membership privileges on university committees except those restricted to regular faculty in Part VII, Section K.

Final Wording:
Appointments to all special faculty ranks shall be made by the academic Department Chair or School Director with Department/School faculty approval if such approval is required by
relevant Department/School or College bylaws. Prior to making an offer of appointment, the Department Chair or School Director must receive verification of the existence and sufficiency of the funding supporting the appointment from the appropriate Dean or the Provost. Conditions of appointment shall be fully detailed in the letter of appointment, including at a minimum: the appointment rank, the term of appointment, the department or school to which the academic appointment applies, and any remuneration to be paid to the special faculty member. Special faculty appointments are not tenurable and do not carry any expectation of renewal, although appointments may be renewed. Service in special faculty ranks normally does not count towards a regular faculty rank tenure probationary period. Appointment of an individual with a special faculty rank to a regular faculty rank must follow the personnel practices and procedures for appointment described in Part IV of the Faculty Manual. If the approved bylaws of the applicable department/school or college specifically provide such privileges, special faculty ranks have voting membership privileges in department/school and college meetings and on department/school and college committees except those restricted to regular faculty in Part VII, Section K. Special faculty ranks have voting membership privileges on university committees except those restricted to regular faculty in Part VII, Section K.

Rationale: The motivation for the changes is five-fold. First, the changes may increase the efficiency of the special faculty hiring process by establishing that appointment offers can be made by the Department Chair/School Director (with faculty approval if required by department or college bylaws); Deans and the Provost, however, still maintain fiduciary oversight by having to verify the availability of adequate funding for the appointment. Third, the stipulation that a letter of appointment for a special faculty rank must name the department to which the academic appointment applies is an additional deterrent to appointing administrators to special faculty ranks. Third, the changes ensure that the letter of appointment supplies critical information (appointment rank, term of appointment, salary, department/school of appointment) to the appointee. The fourth change demands that hiring individuals from special faculty ranks into regular faculty positions must be a process carried out in accord with canonical hiring mechanisms in Part IV of the Faculty Manual. The fifth change recognizes a recent preceding change to the Faculty Manual prohibiting special faculty rank voting membership on several committees named in Part VII, Section K. In light of this recent change, the new language makes a more positive statement to special faculty ranks by clarifying the committees on which they are eligible to serve with voting membership. Such voting membership must be explicitly allowed by relevant department/school/college bylaws and not contravene the Faculty Manual.
1. **Call to Order:** The meeting was called to order by President Bill Bowerman at 2:35 p.m. and guests were welcomed and recognized.

2. **Approval of Minutes:** The Faculty Senate meeting Minutes dated March 9, 2010 were approved as written.

3. **“Free Speech”: None**

4. **Committees:**
   a. **Senate Committees**
      1) **Welfare Committee** – Senator Meredith Futral for Chair Linda Li-Bleuel submitted the March 22, 2010 End of the Year Report (Attachment).

      2) **Scholastic Policies Committee** – Chair Vic Shelburne submitted and briefly explained the Monthly Meeting Report dated March 23, 2010 and the Committee Report 2009-10 Year in Review and thanked his Committee members (Attachment).

      3) **Research Committee** – Chair Dvora noted that a hiring policy for post doctoral students has been drafted and sent to the Provost for signatures. Senator Perahia also noted that there is a good pool of finalists, internal and external with diverse backgrounds, for the position of Vice President for Research.

      4) **Policy Committee** – Jeremy King, Chair, thanked this Committee for their work this year and submitted and explained the 2009-10 Annual Policy Committee Report *(Attachment)*.

      5) **Finance Committee** – Senator Shima Clarke, for Chair Rich Figliola, submitted the 2009-10 Finance Committee Annual Report (Attachment).

   b. **Other University Committee/Commissions:**
      1) President Bowerman stated that President Barker’s Compensation Advisory Group will continue and that the Four Presidents Committee will continue meeting with President Barker once a month with new constituent group officers.

      2) Former Senator Christina Wells submitted, presented and explained results from a summer analysis of the 2009 Faculty Survey compared to the 1999 Faculty Survey (Attachment).
3) Bill Pennington, Chair of the Academic Lecturers Select Committee submitted and explained the Interim Report (Attachment). Questions and answers were then exchanged.

4) President Bowerman stated that Antonis Katsiyannis, Chair of the Budget Accountability Committee, will continue and will work closely with the Compensation Advisory Group and the Faculty Senate Finance Committee.

5) Motion was made to accept the Reports from the Budget Accountability Committee, the Faculty Survey Committee and the Academic Lecturer Select Committee which was seconded. No Discussion. Vote to accept Reports was taken and passed unanimously.

5. Old Business:

a. Jeremy King, Chair of the Policy Committee, submitted and explained the proposed *Faculty Manual* Change, IV.G. Tenure Policies. There was no discussion. Vote to accept change was taken and passed unanimously.

b. Jeremy King submitted and explained the proposed *Faculty Manual* Change – III.F. Endowed Chairs and Titled Professorships. There was no discussion. Vote to accept change was taken and passed unanimously.

c. Jeremy King submitted and explained the proposed *Faculty Manual* Change – III. E. Special Faculty Ranks. Motion was made to amend proposed change which was seconded. Vote to accept amendment was taken and passed. Senate was asked but there was no discussion on proposed amended change. Vote to accept amended proposal was taken and passed.

d. Jeremy King submitted and explained the proposed *Faculty Manual* Change – III. E.6 Lecturer, which was amended and approved by the Executive/Advisory Committee Meeting. Motion was made to accept amendment which was seconded. There was no discussion on amendment. Vote to accept amendment was taken and passed. No discussion. Vote was taken on amended proposed change and passed.

e. President Bowerman explained an informational item regarding regular faculty status without tenure to federal employees to the Senate which will be changed in the 2010 *Faculty Manual*.

6. President Bowerman presented a plaque and a copy of the book, *Life Death & Bialys* by Dylan Schaffer to Holley Ulbrich, the 2010 Recipient of the Alan Schaffer Faculty Senate Service Award; congratulated retiring Faculty Senators by thanking them for their service and presenting certificates to them, and introduced William M. Surver, as the 2010-11 Faculty Senate President.
7. Outgoing President’s Report: Outgoing President remarks were made by President William W. Bowerman, IV, who then introduced William M. Surver, as the Faculty Senate President for 2010-11. New officers were installed at approximately 3:50 p.m.

8. New Business: President William Surver introduced new senators; asked Senators to return their committee preference forms as quickly as possible so that the new session may proceed; noted that he was in the process of setting standing committees and announced the names of the committee chairs; encouraged Senators to notify the Senate Office with the two names of Advisory Committee members; announced that a Faculty Senate Orientation/Retreat will be held on May 11, 2010 (invitations forthcoming); informed the Senate of related Senate positions: Faculty Manual Editorial Consultant, Fran McGuire and Liaison to the Provost, Pat Smart; and stated his plans for the Senate.

9. Adjournment: 4:06 p.m.


Alan Grubb, Secretary

Cathy Toth Sturkie, Program Coordinator
END OF YEAR SUMMARY

- Instrumental in helping Linda Nilson keep her position at OTEI
- Assisted in clarifying the 5-block work load
- Clarified phase-out retirement
- Free parking for Emeritus Faculty
  - Resolution possibly for next Welfare Committee
- Child care committee formed
  - Met with Ross Hanahan at Patrick Square; possible child care center geared towards Clemson employees
- Clarification in Faculty Manual regarding leave initiated
Stan Smith, University Registrar, had three items for our review:

1. We reviewed a new policy to allow a reduced credit load with full-time academic status for students with disabilities which was proposed by Student Disability Services (SDS) at the last Undergraduate Council meeting and was referred to our committee. The number of students who might apply for this waiver is expected to be low (less than 10 per semester) and SDS has developed a form by which the student applies and is approved by an SDS specialist, the academic advisor or chair, the Office of undergraduate studies, and the Director of SDS. The form makes it clear that although Clemson may recognize the students as full-time, an outside agency (insurance companies, scholarship donors, State scholarship program) may not. Its value is that it gives the student full-time status but allows him/her to reduce the credit load below 12 (fewer than 9 for graduate students).

The Scholastic Policies debated and endorsed the proposed policy with the recommendation that BOTH the advisor and the Chair have a signature block on the form. There was some concern that because of reduced curriculum progress, both advisor and chair should be apprised of the potential issues associated with a reduced credit load. It was also suggested that if international students apply for this waiver, the Office of International Programs should have a signature block.

2. We reviewed a request to allow a student with a graduate degree from another institution to use some graduate courses from the previous graduate degree for UNDERGRADUATE credit (starting a new undergrad program at Clemson). Clemson policy allows Clemson undergrads with good academic standing to take up to 12 hours of graduate courses and use them for their undergrad degree but unless there is a departmental Bachelors-Masters program (a few departments at Clemson have this), the student cannot use them for both the undergrad and grad program at Clemson. So there is a dilemma as to whether we should allow a student to use courses from a previously earned graduate degree (not from Clemson) for undergrad requirements at Clemson since in general we don’t allow our own students to do this. Although this is a rare occurrence, the committee supports the idea of credit up to twelve hours if and only if, the departments approves the credits but suggests that the policy concerning graduate course
credit for use at the undergrad level be re-examined by perhaps an ad-hoc committee of both the Graduate and Undergraduate councils.

3. The language in the Graduate Academic Integrity Policy may allow the phrase “dismissed for violation of academic integrity at level 3 (or 4)” to be written on the transcript in the case of a level 3 or 4 violation. This wording however has not been used but an actual level 4 violation recently occurred and the Graduate Academic Integrity Committee has voted to use this language on the student’s transcript. We were informed that in all other dismissals or suspensions, only the word “dismissed” or “suspended” is written on the transcript even if it is for a criminal act. Although this particular academic violation was egregious, it seemed inappropriate to the Scholastic Policies Committee to write the above-mentioned language on the transcript if we did not at least do so for criminal acts. The Scholastic Policies committee suggests that the Graduate Academic Integrity committee might review the language for level 3 or 4 violations.

This was our last meeting of the Academic Year 09-10
End of Year Report

SCHOLASTIC POLICIES COMMITTEE – Vic Shelburne, Chair – (AFLS)
Sean Brittain (E&S)
Wayne Goddard (E&S)
Bob Horton (HEHD)
Haibo Lu (AFLS)
Daniel Smith (AAH)

Topic 1-Grade Inflation

The Scholastic Policies Committee/Faculty Senate made a recommendation two years ago that a new study of grade inflation be done (a Grade Inflation Study should be funded and done). Since this has not been done AND the current budget situation would certainly prohibit the funding, we decided to drop this issue for now.

Topic 2-Winter Semester

No recommendation for Winter Semester ever came to the Scholastic Policies committee for consideration.

Topic 3-International Transfer Credits

The committee approved the new Study Abroad Form for International Transfer Credits

Topic 4-Course drop/withdrawal date (2nd date) time change to later date

Shelburne sat on the sub-committee to make a recommendation for this issue and that committee recommended moving the withdrawal date back by two weeks. This committee also recommended that mid-semester grades be moved back a week. Both of these recommendations were passed unanimously by the Council of Undergraduate Studies at its November 13th meeting. It also passed the Graduate Council.

Topic 5-Make Fall Break a permanent date in October—not a November date in election years

The University Calendar Committee made a recommendation that a permanent change to mid-October be made. The Scholastic Policies Committee concurred with that decision and realized that it may cause schedule issues for fall 2010 if implemented immediately. Therefore, the committee went on record as supporting implementation beginning in fall 2012 (fall 2011 already has a mid-October Fall Break).
Topic 6 - Lab Fees

After receiving feedback from all the College Deans on procedures, this committee handed this issue off to the Faculty Senate Finance Committee for its review.

Topic 8 – Course Redemption Policy

We reviewed the existing Course Redemption policy and made a recommendation to allow C grade redemption (D and F only in present policy). The recommendation of the Scholastic Policies committee was not approved by the Faculty Senate Exec/Advisory Committee at its meeting in December. The Scholastic Policies committee decided not to continue to pursue this.

Topic 9 – Availability of Comments on Student Evaluation of Instructors for Chairs

The revised language of Section IX-6 2009 Faculty Manual was sent to the Policy Committee and revised again. However, it was tabled to no later than April at the January Faculty Senate meeting due to concerns of the Provost. Apparently, a joint committee of faculty (Scholastic Policies members?) and administrators will be appointed to address these concerns and make recommendations so to finalize the wording which will more specifically outline ways which faculty can demonstrate teaching effectiveness. However, we have not been informed of any committee so we assume that the revisions proposed by the Policy Committee will come to the Senate floor at the April meeting.

Topic 10 – Academic Integrity Policy Revision

The Council of Undergraduate Studies voted unanimously on November 13th to NOT define Academic dishonesty in the Undergraduate catalogue as the following: “submitting work that has been turned in for credit for a previous or concurrent course without the consent of the instructor.” The Scholastic Policies Committee recommended that this issue should be addressed at the level of the syllabus.

Topic 11 – Request from Student Affairs (from Gail DiSabatino to Jan Murdock and Bill Bowerman) to have a representative (from Student Affairs) on the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee, the Academic Integrity Committee, Calhoun Honors Committee and the Academic Eligibility Committee.

The committee recommendation was not to add members from Student Affairs to these committees but perhaps allow them as non-voting members at the discretion of each committee.

Topic 12 – Recommendation for faculty speaker at 2010 (and beyond) New Student Convocation.

The committee recommended that the most recent recipient of the Class of 1939 award be asked to speak (as a standard practice) and in the event that he/she cannot perform this function, that
previous winners be asked (in any order). Failing that, nominations could come from the Senate. The motion passed.

**Topic 13 – Recommendation concerning reduced credit load for students with disabilities**

We endorsed the proposed policy from Student Disability Services with the recommendation that BOTH the advisor and the Chair have a signature block on the form. It was also suggested that if international students apply for this waiver, the Office of International Programs should have a signature block.

**Topic 14 – Recommendation to grant up to 12 hours of undergraduate credit to for GRDUATE credit taken elsewhere.**

The committee supports the idea of credit up to twelve hours if and only if, the departments approves the credits but suggests that the policy concerning graduate course credit for use at the undergrad level be re-examined by perhaps an ad-hoc committee of both the Graduate and Undergraduate councils.

**Topic 15 – Thoughts on the Graduate Academic Integrity Policy and phrasing on the transcript for level 3 or 4 violations**

The language in the Graduate Academic Integrity Policy may allow the phrase “dismissed for violation of academic integrity at level 3 (or 4)” to be written on the transcript in the case of a level 3 or 4 violation. This wording however has not been used but an actual level 4 violation recently occurred and the Graduate Academic Integrity Committee has voted to use this language on the student’s transcript. The Scholastic Policies committee suggests that the Graduate Academic Integrity committee might review the language for level 3 or 4 violations.
Annual Report of the Faculty Senate Policy Committee
2009/2010 Academic Year

Committee Members: Senators Denise Anderson (HEHD), Claudio Cantalupo (BBS), Scott Dutkiewicz (Libraries), Jeremy King (Chair; CoES), Jane Lindle (HEHD), Hong Luo (CAFLS), Kelly Smith (AAH), Pradip Srimani (CoES)

The 2009/2010 academic year was a busy one for the Policy Committee. Significant activities/products of the committee are summarized below. The Committee gratefully acknowledges that it was 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. It is a 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 significant multiple changes to the first 2 paragraphs of Section IV, Part D of the Faculty Manual related to Renewal of Appointment, Tenure, and Promotion. The changes: a) limiting membership on tenure, promotion and reappointment (TPR) committees to regular faculty b) limit voting privileges on TPR committees to those members of equivalent or higher rank and tenure status than that sought by the candidate, c) prohibit the use of TPR committees with secretive membership, d) mandate that departments/units have a separate TPR document describing the TPR process, procedures, and committee membership, e) establish guidelines concerning a minimum TPR committee size and procedures to ensure a minimum size. Changes to the Faculty Manual were ultimately approved by the Senate.

♦ In collaboration with Tracy Arwood (Research Compliance) and Bill Marcotte (the Institutional Biosafety Committee Chair), the committee proposed changes to Part VII, Section E and Part X,Section C of the Faculty Manual concerning the Institutional Biosafety Committee and the use of recombinant DNA, and biological/chemical hazards. These changes stemmed from a change in scope of the IBC mission beginning in January 2009. Changes to the Faculty Manual were ultimately approved by the Senate.

♦ The committee proposed changes to the Part VII, Sections C and D of the Faculty Manual splitting the Honorary Degree and Naming Committee into 2 distinct committees—a structure consistent with that used by the Board of Trustees. Changes to the Faculty Manual were ultimately approved by the Senate.
 Acting upon the recommendations of the Grievance Board, the committee recommended changes to Part V, Section 6.1, numbers 5 and 9 of the Faculty Manual related to grievance hearings. The changes: a) require the hearing panel to provide respondents with copies of documentation included or referred to in a petition, and b) provide the Hearing Panel with additional time (10 weekdays) to deliberate about, summarize, and forward recommendations and findings to the Provost. Changes to the Faculty Manual were ultimately approved by the full Senate.

 At the urging of David Grigsby, Vice Provost of International Affairs, the committee recommended changes to Part VII, Section B, #3 of the Faculty Manual that: a) consolidated the International Studies and Curriculum Committee and International Program Coordination Committee (abolishing the former), and b) mandate faculty and student representation on the committees reporting to the VPIA. Changes to the Faculty Manual were ultimately approved by the full Senate.

 Benefiting from the coordinating efforts of Senator Meredith Futral, the committee recommended a minor change to Part VI, Section J of the Faculty Manual allowing the faculty evaluation of the Library Chair and Dean to be made using a form contained in the Libraries bylaws and newly contained in Appendix D of the Faculty Manual. Changes to the Faculty Manual were ultimately approved by the full Senate.

 The committee recommended changes to Section IV, Part H, Number 4 of the Faculty Manual concerning post-tenure review (PTR). The changes restrict membership on PTR committees to regular faculty and clarify that the PTR committee should be distinct from the promotion-tenure-(re)appointment committee. Changes to the Faculty Manual were ultimately approved by the full Senate.

 Responding to questions raised in an internal audit of practices in Financial Aid, the committee recommended minor changes to Part VII, Section B, number 1 of the Faculty Manual concerning the Scholarship and Awards Committee. The changes restrict membership to regular faculty members and allows non-voting members to appoint designees to serve in their stead. Changes to the Faculty Manual were ultimately approved by the full Senate.
Acting upon the suggestions of the college deans as communicated to the committee by the Provost, the committee recommended changes to Part III, Section E, number 8 of the Faculty Manual related to Senior Lecturers. The changes: a) require a department chair to have the concurrence of the tenure-promotion-(re)appointment committee in making recommendations for Senior Lecturer appointments to a Dean, b) provide a date for one-year’s notice of non-renewal, and c) stipulate that senior lecturers cannot have administrative duties beyond those of regular faculty. Changes to the Faculty Manual were ultimately approved by the full Senate.

Based on a draft approved by the university Administrative Council and provided by the General Counsel, the committee recommended two separate changes to the Part III, Section F of the Faculty Manual related to Endowed Chairs and Titled Professorships. The changes establish a policy regarding participation of sponsoring parties in the selection and review of endowed chairs/titled professors. As of the date of this report, the recommended changes had not gone before the full Senate, but were approved by the Senate Executive/Advisory Committee.

The committee recommended changes to Part IV, Section G of the Faculty Manual related to tenure policies to remedy a conflict between this section and the first paragraph of Part III, Section E regarding credit of time towards the tenure probationary period. The changes now clarify that probationary credit for time spent in positions/roles that are not tenure-track positions at Clemson or other institutions of higher education shall in general not be awarded. However, in order to allow such credit in meritorious cases, credit can be awarded if approved by a department TPR committee, the Department chair, the dean, and the Provost. Such credit and approval is subject to written agreement. As of the date of this report, the recommended changes had not gone before the full Senate, but were approved by the Senate Executive/Advisory Committee.

The committee received and revised suggested changes to Part IX, Section D, number 11 of the Faculty Manual regarding the evaluation of teaching by students that were kindly provided by the Scholastic Policies Committee. The recommended changes: update the Manual in line with current modern online evaluation practice; provide three important needed clarifications concerning the difference in chair access to University/department question statistical summaries versus instructor question statistical summaries, the right of a course instructor to make his/her evaluation question summaries and all comments available to his/her chair, and the role of the University in maintaining the evaluation database; establish that student comments are optional possible criteria for evaluation of teaching if the
instructor elects to make them available. The recommended changes were approved by the Executive/Advisory Committee, but postponed by the Senate for consideration at its final meeting of the 2009/2010 academic year.

♦ The committee crafted and endorsed changes to the first paragraph of Part III Section E of the Faculty Manual describing special faculty ranks. The recommended changes: establish that appointment offers can be made by the Department Chair/School Director (with faculty approval if required by department or college bylaws); Deans and the Provost maintain fiduciary oversight by having to verify the availability of adequate funding for appointments; stipulate that a letter of appointment must name the department to which the academic appointment applies; requires that the letter of appointment supplies critical information to the appointee; demands that hiring individuals from special faculty ranks into regular faculty positions must be carried out in accord with canonical hiring mechanisms in Part IV of the Faculty Manual; prohibits special faculty rank voting membership on several committees named in Part VII, Section K. As of the date of this report, the proposed changes were approved by the Executive/Advisory Committee, but their consideration was postponed by the Senate.

♦ The committee crafted and recommended changes to Part III, Section E, number 6 of the Faculty Manual related to Lecturers. The proposed changes: stipulate that the lecturer designation is intended for those not in administrative positions; mandate that lecturer appointments may only be made for academic year periods (Aug-May), which greatly simplifies the enumeration of service years; provide explicit calendar dates of appointments, clarify when 1-year notice of non-renewal must be given. The changes were approved by the Executive/Advisory Committee, but (as of the date of this report) their consideration has been postponed by the Senate.

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. In addition, an educated glance into the near future reveals several items that will likely need attention by next year’s Policy Committee:

♦ Special Faculty Ranks: The Select Committee on Academic Lecturers (Prof. W. Pennington, Chair) has made several recommendations concerning the role, rights, and responsibilities of contingent faculty at Clemson. The 2010/2011 Policy Committee should closely review these
recommendations and consider whether they merit policy changes concerning a host of issues: e.g., department/college/university committee membership/voting rights; faculty senate participation; promotion and reappointment.

- **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. This portion of the Faculty Manual deserves urgent attention by the 2010/2011 Policy Committee.

- **Reduction in Force Policy for Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty**: Given the current uncertainty in the fiscal future of the University arising from declining state budget support, it is especially noteworthy that Clemson lacks a RIF policy for tenured/tenure-track faculty. The 2010/2011 Policy Committee should, in some form and via some means, become and remain vested in the creation, review, and approval of such a policy.

- **Graduate Council Representation for Interdisciplinary Graduate Programs**: There are several interdisciplinary graduate programs whose virtual academic domicile is the Graduate School itself. While the faculty involved with these programs belong to Departments and Colleges from which representation on the Graduate Council is (or can be) drawn, the interdisciplinary programs themselves lack representation on the Graduate Council. The PC has endorsed the idea of these programs having direct representation on the Graduate Council via a representative elected by the faculty of these interdisciplinary programs as identified by the Graduate Dean, who has confirmed that such an identification is a simple matter. Before enacting such a change, the PC desired an explicit endorsement of this idea by the Graduate Council itself. It is hoped that such an endorsement could come at the April or May 2010 meeting of the Graduate Council. With such an endorsement, the draft Faculty Manual change could be brought to the EAC and full Senate for consideration in a speedy fashion.

- **Post-Tenure Review**: During the 2009/2010 academic year, the Policy Committee Chair received a host of passing complaints concerning the Post-Tenure Review process. Many of these complaints were not specific in nature or concerned operations of PTR at the Department level. At the end of the 2009/2010 term, however, a small collection of general complaints about the general process outlined in the Faculty Manual had been acquired. These should be reviewed by the 2010/2011 Policy Committee for possible action.
Department/College Bylaw Violations: In conducting its business during the 2009/2010 academic year, the policy committee was presented with interesting questions related to Department/College bylaw violations: are such violations de facto violations of the Faculty Manual itself? If not, should they be declared such (by amending the Faculty Manual)? Or are current provisions in the Faculty Manual sufficient to allow the Senate President and/or his/her appointee(s) to decide—on a case-by-case basis—whether bylaw violations are Faculty Manual Violations? These questions are worth exploration by the 2010/2011 Policy Committee.

New Mediation/Arbitration Mechanisms: The questions above as well as an informal discussion with University General Counsel suggests that it is worthwhile for the 2010/2011 Policy Committee to explore whether additional mediation and/or arbitration mechanisms (binding or non-binding; operating within the University or outsourced to a third party) might be helpful in resolving disputes or settling issues before they culminate in a grievances and/or Faculty Manual violation filing. This suggestion is not intended to reflect on the importance and effectiveness of the Grievance or Faculty Manual violation processes or the efforts of the Ombudsman office. Rather, the question is whether additional complementary options/mechanisms in resolving difficult issues would be of value in avoiding more serious actions that can consume productive time of numerous faculty and administrators across the University.
Faculty Senate Finance Committee Report Academic Year 2009-2010

Submitted by: Senator Figliola, Chair

During the 2009-2010 academic year the committee studied new issues and addressed concerns of faculty members.

Task 1: Compensation Report Study

The committee responded to concerns on transparency in faculty, staff, and administrative compensation by working with the newly formed University Compensation Group and by working with Institutional Research, as it has in the past, in providing a more detailed annual compensation report. Significant improvements negotiated over the past two years have lead to more detail on raise justifications. Continued efforts are to push for total annual compensation reporting, both in permanent and temporary hires, which is possible today even if it requires separate reporting.

Task 2: University Budget Flow Study

The Committee was represented on the newly formed University Budget Accountability Committee. The charge of this Committee is to study the flow of funds within the University from big pot to Colleges, Divisions, Centers and Institutes. The involvement does bring faculty representation into the discussion, particularly with the continued anticipated pressures on future budgets. This year, the flow of money was outlined and the allocation of funds has been reviewed in large scope. Future discussions will involve more substance related to money flow on campus and to the academic units.

The Committee was asked to review the use of Lab fees returned back to the Colleges. This is an ongoing effort that is not as clear as it would seem simply because money can be transferred out of a category going to one Unit to accommodate added funds into another category. The Committee is interested in whether there have been net gains to departments to accommodate the true expense of offering labs and that answer is not yet answered. It appears that the bulk of the fees are returned directly back to departments generating the fees and in a couple cases returned to departments less some college overhead but we do not know how other budget items were adjusted.

The Committee was asked to review the University return of licensing and trademark royalties. Royalties are tracked by a national clearinghouse and returned to the Clemson athletic enterprise. Annual returns are about $1M. The athletic department returns between 3 to 5% to the general fund. However, many trademarks are not sports related. The University Counsel Office assumption is that trademark royalties from sportswear vendors are sports related. The remainder of returns accounts for about 15% of royalties. The Committee decided that the amount of revenue involved did not justify trying to overcome the inertia built-in to the current Athletic-University relationship at this time.
Task 3: Compensation Strategy

With the formation of the University Compensation Group this year, a University-wide compensation metric has been put into place. An improvement over ad-hoc methods, the basis for such metrics is not so obvious and not necessarily focused on faculty retention. The Committee has been accumulating information on compensation strategy from an economics and a national viewpoint. The best Universities appear to compensate their top faculty at levels on par with top university administrators. Top administrators appear to be very well compensated at large universities and these salaries are available from national publications. A more pragmatic view is that faculty should be compensated at levels consistent with their focus areas based on a common metric used across the University (straw-man example: public, Research 1, AP poll Top-40) and there should be an annually updated plan to accomplish and maintain this. Regarding faculty retention, there must be a better way to address faculty compensation than salary adjustment to match counter offers, a practice of questionable value. Clearly, this study requires more time and should be continued in the future.
Permanent, full-time employees as of October 1, 2009. Actual pay may reflect amounts received in a previous position. Pay dates between October 1, 2008 - September 30, 2009. Includes payroll corrections through January 19, 2010. Employees were included if either budgeted salary or actual pay were greater than or equal to $50,000. October 1, 2009 Salary includes base pay + "increasable" and "non-increasable" supplements in CUBS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAFLS</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Low (%)</th>
<th>High (%)</th>
<th>Average (%)</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept Chair/Head</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowed Chair</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension Associate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Asst Professor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Specialist II</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Specialist III</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total/Average</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.061</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAAH</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Low (%)</th>
<th>High (%)</th>
<th>Average (%)</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowed Chair</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Named Professor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept Chair/Head</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total/Average</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.066</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>President</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Low (%)</th>
<th>High (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provost &amp; VP of Academic Affairs</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Low (%)</th>
<th>High (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Program Director</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Affairs</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Low (%)</th>
<th>High (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Utilities</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Low (%)</th>
<th>High (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBBS</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Low (%)</td>
<td>High (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni Professor</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Named Professor</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept Chair/Head</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Coordinator II</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Professor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Dean</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total/Average</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CES</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Low (%)</th>
<th>High (%)</th>
<th>Average (%)</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni Professor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Named Professor</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept Chair/Head</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowed Chair</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim Vice Provst</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int Assoc Dean</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Associate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems Programmer I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total/Average</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.087</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHEHD</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Low (%)</th>
<th>High (%)</th>
<th>Average (%)</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni Professor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Named Professor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept Chair/Head</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total/Average</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.073</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For Salaries 50k and Over
New hire or recent change to full-time, permanent position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Administrator</th>
<th>A Faculty</th>
<th>I Faculty</th>
<th>O Faculty</th>
<th>P S Faculty</th>
<th>R Faculty</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAFLS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAAH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBBS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHEHD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. Advancement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A Faculty = Administrator w/ faculty rank
O Faculty = Other professional w/ faculty rank
I Faculty = Instructional Faculty
P S Faculty = Public Service Faculty
R Faculty = Research faculty

For I Faculty: 4 were Lecturers

Salary change related to change in contract (9mo/12mo)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>I Faculty</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAFLS</td>
<td></td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAAH</td>
<td></td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBBS</td>
<td></td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = decrease in salary

Other adjustments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>I Faculty</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAAH</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBBS</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHEHD</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>I Faculty</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCIT</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAFLS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBBS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CES</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHEHD</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative Extension Service</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Affairs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provost</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I Faculty = Instructional Faculty
For I Faculty: 2 were Lecturers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Administrator</th>
<th>A Faculty</th>
<th>I Faculty</th>
<th>O Faculty</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CCIT</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAFLS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBBS</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CES</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative Extension Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A Faculty = Administrator w/ faculty rank
O Faculty = Other professional w/ faculty rank
I Faculty = Instructional Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>I Faculty</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHEHD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For I Faculty: 3 were Lecturers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CCIT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% 100.0% 100.0%
Salary change related to change in position or responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Administrator</th>
<th>A Faculty</th>
<th>I Faculty</th>
<th>O Faculty</th>
<th>P S Faculty</th>
<th>R Faculty</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCIT</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAFLS</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAAH</td>
<td>2*</td>
<td>18**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBBS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>9+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CES</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHEHD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative Extension Service</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provost</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSA</td>
<td>5++</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>68.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = 1 decrease in salary  
** = 3 decrease in salary  
+ = 1 senior lecturer  
++ = 1 lecturer

Salary change related to change in position or responsibilities and change in contract (9mo/12mo)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>A Faculty</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAFLS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Salary change related to change in position or responsibilities, change in contract (9mo/12mo), and other adjustments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>A Faculty</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAFLS</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = 90.88% increase in salary

Salary change related to change in position or responsibilities and other adjustments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>I Faculty</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHEHD</td>
<td>12*</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = 1 senior lecturer, 3 Lecturers, and 1 Instructor
1999-2008 Faculty Survey Comparison

Data collection and analysis

Relationships between faculty and administration

Differences between years were analyzed using a chi-square test. When all counts were lower than 5, Fisher’s exact test was used. Differences were considered significant at $P < 0.01$.

2008: More new faculty

For how many years have you been a CU faculty member?

2008: More lecturers, fewer full professors

What is your current faculty rank?

2008: Gender information

What is your gender?
Joint Provost-Faculty Senate Select Committee on Best Management Practices in Support of Academic Lecturers

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

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

TERMS OF REFERENCE

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

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

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

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

Respectfully submitted by the
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.

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

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

Proposed rewording to Faculty Manual, Part III, E

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

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

Promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer

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

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

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

Promotion from Senior Lecturer to Master Lecturer

The master lecturer appointment is intended to recognize the efforts, contributions, and performance of senior lecturers who 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, Chairman, 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 to advise and assist in matters pertaining to the educational interests of the 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, it was approved by the Board of Trustees.
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 Research Faculty/Lecturers
2010 Research Faculty?
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, develop new courses, advise student groups, etc.

0-4 years Lecturers/Visiting Lecturers/Temporary Lecturers
Ranging from “Fill-ins” to 2-3 year teaching “post-docs” to entry-level career lecturers
Best Practices Guide in Support of Academic Lecturers

"... 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."

*paraphrased quote from a Senior Lecturer*
Future Work

One Clemson

The coming years will test this university like no others. If we are to be successful we will truly need to become One Clemson.

Disenfranchising a significant portion of the teaching faculty is not the way to get there.

Neither is minimizing the experience and talents of a group of incredibly committed educators.
Proposed Faculty Manual Change
Part IV, Section G (Tenure Policies), 3\textsuperscript{rd} and 6\textsuperscript{th} Paragraphs

Current Wording:
\textbf{\textsuperscript{3}3}\ The tenure probationary period for a full-time regular faculty member shall not exceed seven years. If advance written agreement is reached by a faculty member, the chair or director, the dean, and the Provost, periods of leave without pay may be excluded from this seven-year period. Included within the tenure probationary period may be the faculty member’s full-time tenured or tenure-track service at other institutions of higher learning, subject to advance written agreement. Candidates must be notified of their options during the contract negotiation process. Agreements for immediate tenure or for a probationary period of two years or less shall be reviewed in accordance with a department's regular tenure peer evaluation process. Probationary faculty who give birth, father, or adopt a child during their probationary period may, at their request, receive a one-year extension of the tenure decision. The request for an extension must come within two months of the birth or adoption. The extension will automatically be granted unless the chair or dean can document sufficient reason for denial. Normally, a maximum of two such extensions may be granted. Extension of the probationary period of a faculty member for serious illness, family tragedy or other special circumstances may be granted with the approval of the department chair, dean and Provost.

\textbf{\textsuperscript{6}6}\ Leave time taken which benefits the institution as well as the individual faculty member may count as probationary period service. Time spent as lecturer or post-doctoral research fellow, as visiting, part-time, or adjunct faculty, or in other non-tenure-track positions, shall not count as tenure probationary service.

Proposed Wording:
\textbf{\textsuperscript{3}3}\ The tenure probationary period for a full-time regular faculty member shall not exceed seven years. If advance written agreement is reached by a faculty member, the chair or director, the dean, and the Provost, periods of leave without pay may be excluded from this seven-year period. Included within the tenure probationary period may be the faculty member’s full-time tenured or tenure-track service at other institutions of higher learning, subject to advance written agreement. Time spent as lecturer or post-doctoral research fellow, as visiting, part-time, or adjunct faculty, or in other non-tenure-track positions (both academic and non-academic), whether at the University or elsewhere, shall not count as tenure probationary service unless approved by the department tenure-promotion-reappointment committee, department chair (see section D, paragraph 2), dean, and Provost and subject to advance written agreement. Candidates must be notified of their options during the contract negotiation process. Agreements for immediate tenure or for a probationary period of two years or less shall be reviewed in accordance with a department's regular tenure peer evaluation process. Leave time taken which benefits the institution as well as the individual faculty member may count as probationary period service. Probationary faculty who give birth, father, or adopt a child during their probationary period may, at their request, receive a one-year extension of the tenure decision. The request for an extension must come within two months of the birth or adoption. The extension will automatically be granted unless the chair or dean can document sufficient reason for denial. Normally, a maximum of two such extensions may be granted. Extension of the probationary period of a faculty member for serious illness, family tragedy or other special circumstances may be granted with the approval of the department chair, dean and Provost.
Leave time taken which benefits the institution as well as the individual faculty member may count as probationary period service. Time spent as lecturer or post-doctoral research fellow, as visiting, part-time, or adjunct faculty, or in other non-tenure-track positions, shall not count as tenure probationary service.

Final Wording:

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

Probationary faculty who give birth, father, or adopt a child during their probationary period may, at their request, receive a one-year extension of the tenure decision. The request for an extension must come within two months of the birth or adoption. The extension will automatically be granted unless the chair or dean can document sufficient reason for denial. Normally, a maximum of two such extensions may be granted. Extension of the probationary period of a faculty member for serious illness, family tragedy or other special circumstances may be granted with the approval of the department chair, dean and Provost.

Rationale: The first paragraph of Part III, Section E of the FM (special faculty ranks) and the penultimate paragraph of Part IV Section G (tenure policies) appear to conflict. The former Part/Section implies that there might be circumstances or occasions when time in special faculty rank-like appointments could count towards the probationary period. However, the latter Part/Section seems to specifically exclude such a possibility. There is also ambiguity concerning the passage in Part IV Section G: does it exclude time spent in industry, political organizations, religious institutions, etc from being counted towards the probationary period? Does it exclude time spent in special faculty ranks only at Clemson? At other institutions? Both?

The proposed changes are meant to clearly establish that probationary credit for time spent in positions/roles that are not tenure-track positions at Clemson or other institutions of higher education shall in general not be awarded—i.e., there is no general expectation that such time shall or can be awarded. However, in order to allow such credit in meritorious cases, credit can be awarded if approved by a department TPR committee, the Department chair, the dean, and the
Provost. In order to avoid misunderstandings, such credit and approval is subject to written agreement (e.g., contained within an offer letter).
Proposed Faculty Manual Change
Part IV, Section G (Tenure Policies), 3rd and 6th Paragraphs

Current Wording:

§ 3 The tenure probationary period for a full-time regular faculty member shall not exceed seven years. If advance written agreement is reached by a faculty member, the chair or director, the dean, and the Provost, periods of leave without pay may be excluded from this seven-year period. Included within the tenure probationary period may be the faculty member’s full-time tenured or tenure-track service at other institutions of higher learning, subject to advance written agreement. Candidates must be notified of their options during the contract negotiation process. Agreements for immediate tenure or for a probationary period of two years or less shall be reviewed in accordance with a department’s regular tenure peer evaluation process. Probationary faculty who give birth, father, or adopt a child during their probationary period may, at their request, receive a one-year extension of the tenure decision. The request for an extension must come within two months of the birth or adoption. The extension will automatically be granted unless the chair or dean can document sufficient reason for denial. Normally, a maximum of two such extensions may be granted. Extension of the probationary period of a faculty member for serious illness, family tragedy or other special circumstances may be granted with the approval of the department chair, dean and Provost.

§ 6 Leave time taken which benefits the institution as well as the individual faculty member may count as probationary period service. Time spent as lecturer or post-doctoral research fellow, as visiting, part-time, or adjunct faculty, or in other non-tenure-track positions, shall not count as tenure probationary service.

Proposed Wording:

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

Final Wording:

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

Rationale: The first paragraph of Part III, Section E of the FM (special faculty ranks) and the penultimate paragraph of Part IV Section G (tenure policies) appear to conflict. The former Part/Section implies that there might be circumstances or occasions when time in special faculty rank-like appointments could count towards the probationary period. However, the latter Part/Section seems to specifically exclude such a possibility. There is also ambiguity concerning the passage in Part IV Section G: does it exclude time spent in industry, political organizations, religious institutions, etc from being counted towards the probationary period? Does it exclude time spent in special faculty ranks only at Clemson? At other institutions? Both? The proposed changes are meant to clearly establish that probationary credit for time spent in positions/roles that are not tenure-track positions at Clemson or other institutions of higher education shall in general not be awarded—i.e., there is no general expectation that such time shall or can be awarded. However, in order to allow such credit in meritorious cases, credit can be awarded if approved by a department TPR committee, the Department chair, the dean, and the
Provost. In order to avoid misunderstandings, such credit and approval is subject to written agreement (e.g., contained within an offer letter).
Proposed Addition and Change to the Faculty Manual
Part III, Section F (Endowed Chairs and Titled Professorships)
Add a new 6th paragraph

Proposed Wording:

During development of an endowed chair proposal, a sponsoring party representative may act in an advisory capacity with the committee or members thereof developing the proposal. During any competitive review process evaluating an endowed chair proposal, a sponsoring party representative may take part in presenting the proposal to the review team, acting in a support capacity. After an endowed chair proposal has been approved, a sponsoring party representative may act only in an advisory capacity during the search and screening process with the approval of both the majority of the search-and-screening committee and the Provost. If having such approvals, the sponsoring party representative may interview the final candidates and offer opinions about the candidates’ qualifications to the search-and-screening committee. A sponsoring party representative may not be a voting member of the search-and-screening committee or be directly involved in making the final decision to hire.

Rationale:

The proposed addition establishes the role and limits of participation of external sponsors in developing and presenting endowed chair proposals (e.g., Center of Excellence Endowed Chair proposals) and, subsequent to their approval, filling them via a search process. In particular, the addition recognizes the right of external sponsors of successful competitive endowed chair proposals to engage finalists for the chair position, and provide feedback about the finalists to the voting members of the search-and-screening committee with the approval of the Provost and the majority of the committee. The policy makes clear that external sponsors are to have no vote on the search-and-screening committee, or otherwise be involved in the final hiring decision, in order that institutional integrity in the hiring process is maintained.
Current 8th/New 9th Paragraph

**Current Wording**
For any such review the Provost shall ensure that a committee (composed in the same manner as the search-and-screening committee that made the initial selection of the holder) evaluates the performance of the holder of the chair or titled professorship. Recommendations for removal by this committee shall follow the same route as those of the initial search-and-screening committee. Should these recommendations result in a decision by the President to remove the incumbent from the chair or titled professorship, such a decision shall not affect the incumbent's tenure status and professorial rank. If the holder of the chair or endowed professorship is a department chair or prospective department chair, the appointments shall be independent.

**Proposed Changes**
For any such review the Provost shall ensure that a committee (composed in the same manner as the search and screening committee that made the initial selection of the holder) evaluates the performance of the holder of the chair or titled professorship. **The committee shall not include any sponsoring party representation, and its majority shall be composed of faculty members from the department to which the chair or titled professorship is assigned and shall be elected by the faculty of that department.** Recommendations for removal by this committee shall follow the same route as those of the initial search-and-screening committee. Should these recommendations result in a decision by the President to remove the incumbent from the chair or titled professorship, such a decision shall not affect the incumbent's tenure status and professorial rank. If the holder of the chair or endowed professorship is a department chair or prospective department chair, the appointments shall be independent.

**Final Wording**
For any such review the Provost shall ensure that a committee evaluates the performance of the holder of the chair or titled professorship. The committee shall not include any sponsoring party representation, and its majority shall be composed of faculty members from the department to which the chair or titled professorship is assigned and shall be elected by the faculty of that department. Recommendations for removal by this committee shall follow the same route as those of the initial search-and-screening committee. Should these recommendations result in a decision by the President to remove the incumbent from the chair or titled professorship, such a decision shall not affect the incumbent's tenure status and professorial rank. If the holder of the chair or endowed professorship is a department chair or prospective department chair, the appointments shall be independent.

**Rationale:** The change ensures that a review of an endowed chair, in his/her capacity as a Clemson faculty member, is free from the influence of sponsoring parties, which would be prohibited from serving on review committees.
Proposed Faculty Manual Change  
Part III, Section E (Special Faculty Ranks), 1st Paragraph

Current Wording:
Appointments to special faculty ranks include visiting, adjunct, and part-time positions as well as the special ranks of lecturer and post doctoral research fellow in academic units that are under the jurisdiction of the Provost. Conditions of appointment must be fully detailed in the appointment letter. Such appointments may be renewable, but they do not normally carry any expectation of renewal, are not tenurable, and service in such ranks normally does not count towards the tenure probationary period. Special appointments do not carry voting privileges except as may be provided in relevant college/school/departmental faculty bylaws.

Proposed Wording:
Appointments to all special faculty ranks include visiting, adjunct, and part-time positions as well as the special ranks of lecturer and post doctoral research fellow in academic units that are under the jurisdiction of the Provost shall be made by the Department Chair or School Director with Department/School faculty approval if such approval is required by relevant unit or College bylaws (in this section, references to department chair should be understood to refer to the school/center/institute director if appropriate). Prior to making an offer of appointment, the Department Chair or School Director must receive verification of the existence and sufficiency of the funding supporting the appointment from the appropriate Dean or the Provost. Conditions of appointment must be fully detailed in the letter of appointment letter, including at a minimum: the appointment rank; the department, school, center, or institute to which the academic appointment applies; and any remuneration to be paid to the special faculty member. Such Special faculty appointments are not tenurable and may be renewable, but they do not normally carry any expectation of renewal, although appointments may be renewed. are not tenurable, and Service in such special faculty ranks normally does not count towards the a regular faculty rank tenure probationary period (see Part IV, Section G). Appointment of an individual with a special faculty rank to a regular faculty rank must follow the personnel practices and procedures for appointment described in Part IV of the Faculty Manual. If the approved bylaws of the applicable unit or college specifically provide such privileges, special faculty ranks have voting and membership privileges in unit and college meetings and on unit and college committees except those restricted to regular faculty in Part VII, Section K. Special appointments do not carry voting privileges except as may be provided in relevant college/school/departmental faculty bylaws. Special faculty ranks have voting membership privileges on university committees except those restricted to regular faculty in Part VII, Section K.
Final Wording: Appointments to all special faculty ranks shall be made by the Department Chair with Department faculty approval if such approval is required by relevant unit or College bylaws (in this section, references to department chair should be understood to refer to the school/center/institute director if appropriate). Prior to making an offer of appointment, the Department Chair must receive verification of the existence and sufficiency of the funding supporting the appointment from the appropriate Dean or the Provost. Conditions of appointment shall be fully detailed in the letter of appointment, including at a minimum: the appointment rank; the department, school, center, or institute to which the academic appointment applies; and any remuneration to be paid to the special faculty member. Special faculty appointments are not tenurable and do not carry any expectation of renewal, although appointments may be renewed. Service in special faculty ranks normally does not count towards a regular faculty rank tenure probationary period (see Part IV, Section G). Appointment of an individual with a special faculty rank to a regular faculty rank must follow the personnel practices and procedures for appointment described in Part IV of the Faculty Manual. If the approved bylaws of the applicable unit or college specifically provide such privileges, special faculty ranks have voting and membership privileges in unit and college meetings and on unit and college committees except those restricted to regular faculty in Part VII, Section K. Special faculty ranks have voting membership privileges on university committees except those restricted to regular faculty in Part VII, Section K.

Rationale: The motivation for the changes is five-fold. First, the changes may increase the efficiency of the special faculty hiring process by establishing that appointment offers can be made by the Department Chair/School Director (with faculty approval if required by department or college bylaws); Deans and the Provost, however, still maintain fiduciary oversight by having to verify the availability of adequate funding for the appointment. Third, the stipulation that a letter of appointment for a special faculty rank must name the department to which the academic appointment applies is an additional deterrent to appointing administrators to special faculty ranks. Third, the changes ensure that the letter of appointment supplies critical information (appointment rank, term of appointment, salary, department/school of appointment) to the appointee. The fourth change demands that hiring individuals from special faculty ranks into regular faculty positions must be a process carried out in accord with canonical hiring mechanisms in Part IV of the Faculty Manual. The fifth change recognizes a recent preceding change to the Faculty Manual prohibiting special faculty rank voting membership on several committees named in Part VII, Section K. In light of this recent change, the new language makes a more positive statement to special faculty ranks by clarifying the committees on which they are eligible to serve with voting membership. Such voting membership must be explicitly allowed by relevant department/school/college bylaws and not contravene the Faculty Manual.
Amendments: 1) Department/School changed to Department/School/Center/Institute or the umbrella of “unit” 2) Part IV Section G is referenced since it provides information about use of time spent in non-tenure-track positions as credit towards probationary service.

Amendment Rationale: The amendment makes clear that in this section of the Faculty Manual, Department Chair refers to the relevant chair or (school,center,institute) director. This same referencing approach is used elsewhere in the Faculty Manual—namely, Part IV, Section D, paragraph 2. The second thrust of the amendment is to provide a pointer informing the reader that the detailed policy concerning use of special faculty rank time as credit towards the tenure probationary period is found elsewhere in the Faculty Manual (Part IV, Section G).
Proposed Faculty Manual Change
Part III, Section E, #6 (Lecturer)

Current Wording:
6. Lecturer. 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. Full-time academic appointments shall be for one-year terms and may be renewed. (The termination date of appointments made for the full academic year shall be extended over the summer until the next academic year begins.) Notice of renewal or non-renewal must be provided before July 15 for the following academic year. After four or more years of continuous appointment as a lecturer, one year's notice of non-renewal must be provided.

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

Final Wording:
6. Lecturer. This rank is assigned in cases where the assignment of regular faculty ranks is not appropriate or possible. Individuals having initial lecturer appointments beginning after 15 May 2011 shall have no administrative duties inconsistent with those of regular faculty. These academic appointments are non-tenure track, shall be for one-year terms and may be renewed. For the purposes of academic appointment and reappointment, a one-year term begins August 15 and ends May 15 although lecturers may be extended benefits over the summer. Notice of renewal or non-renewal must be provided before July 15 for the following August 15-May 15 term. After May 15 following completion of four or more one-year terms of continuous appointment as a lecturer, one year's notice of non-renewal must be provided. No notice of non-renewal shall be required if a Lecturer resigns, is terminated, or is dismissed for cause (Part IV, section K).
**Rationale:** The changes accomplish several goals. First, they make clear that the lecturer designation is intended for those not in administrative positions; this will motivate the HR reclassification of numerous current administrators that currently occupy lecturer positions and prevent a return to this troublesome condition. Second, the changes mandate that lecturer appointments may only be made for academic year periods (Aug-May), which greatly simplifies the enumeration of service years. Personnel teaching just 1 semester per year or starting service mid-academic year or during the summer can be (temporarily) classified as a Temporary Lecturer, which is already defined in the Faculty Manual. Third, the changes provide explicit date of appointments. Fourth, the use of “full time” with lecturer is deleted inasmuch as it seems irrelevant, simplifies the nomenclature (one is either a Lecturer or is not a Lecturer), and acknowledges the value of these contingent employees regardless of how many courses they are teaching. Fifth, the changes clarify when 1-year notice of non-renewal must be given: after July 15 following completion of 4 (or more) consecutive Aug-May periods as a Lecturer. Sixth, the changes explicate the common sense notion that no notice of non-renewal should be required for any Lecturers that resign, are terminated, or dismissed for cause (all outlined in Part IV, Section K of the Faculty Manual).

**Amendment Rationale:** The amendment adds a grandfather clause for those existing administrators that have lecturer appointments. The amendment also provides a year’s time for the University to continue to work with the State OHR on developing and employing non-lecturer classification/titles for new hires into administrative positions. This compromise is acceptable to the University’s General Counsel, who initially raised concerns about a Faculty Manual change without such provisions.
Faculty Senators:

We will never forget Alan Schaffer for many reasons. We will remember his humor, his energy, his historical knowledge of Clemson University, and his belief in University governance, in general, but the Faculty Senate, in particular.

Before Alan passed away in August, 2003, he established a generous endowment honoring the Faculty Senate. His desire was that this endowment would cover such things as special events or legal counsel in the time of need. As a former member and president of the Faculty Senate, Alan was aware of the Senate’s financial needs.

The Faculty Senate Endowment is really an endowment for all faculty members through the work of the Faculty Senate. They say that Thomas Green Clemson believed that one person could make a difference. This is but just one way in which Alan made a difference.

If you so choose, your contribution may be made to the University Foundation with a “Faculty Senate Endowment” notation. On behalf of past, present, and future Faculty Senates, I thank you.

Sincerely,

Cathy Toth Sturkie, Program Assistant
Faculty Senate
PLEASE BE REMINDED THAT DONATIONS TO THE FACULTY SENATE OPERATING ACCOUNT ARE ALWAYS NEEDED AND WILL BE ACCEPTED JOYFULLY

THE OPERATING ACCOUNT IS OUR SOURCE FOR ITEMS SUCH AS, FLOWERS ON OCCASIONS, DONATIONS, SOCIAL ACTIVITIES, ETC,

IF YOU WOULD LIKE TO MAKE A DONATION, PLEASE CONTACT CATHY STURKIE 656-2456

THANK YOU
MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
MAY 11, 2010

1. Call to Order: The Faculty Senate Meeting was called to order at 2:36 p.m. by President William M. Surver, and guests were recognized and introduced.

2. Approval of Minutes: The Faculty Senate Minutes dated April 13, 2009 were approved as written.

3. “Free Speech”: None

4. Special Order of the Day – George Smith, Associate Vice President for Student Affairs provided a presentation of the twelve Principles of Parking and asked the Faculty Senate’s endorsement of the principles. Motion was made and seconded to endorse the twelve parking principles. Vote was taken and passed.

5. Election to University Committees/Commissions – Election was held by secret ballot to elect faculty senators and faculty to University Committees/Commissions.

6. Committee Reports:
   a. Senate Committees:
      1) Finance Committee – President Surver stated that this Committee will be chaired by Rich Figliola and also noted that it works closely with the Budget Accountability Committee and the President’s Compensation Advisory Group.

      2) Welfare Committee – Chair Michelle Martin stated that there was no report.

      3) Scholastic Policies Committee - Chair Bob Horton stated that there was no report.

      4) Research Committee – President Surver stated that this Committee will be chaired by Paul Dawson.

      5) Policy Committee – Jeremy King, Chair, stated that this Committee will meet tomorrow in 114 Kinard and that two items will come before the Senate under New Business.
b. University Commissions and Committees:
   1) Budget Accountability Committee - President Surver stated that this Committee will be chaired by Antonis Katsiyannis.

7. President’s Report: President Surver:
   a. stated that the new senators had met this morning at the Faculty Senate Orientation;
   b. informed the Senate that changes are coming this year and that questions from the administration have been forwarded to each department to address this year;
   c. asked Senators to become more directly responsible to and stay in touch with the faculty who elected them as college senators;
   d. asked Senators to set up monthly meetings with respective deans of colleges;
   e. informed the Senate that he plans to regularly send out newsletters to faculty; and
   f. stated that it will be both an exciting, tough and challenging year.

8. Old Business: None

9. New Business:
   a. Proposed Faculty Manual Change – Jeremy King submitted for approval and explained, VI.J. Review of Academic Administration (Constituent Group). There was no discussion. Vote to approve was taken and passed (Attachment).

   b. Fran McGuire shared his eight “ATES” for Faculty Senators to follow as responsible senators elected to the Senate by their colleagues (Attachment).

   c. Provost Dori Helms informed the Senate that finalists for the Vice President for Research will meet with President Barker and the decision will be made shortly after those meetings; that the administration will meet with each department to hear responses to the budget questions they were asked to address and they are in the negotiation stage with the finalist for the search for the Dean of Architecture, Arts & Humanities. Questions and answers were then exchanged during which the Provost stated that the “University will be reshaped this year.”

10. Announcements:
    a. The next Executive/Advisory Committee meeting will be held on May 25, 2010 in 205 Cooper Library.
    b. The June and July Faculty Senate meetings are canceled.
c. The Executive/Advisory Committee will not meet in June or July.

d. The next Faculty Senate meeting will be on August 24th (new date due to Summer Reading Program) at the Madren Center.

11. **Adjournment:** President Surver adjourned the meeting at 3:55 p.m.

[Signature]
Linda Howe, Secretary

[Signature]
Cathy Tom Sturkie, Program Coordinator
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> 64 of those people would be male and 36 would be female

> 84 of those people would be White

Those people would average 10.6 years of service at Clemson University.

- 64 of those people would be male and 36 would be female
- 84 of those people would be White
11 of those people would live in HED
31 of those people would live in COES
15 of those people would live in BBS
23 of those people would live in AANC
20 of those people would live in AELS
24 of those people would be Assistant Professors, and their average age would be 38.

19 of those people would be Associate Professors, and their average age would be 49.

26 of those people would be Full Professors. Their average age would be 56, and their average years of service for Clemson would be 18.3 years.
38 of those people would be tenured

27 of those people would be Lecturers
8 people leave the village every year.
Anderson, or another area, commute from Greenville. The rest would reside in Clemson or the surrounding areas in close proximity; 68 of those people would...
10 of those people would have gone to undergraduate school at Clemson.

17 of those people would have gone to graduate school at Clemson.

19 of those people got their highest degree in South Carolina.

49 of those people got their highest degree from somewhere outside of the South.
The Process of Promotion and Tenure

- Assistant Professors
- Associate Professors
- Full Professors

10+ years

6 years

Annual Review, Peer Review, External Review
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Rank</th>
<th>Instructional Faculty - tenure track</th>
<th>Instructional Faculty - non-tenure track</th>
<th>Research Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst/Assoc/Prof</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Rank</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000-2009</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Instructor and Lecturer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clemson University Faculty Complement
NEXT CU BOARD MEETING

- Location: Madren Center

- OCTOBER 14 (committee meetings - afternoon)

- OCTOBER 15 (Full Board in morning)
Faculty Senate Report
Presented to the Board of Trustees Summer Quarterly Meeting

Bill Surver-Faculty Senate President

The Faculty Senate year has begun and I personally am looking forward to a productive year. In this report I would like to share with you some of my goals and plans for the coming year. Needless to say, Clemson is facing significant challenges but I am confident, that working together, we can overcome them and make Clemson an even better University. The Faculty Senate pledges to do all it can to assure that this happens.

Some of my goals for the coming year are as follows:

1. To make the Faculty Senate more responsible to the Clemson Faculty.

   We, the Senate, represent the Faculty and not our individual selves. The Senate must become more aware of Faculty concerns and how they may be addressed. Communication between Faculty and the Senate is paramount.

   To accomplish this, I have instructed each College Lead Senator to assign a Senator to each academic department in that College. The Senator will meet regularly with the department and serve as a resource when issues of concerns arise. These will immediately be conveyed to the Lead Senator and me. I will then determine appropriate action to be taken. It may be as simple as clarification of the Faculty Manual or may require action by a Senate committee. If committee action is required, I will allow the committee to make its recommendation(s) to the Executive/Advisory Committee and the entire Senate. It is not my role to interfere with committee discussions and decisions, unless asked to do so.

2. To keep the Clemson Faculty informed of Senate activities and their rights and responsibilities as written in the Faculty Manual.

   I will write a monthly letter to the Faculty in which I will include such things as newly approved policies, updates on Senate committees, general concerns of faculty and how the Senate is addressing these, Senate activities, and a section on Faculty Manual policies. I am constantly amazed how many of our Faculty do not know the contents of the Faculty Manual and what their rights and responsibilities are. This will also be of benefit to administrators as they make their decisions.
3. To have the Senate become more proactive instead of reactive.

This is especially important as we enter into the next academic year. Administrators, Faculty, Staff and Students must all work together if we are to be successful and become an even better Clemson. To date, I have appointed three committees, a Faculty Workload Committee, chaired by Bill Bowerman; an Academic Calendar Committee chaired by Pat Smart; and a Lecturer Committee chaired by Senate Vice-President Dan Warner. If you wish, I will be happy to discuss their specific charges with you.

4. To support and enhance our Joint Statement on Shared Governance.

Compared to many Colleges and Universities, Clemson can be proud of the Joint Statement of Shared Governance adopted last year. It clearly reflects the role of the Board of Trustees, the Clemson Administration, and Clemson Faculty in governing our University. I am grateful for the opportunities given to the Senate for participation on such committees as the Budget Compensation Group, the Four Presidents Council, the Academic Council, the past Faculty Senate Presidents Council, and others. I also will be meeting monthly individually with President Barker and Provost Helms. I also look forward to interacting with the Board of Trustees, who truly represents the best interests of Clemson.

These are some of my goals for the coming year. I have been at Clemson for 30 years and am proud to see us grow from a good university to a great university. I am confident that we will even become greater in spite of all the pressures facing us. Our leadership is strong and our faculty are the best and are dedicated to working together to face our challenges head on.
Meetings: We’ll meet the 3rd Tuesday of the month at 2:30. Next meetings: 9/21, 10/19 in 402 Tillman.

Definition of Credit Hour
Horton will contact Stan Smith to see if something is happening on this and to see if there is something SP should do.

Graduate Advisory Committee
SP voiced unanimous support for the proposed change to the Graduate Advisory Committee.

Undergraduate Senate’s Academic Affairs Committee
Horton will meet with Ben Boone to discuss how to communicate. SP will also suggest that this committee appoint someone to serve ex-officio on SP and to keep communications open between both groups. In November, we will set up some type of joint meeting, though we will need to determine what we want to accomplish.

Academic Redemption Policy
We discussed this and determined that there were not sufficient grounds or requests to re-open this. It was noted that any academic unit can establish their own standards, though they do have to follow university policy.

Summer Schedule (Lead: Leslie Williams)
This is likely to be a major issue, though it is not clear yet what role SP needs to play. Williams has been appointed as a member on a committee looking into changes to the summer schedule and will serve as SP’s lead on this issue. Horton will also check with EAC to ensure that Faculty Senate has meaningful role on issues dealing with a change in the summer schedule.

Gen Ed
This continues to be an issue. Horton will check with EAC to be sure someone or group from Faculty Senate is involved or at least informed.

Other Concerns
None raised at this time
Report of the Faculty Senate Policy Committee
12 May 2010 Meeting

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

Special guests: Fran Mcguire, Pat Smart, Cathy Sturkie

The Policy Committee met on 12 May 2010 to begin work in the new Senate year. The following items/issues were considered:

1. The committee discussed a Faculty Manual change related to the Alcohol and Other Drug Task Force brought forth by Elaine Richardson from the Academic Success Center. The suggested changes would alter the name of this body, provide a description of its charge in the Faculty Manual, and revise its membership. The committee was general supportive of the changes but had suggestions/questions regarding particulars related to the orientation of the mission of the Task Force, the length of terms, the chair (s)election process, and the role of the VPSA. The committee agreed on changes it would like to see in the draft FM revision. The draft has been provided to Dr. Richardson for her review and comment before the committee reconsiders this item at its next meeting.

2. The committee considered and approved a proposed change to the Faculty Manual related to representation of interdisciplinary graduate programs housed in the graduate school—an issue that Senator Denise Anderson worked on in the previous Senate year. The proposed change, which was endorsed by the Graduate Council on 28 April 2009, provides elected representation for these programs on the Graduate Advisory Committee and, as a result, on the Graduate Council. The approved proposed change was forwarded to the EAC for consideration.

3. The committee considered a proposed Faculty Manual change, kindly crafted by Fran McGuire, that would clarify the length/location-of-service requirements for sabbatical. An informal survey (attached) of 20 doctoral research intensive public institutions found that 18 had systemic university-wide sabbatical policies. Eleven of the 18 clearly require the standard 6 years of service at the institution to be eligible for sabbatical (some of the eleven do offer fractional sabbaticals for fewer years of service). It can probably be reasonably inferred that the same policy holds for the other 7 institutions, though the policy wording is not crystal-clear in these cases.

The proposed change considered by the committee would have allowed for exceptions to the 6-year minimum frequency of sabbaticals only in the case of written agreement at the time of
hire. In its discussions, the policy committee questioned and re-examined the purpose and benefits of sabbatical, the issue of to whom such benefits accrue, and the resource-sensitivity of and approval process for sabbatical requests. The committee also considered the legacy frequency of sabbatical in the context of institutional hiring and retention. At the end of its discussion, the committee felt that removing any limitation on period of service or sabbatical frequency would arm Clemson with unique ways of attracting and retaining faculty, allow departments and Chairs flexibility in incentivizing faculty and strategically promoting productivity, but not strain resources as long as sabbatical remains a competitive opportunity subject to resource availability and various stakeholder review.

Given the dramatic nature of such a change, the committee elected to contemplate possible implications and complications of such a change and discuss these at its next meeting.

4. The committee concluded its meeting with an informal discussion related to reports that the University plans on establishing a full 12-week summer semester and that 9-month faculty obligations might be (in part anyway) fulfilled during this summer period. The committee believes that myriad issues—most unidentified at present—related to Faculty Manual policy will manifest themselves when faculty engage in this 12-week summer semester. The committee further believed that such the entire Faculty Manual must be reviewed in the context of the 12-week summer semester to identify problematic policy issues and address them. The committee recommended to Faculty Senate President William Surver that a special ad hoc committee—having a chair experienced in Faculty Manual policy issues and productive work with the administration—be appointed to do so.
Sabbatical Policies—an informal survey

U Maryland College Park—6 years of service AT UMCP (service at other U Md institutions considered at discretion of President)  http://www.president.umd.edu/policies/ii200a.html

Michigan State University—6 years of service “TO THE UNIVERSITY”
http://www.hr.msu.edu/documents/facacadhandbooks/facultyhandbook/sabbatical.htm

Cornell—12 semesters of “active, on-campus professional service”
http://www.dfa.cornell.edu/dfa/cms/treasurer/policyoffice/policies/volumes/humanresources/upload/vol6_2_1.pdf

U Colorado Boulder—6 years of service “to the University”
http://www.colorado.edu/facultyaffairs/deskref/part6sabbaticals.htm

U Michigan—6 years of service in regular professorial ranks “at the University”
http://spg.umich.edu/pdf/201.30-2.pdf

U Florida—6 years of continuous full time service “to the university”
http://www.hr.ufl.edu/academic/sabbatical.asp

U Wisconsin—6 years of service “at the University of Wisconsin”
http://www.ohr.wisc.edu/grants/facsabb.html

LSU—6 years of service “on the campus”
http://www.lsusystem.edu/userfiles/file/PMs/pm-12.doc.pdf

UIUC—“served the University”...different options, either 6 or 8 or 3-4 years
http://www.uillinois.edu/trustees/statutes.cfm#sec97

U Alabama—“after six academic years of full-time employment at The University of Alabama”
http://facultysenate.ua.edu/handbook/chapter-3.html

U Delaware—FT member of “the faculty” for six full years...six appointment years of full-time service. I reasonably construe this as being at U Del, but unclear

WVU—unclear...six years of full time employment “in a faculty rank”
http://eberly.wvu.edu/r/download/14555

USC—unclear...six years of service “as a full-time faculty member”
http://www.sc.edu/provost/forms/sabbaticalrequest20092010.pdf
U Ky—unclear...6 years of “continuous eligible service”
http://www.as.uky.edu/WORKING/FACULTY-RESOURCES/POLICIES/Pages/Sabbatical.aspx

U Washington—unclear

Purdue—unclear

Georgia Tech—unclear

UNC—unclear

U Georgia—apparently no system sabbatical policy; individual dept’s do though

UVa—no university policy...each Dean maintains own policy
Report of the Faculty Senate Policy Committee  
August 2010

The Policy Committee met on 17 August 2010. Attending were Senators Claudio Cantalupo, Jeremy King (Chair), Kevin Layfield, Jane Lindle, and Pradip Srimani.

J. King provided the committee with an update on the issue of revising the sabbatical leave policy in the Faculty Manual. General Counsel has been independently considering the need for changes to the policy to avoid dual employment conflicts and, like the Policy Committee itself, to ease restrictions on the absolute length of terms of service to be eligible for sabbatical. J. King met with Rebecca Alley and Clay Steadman (Office of General Counsel) to discuss these concerns/suggestions. Ms. Alley and Mr. Steadman have augmented a draft of the Policy Committee's suggested changes with text addressing their concerns. The Policy Committee will consider this draft at its September meeting. Per the Faculty Manual, we expect any approved draft will have to be reviewed and approved by the Welfare Committee as well.

J. Lindle provided an update on the issue of student evaluation of teaching, which was a Faculty Senate agenda item tabled/postponed from last year. Given recent changes made by Wickes Wescott in the implementation of the evaluation instrument, the committee believes that the basic language in the proposed Faculty Manual change from last year is nearly sufficient for the Senate to reconsider this item. The committee did, however, believe that the interpretation of the evaluation data would benefit greatly from the availability of modulating or normalization factors such as the class grade distribution (or statistical moments thereof), etc. The committee asked Senator Lindle to work on draft language in the proposed Faculty Manual change that encouraged the provision and use and/or the need to recognize the consideration of such factors in the evaluation process.

The committee also engaged in a discussion on questions surrounding and issues associated with a reduction-in-force (RIF) policy. The committee felt that developing a set of guiding principles behind a RIF policy was a necessary step prior to working on the details of the process. Senator King has developed such a set of guiding principles and some initial ideas/language concerning the basic mechanism of a RIF policy; these have been provided to the committee for review/comment. Senator Pennington has kindly agreed to shoulder the task of continuing to develop, improve, and complete this draft with the aid of the committee.

The committee also discussed a RIF policy in terms of current AAUP guidelines. Besides malfeasance/misconduct and physical/mental health impairments, these guidelines recognize termination of tenure faculty for a) a financial exigency which threatens the survival of the entirety of an institution, and b) program elimination, in its entirety, that is based only on educational (presumably meaning “not financial”) considerations. There are not guidelines for intermediate cases
(elimination of a subset of faculty associated with programs, eliminating programs due to financial considerations without declaration of exigency, etc) in environments that are similar to the one in which we find ourselves now (e.g., significant financial stress/pressure but not so great as to threaten the entire existence of the University). The committee discussed whether a RIF policy might depart from AAUP guidelines. A number of advantages and disadvantages were recognized. While no strong feeling emerged, the committee leaned in the direction of the AAUP guidelines, which do provide protections against the malicious targeting individual faculty for elimination.
Proposed Faculty Manual Change
Part VII, Section F, Number 1 (Alcohol and Other Drug Task Force)

Current Wording:
Alcohol and Other Drugs Task Force consists of representatives of designated departments within the university as well as from the local community. The Vice President for Student Affairs appoints members to represent the following areas: university union, university housing, counseling and psychological services, health services/medical services, health services/health education, public safety, peer health educators, athletics, county, student government, public affairs/publications, Clemson city police, fraternities and sororities, campus ministry, graduate student government, and other individuals as appropriate. Two faculty members are elected by the Faculty Senate. The chair is elected annually by the committee.

Proposed Changes:
The Alcohol and Other Drugs Task Force Advisory Board is charged with reviewing and monitoring the student-oriented assessment, programming, and policy development for alcohol and other drugs, and in turn making recommendations to the administration. Membership will consist of 2 members elected by the Faculty Senate, 2 members elected by the Staff Senate, and other members as appointed by the Vice President for Student Affairs to represent each of the following areas: Dean of Students, Student Health Services, Gantt Center for Student Life, Residential Life, Undergraduate and Graduate Student Government, Campus Law Enforcement, Athletics, Media Services and other areas or individuals as deemed appropriate by the Vice President for Student Affairs. Elected members serve staggered 2 year terms, consists of representatives of designated departments within the university as well as from the local community. The Vice President for Student Affairs appoints members to represent the following areas: university union, university housing, counseling and psychological services, health services/medical services, health services/health education, public safety, peer health educators, athletics, county, student government, public affairs/publications, Clemson city police, fraternities and sororities, campus ministry, graduate student government, and other individuals as appropriate. Two faculty members are elected by the Faculty Senate. The chair is elected annually by the committee.

Final Wording:
The Alcohol and Other Drugs Advisory Board is charged with reviewing and monitoring the student-oriented assessment, programming, and policy development for alcohol and other drugs, and in turn making recommendations to the administration. Membership will consist of 2 faculty members elected by the Faculty Senate, 2 staff members elected by the Staff Senate, and other members as appointed by the Vice President for Student Affairs to represent each of the following areas: Dean of Students, Student Health Services, Gantt Center for Student Life, Residential Life, Undergraduate and Graduate Student Government, Campus Law Enforcement, Athletics, Media Services and other areas or individuals as deemed appropriate by the Vice
President for Student Affairs. Elected members serve staggered 2 year terms. The chair is elected annually by the committee.

**Rationale:** The Alcohol and Other Drug Task Force (AODTF), which began operating in Fall 2002, has no formal charge in the Faculty Manual. In as much as the AODTF continues to operate, and does so in an advisory fashion, the proposed change revises the name of the AODTF to an Advisory Board, and provides this Board with a charge that is consonant with its current de facto operation. A Community Coalition with complementary goals was formed several years ago, and the AODTF collaborates with them; thus, the change refines membership to stakeholders within the university.
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MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
AUGUST 24, 2010

1. Call to Order: The Faculty Senate Meeting was called to order at 2:32 p.m. by President William M. Surver, and guests were recognized and introduced.

2. Approval of Minutes: The General Faculty and Staff Meeting Minutes dated May 6, 2010 were approved as written, as were the Faculty Senate Minutes dated May 11, 2010.

3. “Free Speech”: None

4. Special Order of the Day – Professor Windsor W. Sherrill, Faculty Representative to the Board of Trustees, provided information regarding the Faculty Representative role as well as the structure of board of trustees. Also presented were highlights from recent reports to the board, including a presentation entitled, “If the Faculty Were a Village of 100 People...” and “An Overview of the Promotion and Tenure Process” (For copies please contact Dr. Sherrill.) Dr. Sherrill encouraged Senators to attend the Board meetings; stated that Trustees are truly interested in faculty morale, issues and concerns; and that an effort to bring Trustees to campus to partner with a faculty member for a day is being pursued.

5. Committee Reports:
   a. Senate Committees:
      1) Finance Committee – Rich Figliola, Chair, and stated that the first meeting will be held on September 7, 2010.
      
      2) Welfare Committee – Chair Michelle Martin stated that there was no report at this time and noted that former Senator Linda LiBleuel spoke with a reporter from the Anderson-Independent regarding campus childcare.
      
      3) Scholastic Policies Committee - Chair Bob Horton submitted and explained the Report dated August 17, 2010 (Attachment).
      
      4) Research Committee – Chair Paul Dawson stated that the Committee met prior to this Senate meeting to begin setting the agenda for this year. Senator Dawson noted that he will invite the new Vice President for Research to meet with the Committee and then to speak to the full Senate later in the fall semester. Four issues the Committee plans to address are: intellectual property at Clemson; the internal grant submission policy; development of a way to document non-traditional awards (especially in FAS) and consulting issues.

      5) Policy Committee – Jeremy King, Chair, submitted and explained the Reports dated May 12, 2010 and August, 2010 (Attachment).
b. University Commissions and Committees:
   1) **Budget Accountability Committee** - President Surver introduced Antonis Katsiyannis, who will chair this Committee.

6. President's Report: President Surver:
   a. announced that a faculty, staff and student picnic will be held Thursday, August 26, 2010 on Bowman Field at noon;
   b. stated that plans are underway to have faculty and staff events in order to form a faculty and staff gathering opportunity. On September 14th a joint lunch will be held at the Madren Center for the Faculty and Staff Senates. On the following Thursday, another joint social will be held at 4:30 p.m. at the Madren Center for both Senates.
   c. stated that beginning next week the three mission vice presidents will visit each department on campus to talk about a 20-25% departmental budget cut. Much discussions followed beginning with the question just what is to be gained or derived from these meetings.
   d. reminded lead senators to set up meetings among college senators and departments.
   e. stated that Bill Bowerman will chair an *ad hoc* Committee on Workload and Pat Smart will chair a Committee on the Academic Calendar.

7. Old Business: None

8. New Business:
   a. Proposed **Faculty Manual** Change – Jeremy King submitted for approval and explained, VII.F.1.Alcohol and Other Drug Task Force which was seconded. There was no discussion. Vote to approve was taken and passed unanimously with required two-thirds vote (Attachment).

9. Announcements:
   a. President Surver informed the Senate of the death of the wife of fellow Senator Robert Hewitt.

   b. The next Executive/Advisory Committee meeting will be held on August 31, 2010 at the Madren Center.

   c. The next Faculty Senate meeting will be on September 14, 2010 at the Madren Center.

   d. Senator Michelle Martin announced the upcoming FamilyFest to be held on August 29, 2010 from 2-4:00 p.m..

10. Adjournment: President Surver adjourned the meeting at 3:47 p.m.
Absent: D. Tonkyn (F. Chen for), G. Tissera (R. Moore for), S. Dutkiewicz, (M. Mastrovita for)
SCHOLASTIC POLICIES COMMITTEE – Bob Horton, Chair – (HEHD)
Sean Brittain (E&S)
David Tonkyn (AFLS) - absent
Xiaobo Hu (BBS)
Kelly Smith (AAH)
Leslie Williams (AAH)

Meetings: We’ll meet the 3rd Tuesday of the month at 2:30. Next meetings: 9/21, 10/19 in 402 Tillman.

Definition of Credit Hour
Horton will contact Stan Smith to see if something is happening on this and to see if there is something SP should do.

Graduate Advisory Committee
SP voiced unanimous support for the proposed change to the Graduate Advisory Committee.

Undergraduate Senate’s Academic Affairs Committee
Horton will meet with Ben Boone to discuss how to communicate. SP will also suggest that this committee appoint someone to serve ex-officio on SP and to keep communications open between both groups. In November, we will set up some type of joint meeting, though we will need to determine what we want to accomplish.

Academic Redemption Policy
We discussed this and determined that there were not sufficient grounds or requests to re-open this. It was noted that any academic unit can establish their own standards, though they do have to follow university policy.

Summer Schedule (Lead: Leslie Williams)
This is likely to be a major issue, though it is not clear yet what role SP needs to play. Williams has been appointed as a member on a committee looking into changes to the summer schedule and will serve as SP’s lead on this issue. Horton will also check with EAC to ensure that Faculty Senate has meaningful role on issues dealing with a change in the summer schedule.

Gen Ed
This continues to be an issue. Horton will check with EAC to be sure someone or group from Faculty Senate is involved or at least informed.

Other Concerns
None raised at this time
The Policy Committee met on 17 August 2010. Attending were Senators Claudio Cantalupo, Jeremy King (Chair), Kevin Layfield, Jane Lindle, and Pradip Srimani.

J. King provided the committee with an update on the issue of revising the sabbatical leave policy in the Faculty Manual. General Counsel has been independently considering the need for changes to the policy to avoid dual employment conflicts and, like the Policy Committee itself, to ease restrictions on the absolute length of terms of service to be eligible for sabbatical. J. King met with Rebecca Alley and Clay Steadman (Office of General Counsel) to discuss these concerns/suggestions. Ms. Alley and Mr. Steadman have augmented a draft of the Policy Committee’s suggested changes with text addressing their concerns. The Policy Committee will consider this draft at its September meeting. Per the Faculty Manual, we expect any approved draft will have to be reviewed and approved by the Welfare Committee as well.

J. Lindle provided an update on the issue of student evaluation of teaching, which was a Faculty Senate agenda item tabled/postponed from last year. Given recent changes made by Wickes Wescott in the implementation of the evaluation instrument, the committee believes that the basic language in the proposed Faculty Manual change from last year is nearly sufficient for the Senate to reconsider this item. The committee did, however, believe that the interpretation of the evaluation data would benefit greatly from the availability of modulating or normalization factors such as the class grade distribution (or statistical moments thereof), etc. The committee asked Senator Lindle to work on draft language in the proposed Faculty Manual change that encouraged the provision and use and/or the need to recognize the consideration of such factors in the evaluation process.

The committee also engaged in a discussion on questions surrounding and issues associated with a reduction-in-force (RIF) policy. The committee felt that developing a set of guiding principles behind a RIF policy was a necessary step prior to working on the details of the process. Senator King has developed such a set of guiding principles and some initial ideas/language concerning the basic mechanism of a RIF policy; these have been provided to the committee for review-comment. Senator Pennington has kindly agreed to shoulder the task of continuing to develop, improve, and complete this draft with the aid of the committee.

The committee also discussed a RIF policy in terms of current AAUP guidelines. Besides malfeasance/misconduct and physical/mental health impairments, these guidelines recognize termination of tenure faculty for a) a financial exigency which threatens the survival of the entirety of an institution, and b) program elimination, in its entirety, that is based only on educational (presumably meaning “not financial”) considerations. There are not guidelines for intermediate cases.
(elimination of a subset of faculty associated with programs, eliminating programs due to financial considerations without declaration of exigency, etc) in environments that are similar to the one in which we find ourselves now (e.g., significant financial stress/pressure but not so great as to threaten the entire existence of the University). The committee discussed whether a RIF policy might depart from AAUP guidelines. A number of advantages and disadvantages were recognized. While no strong feeling emerged, the committee leaned in the direction of the AAUP guidelines, which do provide protections against the malicious targeting individual faculty for elimination.
Proposed Faculty Manual Change
Part VII, Section F, Number 1 (Alcohol and Other Drug Task Force)

Current Wording:
Alcohol and Other Drugs Task Force consists of representatives of designated departments within the university as well as from the local community. The Vice President for Student Affairs appoints members to represent the following areas: university union, university housing, counseling and psychological services, health services/medical services, health services/health education, public safety, peer health educators, athletics, county, student government, public affairs/publications, Clemson city police, fraternities and sororities, campus ministry, graduate student government, and other individuals as appropriate. Two faculty members are elected by the Faculty Senate. The chair is elected annually by the committee.

Proposed Changes:
The Alcohol and Other Drugs Task Force Advisory Board is charged with reviewing and monitoring the student-oriented assessment, programming, and policy development for alcohol and other drugs, and in turn making recommendations to the administration. Membership will consist of 2 members elected by the Faculty Senate, 2 members elected by the Staff Senate, and other members as appointed by the Vice President for Student Affairs to represent each of the following areas: Dean of Students, Student Health Services, Gantt Center for Student Life, Residential Life, Undergraduate and Graduate Student Government, Campus Law Enforcement, Athletics, Media Services and other areas or individuals as deemed appropriate by the Vice President for Student Affairs. Elected members serve staggered 2 year terms, consists of representatives of designated departments within the university as well as from the local community. The Vice President for Student Affairs appoints members to represent the following areas: university union, university housing, counseling and psychological services, health services/medical services, health services/health education, public safety, peer health educators, athletics, county, student government, public affairs/publications, Clemson city police, fraternities and sororities, campus ministry, graduate student government, and other individuals as appropriate. Two faculty members are elected by the Faculty Senate. The chair is elected annually by the committee.

Final Wording:
The Alcohol and Other Drugs Advisory Board is charged with reviewing and monitoring the student-oriented assessment, programming, and policy development for alcohol and other drugs, and in turn making recommendations to the administration. Membership will consist of 2 faculty members elected by the Faculty Senate, 2 staff members elected by the Staff Senate, and other members as appointed by the Vice President for Student Affairs to represent each of the following areas: Dean of Students, Student Health Services, Gantt Center for Student Life, Residential Life, Undergraduate and Graduate Student Government, Campus Law Enforcement, Athletics, Media Services and other areas or individuals as deemed appropriate by the Vice
President for Student Affairs. Elected members serve staggered 2 year terms. The chair is elected annually by the committee.

**Rationale:** The Alcohol and Other Drug Task Force (AODTF), which began operating in Fall 2002, has no formal charge in the Faculty Manual. In as much as the AODTF continues to operate, and does so in an advisory fashion, the proposed change revises the name of the AODTF to an Advisory Board, and provides this Board with a charge that is consonant with its current de facto operation. A Community Coalition with complementary goals was formed several years ago, and the AODTF collaborates with them; thus, the change refines membership to stakeholders within the university.
MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
SEPTEMBER 14, 2010

1. Call to Order: The Faculty Senate Meeting was called to order at 2:35 p.m. by President William M. Surver, and guests were recognized and introduced.

2. Approval of Minutes: The Academic Convocation Minutes dated August 17, 2010 and the Faculty Senate Minutes dated August 24, 2010 were approved as distributed.

3. "Free Speech": None

4. Special Order of the Day – Arlene Stewart, Director, Student Disability Services and Jeff Dube, a student, provided information and shared personal experiences, respectively, regarding the Student Disability Services at Clemson (attachment) and urged faculty to always be aware that students may be uncomfortable approaching them with disability issues.

5. Committee Reports:
   a. Senate Committees:
      1) Finance Committee – Senator Wayne Goddard for Chair Rich Figliola, stated that the Committee met on September 7, 2010 and submitted the Report dated September 7, 2010. The Committee hopes to better understand University finances and find answers to such questions as where does money go and how is it spent (Attachment).

      2) Welfare Committee – Chair Michelle Martin stated that the Committee had not yet met but will soon.

      3) Scholastic Policies Committee - Chair Bob Horton noted that the Committee will meet Tuesday and will discuss credit for online courses. In November, the Student Senate Scholastic Committee Chair will meet with the Faculty Senate Scholastic Policies Committee.

      4) Research Committee –Chair Paul Dawson stated that the Committee has been communicating electronically. The Committee will look at the new Intellectual Property Policy that seems straightforward and will offer suggestions regarding implementation of the policy in which there is faculty involvement. It was suggested to identify faculty in areas to help in the review of the internal grant process. Senator Dawson spoke with Wickes Westcott who suggested that faculty might get words to attach to internal submissions to use in the future. The Committee will also pursue
ways in which to document non-traditional awards in the FAS system. There is a new Conflict of Interest Policy dealing with research that the Committee will also address.

5) Policy Committee – Jeremy King, Chair, noted that the Committee had not met since the last Senate meeting but that issues were being addressed behind the scenes. The Committee will meet next Tuesday.

b. University Commissions and Committees:
   1) Budget Accountability Committee - Antonis Katsiyannis, Chair, stated that this Committee’s first meeting on September 27th.

   2) Academic Calendar Committee – Chair Pat Smart stated that this Committee has met once and are looking at plans being presented; is trying to address issues that will arise and will compare summer school processes with other institutions.

   3) Status of Lecturers – Dan Warner, Chair, stated that the Committee will build upon the work of last year’s Committee chaired by Bill Pennington. He reminded the Senate that it accepted that Report and that it is now being addressed by the Policy Committee. He has prepared a draft report of his recent trip to Quebec to attend COCAL IX, the Ninth International Conference on Contingent Faculty and will share it soon. Vice President Warner asked Senators to submit names of people who would be contributors to this Committee membership.

   4) Committee on Workload – Chair Bill Bowerman, noted that the Committee will look at workload versus the calendar issue and anticipates being proactive

6. President’s Report: President Surver:
   a. announced that the first newsletter from him will be mailed to all faculty later this week;
   b. stated that he is included in the departmental visits by vice presidents to all departments;
   c. reminded Senators of a faculty/staff get together on Thursday, September 23rd, from 4:30-6:30 p.m. at the Madren Center;
   d. stated that the first lunch between both the Staff and the Faculty Senates was held today and was very successful;
   e. noted that he has been very involved in the “Will to Lead” Campaign and has been speaking with donors;
   f. noted that according to Angie Leidinger, Executive Secretary to the Board of Trustees, the interest in higher education has been rejuvenated and
   g. stated that the Board of Trustees are concerned about binge-drinking and are putting together a presentation that will be unveiled next month.

7. Old Business: None
8. **New Business:**
   a. Proposed *Faculty Manual* Change – Jeremy King submitted for approval and explained, VII, B. 2d. Graduate Advisory Committee. There was no discussion. Vote to approve was taken and passed with required two-thirds vote (Attachment).

9. **Announcements:**
   a. Vice President Dan Warner will chair the October Faculty Senate meeting.

   b. The deadline for nominations for the Class of '39 Award for Excellence is October 20, 2010.

   c. Pencil in October 14th for the Board of Trustees Dinner hosted by the Faculty Senate.

   d. The next Executive/Advisory Committee meeting will be held on September 28, 2010 at the Madren Center.

   e. The next Faculty Senate meeting will be held on October 12, 2010 with Debbie Jackson as Special Order of the Day discussing the upcoming SACS visit.

10. **Adjournment:** President Surver adjourned the meeting at 3:55 p.m.

    Linda Howe, Secretary

    Cathy Toth Sturkie, Program Coordinator

Absent: L. Temesvari, C. Starkey, J. Meriwether (M. Saltzman for), R. Figliola, P. Rangaraju, D. Anderson (S. Timmons for)
Faculty Accommodation Letters

- New format:
  - Designed to support faculty/student interaction
  - Reflects only instructional concerns
  - Items listed are faculty led and supported

Documentation

- Rigorous
- Vetted
- Some reviewed annually

Student Disability Services Stats
Spring 2010

- Total students: 665
- ADHD 310 Other (sleep, speech, temp) 7
- Deaf/HOH 10 Psychological 70
- LD 135 TBI 8
- Medical 99 Blind/VI 8
- Mobility 18

Clemson Position on Universal Design and Disability at Clemson

- It is the practice of Undergraduate Studies at Clemson University to create inclusive learning environments. Having a student with a disability in your class will give you the opportunity to evaluate your course design in terms of inclusiveness of student diversity. Some strategies that can move your course toward Universal Design and that could eliminate the need for accommodations/modifications are:
Faculty Senate Finance Committee Report

Meeting: 9/07/2010  Rm 215 Fluor Daniel EIB     2:30PM – 3:35PM

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

Submitted by: Senator Figliola

The Committee has organized for the year:

**Task 1: Compensation Report Study (Lead: Wang)**

The Committee will continue to work to ensure a clear and transparent annual compensation report. The committee is working towards “total compensation” reporting.

**Task 2: University Budget Flow (Lead: Figliola; Second: Goddard)**

The Committee is represented on the University Budget Accountability Committee (BAC). The BAC is scheduled to meet regularly this fall. Our interest is in transparent reporting of the money flow on campus, particularly to Programs, Centers and Institutes, a clear rationale for budget decisions, and the effects of budget cuts as they may pertain to faculty positions and realignments.

**Task 3: Study on On-Line Education (Lead: Hewitt)**

The Committee will review the financial conduct of on-line courses: (1) The money flow to/from courses; (2) Study the economics of on-line courses and the setting of tuition; (3) How on-line courses are monitored for quality/evaluation/assessment relative to campus lecture courses.

**Task 4: University International Programs Study (Lead: Morris)**

The growth of international programs brings questions as to administration and cost structures. The Committee will study the programs, fee structures, and administrative redundancies with an eye towards return on investment and efficiency.

**Other Business:**

The Committee will extend an invitation to the Graduate School Dean to discuss the activities of the Graduate School, its costs, and its outcomes. Later, we may extend the same courtesy to undergraduate studies.

A previous report from the College deans indicates that lab fees are for the most part return directly to the departments. Senator Meriwether will look into how lab fees are used and how they are factored into overall departmental budgets.

Senator Chapman will explore the origins of the mandate on collecting state taxes on all non-research equipment items.

Other business as brought to it by faculty.
Faculty Senate Finance Committee Report

Submitted by: Senator Figliola

Next Meeting: 10/19/2010 Rm 215 Fluor Daniel EIB 2:30PM

Task 2: University Budget Flow (Lead: Figliola; Second: Goddard)

The Committee is represented on the University Budget Accountability Committee (BAC, which met September 29, 2010. Chairman Antonis Katsiyannis will report on that meeting.

Task 4: University International Programs Study (Lead: Morris)

The Committee will study the programs, fee structures, and administration of international programs both to inform the faculty and to study return on investment and efficiency.

Action: Senator Morris met with Dave Grigsby and Teresa Wise of the Office of International Affairs. They provided a breakdown of fees.

_The Clemson University study abroad fee is 10% of in-state tuition. This fee funds operation of the Office of International Affairs-ensuring that students and faculty receive professional and innovative services based on the best and latest standards, principles of practice, and knowledge in the field of international education._

Dave and Teresa have offered to meet with the Faculty Senate or to the Committee to present activities of their office including clarifying about fees charged. We are also interested in how programs are initiated, evaluated (assessment), and whether there is some form of accreditation process for the credit hours awarded.
Faculty Senate Welfare Committee  
September 16, 2010  
Strode Tower 206

Present: Michelle Martin (Chair), Denise Anderson, Wayne Stewart, Mary LaForge, Danny Smith  
Absent: Prasad Rangaraju (teaching)

Called to order at 2:31

- **Emeritus Parking:** During the 2009-10 academic year, the one-line change to the Faculty Manual met with resistance in Advisory/Exec and never made it to the full floor of the Senate. We are in support of this change and will present it, again, to the Exec later this month. If Gary Powell, the representative from the Emeritus College, needs to come and speak to the Senate about this issue, he is willing. The change is to add this sentence to the end of Section III-7 of the Manual: “Emeritus faculty not receiving university compensation may apply for the privilege of free parking through the Emeritus College.”

- **Honor Code/Binge Drinking:** Michelle informed the committee that the Board of Trustees is pursuing this issue even though research has found that such a code has no impact on binge drinking. Denise Anderson asked whether this is even in the purview of our committee since it deals exclusively with students.

- **Child Care:** Danny Smith reported on Dori Helms’s discussion of child care at Clemson that followed the September 14 Faculty Senate meeting. She has been working on this since 1973 and has thus far failed to make it a priority for those at Clemson who could make it happen. The Welfare Committee decided that it’s time to craft a resolution concerning child care since faculty retention, quality of life, sense of community and the cost of replacing faculty who leave because of child care difficulties are all impacted by Clemson’s lack of child care. Michelle Martin will begin working on the resolution in support of the Provost’s assertion that without the rallying of a great deal of support from all over campus, Clemson will never have child care.

- **The outsourcing of Parking Services:** a Welfare Committee member raised the question of whether faculty, staff and students will have any input after the committee makes its decision. We have sent a question to a committee member to this effect.

Adjourned at 3:15
Graduate Credit from Other Institutions Applied to Undergraduate Degree
Jan Murdoch is crafting a draft statement for us to consider. Currently we allow 12 credits from CU to be applied for undergraduate, and initially the thought is do the same for other regionally accredited institutions.

Jan’s initial draft:

Draft policy proposal: To allow undergraduate students to apply up to 12 credits of graduate level coursework toward an undergraduate degree

Degree-seeking undergraduate students may apply up to 12 credits of graduate level coursework toward their undergraduate degree. If the credits were taken at another institution, they must be evaluated by the associated academic department at Clemson University. Ordinarily, credits will only be awarded from institutions in good standing with regional accrediting bodies and with professional accrediting organizations as applicable.

Scholastic Policies supports this and in fact questions why this would be limited to 12 hours. Horton has relayed our support and our question to Jan Murdoch and will pursue this with EAC.

Definition of Credit Hour
Stan Smith shared that with face-to-face instruction, 750 minutes per credit hour is the working guideline. We discussed the possibility of suggesting a guideline for online courses, though there is also concern that there will be a definition provided that we will have to follow.

Nevertheless, Williams will craft a draft statement for us to discuss at our next meeting.

Undergraduate Senate’s Academic Affairs Committee
Horton has met with Ben Boone to discuss communications, and will continue this on a regular basis. SP will also suggest that this committee appoint someone to serve ex-officio on SP and to keep communications open between both groups. In November, we will set up some type of joint meeting, though we will need to determine what we want to accomplish. Issues on their radar:
Reform of Academic Grievance. Should there be a standing committee? At the least, this should be linked with Academic Integrity. There is also a UG Judicial Branch that should perhaps be connected. **NOTE: If they pursue this, Scholastic Policies should be involved.**

Summer Calendar. There is some concern that students in travel abroad programs may not be able to do this and internships, as the short summers overlap others.

ENGL 103. There have been many complaints about the format and value of this course.

Interactions with the library and CCIT renovations.

There are also concerns about the quality of distance and online courses. **We need more information from the students to see what their concerns are, but we do believe we need better oversight. Horton will check with the Curriculum Committee to see if there are requirements for courses to be offered online.**

Course registration. There are issues that arise with the enforcement of pre-requisites and general frustration with getting into needed sections.

Absentee policy. Redfern no longer gives out "excuses," so students have to get notes from off-campus sources that may or may not be enforced. There is also a notification in BlackBoard but apparently faculty do not have to honor these.

They are also trying to make sense of CU's financial books to see how funding is passed on to the colleges.

Gen Ed. Dori has asked for a student group to determine what students want for Gen Ed.

**Graduate Committees**

Currently, chairs should flag something in FAS to indicate who is allowed to serve on graduate students' committees. Who should make this determination? What should the criteria be? Bruce Rafert will, I think, be putting a committee together on this, but does not want this to be dictated by the Graduate School. Horton will contact Rafert and ask that SP have a representative included on this committee.

**Faculty-Authored Textbooks**

Is there a plan in place at each college? Richard Cowden, auditor, 656-4899. There is a brief mention in Faculty Manual.

BBS has an active and functioning policy. Xiabo will send their policy to Horton to share and others will continue to check with their colleges to see what, if anything, is being done.

**Academic Integrity: Lead Kelly Smith**

See memo from Kelly. Should we expand issues of academic integrity beyond the classroom?
OLD/COMPLETED BUSINESS
Academic Redemption Policy
We discussed this and determined that there were not sufficient grounds or requests to re-open this in 2010-11. It was noted that any academic unit can establish their own standards, though they do have to follow university policy.

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. It would be helpful if there were a central place where all summer 2011 courses are listed, with registration not available until April.

Gen Ed
At this time, there is no movement on Gen Ed, so this is not an issue we need to consider at this time.

EPortfolios
All students are now required to provide documentation on 8 competencies.
Faculty Senate Research Committee Report from 10-04-10

1. The revised Intellectual Property review process which is being reviewed by the committee.
   http://www.clemson.edu/research/technology/policies/patents.html This revised policy is still being reviewed as it relates to research. One concern of the committee is:

   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. 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 Research the Research committee found the description for the IP committee to be vague. The Intellectual Property Committee was only defined as "representatives from the faculty and administration." The 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 senior contract advisor 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 serving in an ex-officio, non-voting capacity.
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.

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?

5. Reviewing **New Conflict of Interest Policy.** Still under review. Some interaction with consulting and research money acquisition.

6. New consulting policy was 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.
Report of the Faculty Senate Policy Committee
21 Sept 2010 Meeting

Committee members present: Claudio Cantalupo, Scott Dutkiewicz, Jeremy King, Dale Layfield, Jane Lindle, Pradip Srimani

Special guests: Fran Mcguire, Pat Smart, Cathy Sturkie, Dan Warner

The Policy Committee met on 21 Sept 2010 to continue work in the new Senate year as follows:

1. The committee discussed a Faculty Manual change related to the evaluation of teaching. This was an item postponed on the floor of the Senate last year due to concerns about instructor control of the temporal window of availability of the electronic evaluation instrument and about provision of additional useful data in the subsequent feedback to the instructor. The former concern has been remedied by changes in internal institutional procedure. As for the latter concern: the committee recommends that the Faculty Senate President confer with Senator Lindle, Dr. Wickes Wescott, and the Provost to assign or form a committee to examine gathering and reporting additional data (e.g., modulating factors such as expected course grades, gender, higher order statistical moments of the evaluation distribution, etc) in the student evaluation process.

The committee made minor wording changes to last year’s draft: calling attention to the importance of student evaluations being consistent with current research-based practices, and reiterating the mandate that student evaluations alone not be used to evaluate teaching. The proposed Faculty Manual change was sent to the EAC for review.

2. The committee considered and approved a proposed change to the Faculty Manual related to changes to the Faculty Manual. The proposed change would allow unusually urgent or critical updates to be immediately included in the Faculty Manual with the approval of the Executive Advisory Committee, 2/3 of the Senate, and the Provost (or BOT if required). For the historical record, the Policy Committee wishes to make clear its feelings that such immediate inclusions should be rare and intentionally difficult to accommodate. The proposed change also pushes back the date of the annual Faculty Manual update by one month to August 1st in order to allow sufficient time for revisions to be included.

3. The committee considered again a draft Faculty Manual change related to sabbatical leave. The draft would eliminate or loosen a rigid 6 year time requirement before or between sabbatical leaves. The committee believes this removal would enable the University to recruit, retain, professionally develop, and stimulate the productivity of high quality faculty. The draft also addresses concerns raised by General Counsel about certain forms of
remuneration received by faculty members during sabbatical leave—a concern for faculty who might otherwise unknowingly violate State law on dual employment—and about the necessity of returning to campus after sabbatical. The draft proposal has been sent to the Welfare Committee for its consideration.

4. Finally, the Committee heard from President Elect Dan Warner, who provided a synopsis of his forthcoming report on his recent attendance at a conference on contingent faculty. This intriguing summary led to a wide-ranging discussion of contingent faculty at Clemson and a host of other issues: the tie between tenure and academic freedom; fiscal, economic, and political constraints on the faculty infrastructure; the general education curriculum; and broadening the umbrella of regular faculty. President Elect Warner shared his perspective that the work of his committee on contingent faculty issues might be hampered if the Policy Committee proceeds too quickly with consideration of revisions to the Faculty Manual related to Senior Lecturers and a new Master Lecturer classification. The Policy Committee appreciated this concern, and eagerly anticipates concrete recommendations to the Policy Committee on how to proceed by President Elect Warner’s committee in the next 2-3 months.

Sabbatical Policies—an informal survey

U Maryland College Park—6 years of service AT UMCP (service at other U Md institutions considered at discretion of President) [http://www.president.umd.edu/policies/ii200a.html](http://www.president.umd.edu/policies/ii200a.html)

Michigan State University—6 years of service “TO THE UNIVERSITY” [http://www.hr.msu.edu/documents/facacadhandbooks/facultyhandbook/sabbatical.htm](http://www.hr.msu.edu/documents/facacadhandbooks/facultyhandbook/sabbatical.htm)
Cornell—12 semesters of “active, on-campus professional service”
http://www.dfa.cornell.edu/dfa/cms/ treasurer/policyoffice/policies/volumes/humanresources/upload/vol6_2_1.pdf

U Colorado Boulder—6 years of service “to the University”
http://www.colorado.edu/facultyaffairs/deskref/part6sabbaticals.htm

U Michigan—6 years of service in regular professorial ranks “at the University”
http://spg.umich.edu/pdf/201.30-2.pdf

U Florida—6 years of continuous full time service “to the university”
http://www.hr.ufl.edu/academic/sabbatical.asp

U Wisconsin—6 years of service “at the University of Wisconsin”
http://www.ohr.wisc.edu/grants/facsabb.html

LSU—6 years of service “on the campus”
http://www.lsusystem.edu/userfiles/file/PMs/pm-12.doc.pdf

UIUC—“served the University”...different options, either 6 or 8 or 3-4 years
http://www.uiuinois.edu/trustees/statutes.cfm#sec97

U Alabama—“after six academic years of full-time employment at The University of Alabama”
http://faculty senate.ua.edu/handbook/chapter-3.html

U Delaware—FT member of “the faculty” for six full years...six appointment years of full-time service. I reasonably construe this as being at U Del, but unclear

WVU—unclear...six years of full time employment “in a faculty rank”
http://eberly.wvu.edu/r/download/14555

USC—unclear...six years of service “as a full-time faculty member”
http://www.sc.edu/provost/forms/sabbaticalrequest20092010.pdf

U Ky—unclear...6 years of “continuous eligible service”
http://www.as.uky.edu/WORKING/FACULTY-RESOURCES/POLICIES/Pages/Sabbatical.aspx

U Washington—unclear

Purdue—unclear
Georgia Tech—unclear

UNC—unclear

U Georgia—apparently no system sabbatical policy; individual dept's do though

UVa—no university policy...each Dean maintains own policy
Proposed Change to the Faculty Manual
Part VII, Section B, Number 2, d (Graduate Advisory Committee)

Current Wording:
d. Graduate Advisory Committee independently studies and reviews policy on non-curricular graduate student academic matters and on those issues affecting the general welfare of graduate students. Membership consists of one faculty member from each college elected by the collegiate faculties for three-year terms and two graduate students appointed by the president of graduate student government. The non-voting chair is the Vice-Provost and Dean of the Graduate School.

Proposed Changes:
d. Graduate Advisory Committee independently studies and reviews policy on non-curricular graduate student academic matters and on those issues affecting the general welfare of graduate students. Membership consists of one faculty member from each college elected by the collegiate faculties for three-year terms, one faculty member representing all the interdisciplinary graduate programs housed within the Graduate School elected by the interdisciplinary graduate program faculty as identified by the Dean of the Graduate School for a three-year term, and two graduate students appointed by the president of graduate student government. The non-voting chair is the Vice-Provost and Dean of the Graduate School.

Final Wording:
d. Graduate Advisory Committee independently studies and reviews policy on non-curricular graduate student academic matters and on those issues affecting the general welfare of graduate students. Membership consists of one faculty member from each college elected by the collegiate faculties for three-year terms, one faculty member representing all the interdisciplinary graduate programs housed within the Graduate School elected by the interdisciplinary graduate program faculty as identified by the Dean of the Graduate School for a three-year term, and two graduate students appointed by the president of graduate student government. The non-voting chair is the Vice-Provost and Dean of the Graduate School.

Rationale: There currently exist (and have existed previously) graduate programs that are not housed within colleges—nor does it seem practical for some programs to be housed within a traditional college. These (typically interdisciplinary) graduate programs are officially housed within the Graduate School itself. Currently, these programs do not have direct representation as a program per se in graduate-related policy-making. The proposed change gives the interdisciplinary graduate programs a voice and ear on the Graduate Advisory Committee, and (concomitantly) also on the Graduate Council. The proposed change was endorsed by the Graduate Advisory Committee itself in Spring 2010, and by the Graduate Council at its 28 April 2010 meeting.
1. Lab Fees. Major projects funded in the past 3 years. 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.

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

3. Academic infrastructure-classrooms, dorms, commons, FIKE like facility...Funding is limited...lots of options are being considered!

4. Set 2010-2011 Committee goals

Agenda Items - Tuesday, October 26, 2010 – 3:30pm – 206 Sikes Hall

1. President’s Compensation Committee- Update (Brett Dalton, CFO)

2. CU Budget 2010-11 Overview (Brett Dalton, CFO)

3. Student Fees-break down; trends over the last 5 years (Brett Dalton, CFO)
Proposed Faculty Manual Change

Part II, Section C (Procedures for Updating the Manual), paragraph #3

Current Wording:

The specific revision of the Faculty Manual will take effect on the July 1st following final approval by the Provost, or the Board of Trustees for those changes subject to the Board’s approval. The approved resolution will be incorporated into both the master hard copy of the Faculty Manual maintained in the Faculty Senate Office by the Program Coordinator and the electronic version of the Faculty Manual no later than July 1st to be used during the next academic year. This process of incorporation will be at the direction of the Editorial Consultant and under the oversight of the Senate President. When it is completed, the Senate President will report to the Senate and Provost that the Manual has been updated. Overall responsibility for maintaining and distributing the Clemson University Faculty Manual is vested in the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost and is carried out by the Faculty Senate Office.

Proposed Wording:

The specific revision of the Faculty Manual will take effect on the July August 1st following final approval by the Provost, or the Board of Trustees for those changes subject to the Board’s approval. The approved resolution will be incorporated into both the master hard copy of the Faculty Manual maintained in the Faculty Senate Office by the Program Coordinator and the electronic version of the Faculty Manual no later than July August 1st to be used during the next academic year. This process of incorporation will be at the direction of the Editorial Consultant and under the oversight of the Senate President.

There may be extenuating circumstances when immediate inclusion of an adopted revision in the Manual is required or highly desirable for the time-critical promotion of faculty welfare. To ensure continuity in adherence to the Manual and minimize inadvertent violations of the Manual by members of the University community, immediate inclusions shall not be made as a matter of convenience but, instead, reserved for those rare cases where adopted revisions are unusually timely or urgent and do not place an undue burden upon faculty. Immediate inclusion of specific revisions must first be approved, on a case-by-case basis, by the Faculty Senate Executive Advisory committee. The approved request must then be brought to the Senate and requires approval by two-thirds of the Senators present. Immediate inclusion requests approved by the Senate must be subsequently approved by the Provost or, for those changes subject to Board of Trustees approval, the Board of Trustees. The Senate President must, within 10 weekdays following final approval, notify all faculty of any immediate revisions to the Faculty Manual.

When it is completed, The Senate President will report to the Senate, and Provost, and faculty whenever that the Manual has been updated. Overall responsibility for maintaining and distributing the Clemson University Faculty Manual is vested in the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost and is carried out by the Faculty Senate Office.
Final Wording:

The specific revision of the *Faculty Manual* will take effect on the August 1st following final approval by the Provost, or the Board of Trustees for those changes subject to the Board’s approval. The approved resolution will be incorporated into both the master hard copy of the *Faculty Manual* maintained in the Faculty Senate Office by the Program Coordinator and the electronic version of the *Faculty Manual* no later than August 1st to be used during the next academic year. This process of incorporation will be at the direction of the Editorial Consultant and under the oversight of the Senate President.

There may be extenuating circumstances when immediate inclusion of an adopted revision in the Manual is required or highly desirable for the time-critical promotion of faculty welfare. To ensure continuity in adherence to the Manual and minimize inadvertent violations of the Manual by members of the University community, immediate inclusions shall not be made as a matter of convenience but, instead, reserved for those rare cases where adopted revisions are unusually timely or urgent and do not place an undue burden upon faculty. Immediate inclusion of specific revisions must first be approved, on a case-by-case basis, by the Faculty Senate Executive Advisory committee. The approved request must then be brought to the Senate and requires approval by two-thirds of the Senators present. Immediate inclusion requests approved by the Senate must be subsequently approved by the Provost or, for those changes subject to Board of Trustees approval, the Board of Trustees. The Senate President must, within 10 weekdays following final approval, notify all faculty of any immediate revisions to the Faculty Manual.

The Senate President will report to the Senate, Provost, and faculty whenever the Manual has been updated. Overall responsibility for maintaining and distributing the *Clemson University Faculty Manual* is vested in the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost and is carried out by the Faculty Senate Office.

Rationale:

It may be necessary to amend the Faculty Manual on short notice. Such occasions will be rare but may occur. The current Manual does not provide any latitude in the dates for incorporation of changes into the Manual. The proposed change provides a mechanism to accommodate immediate inclusion of adopted changes to the Manual if necessary. The proposed change imposes stringent requirements for immediate changes in the Manual.
H. Emeritus Faculty

Regular faculty members, including library faculty, who have served at least five years at the university and fifteen years in the academic profession receive the title of Emeritus or Emerita appended to their professorial rank upon official retirement.

In recognition of their service to the university, their honored place in the university community, and their ongoing capacities for advancing human knowledge and contributing to the intellectual and cultural life of the university, emeritus faculty as scholars have certain rights and privileges accorded to them by Clemson University. For example, they are members of the university faculty (see Part VIII below, Faculty Constitution, Article I, Section 1) and are welcome to participate fully in all meetings of the university faculty. Colleges and academic departments may extend similar invitations to their retired colleagues. Emeritus faculty not receiving university compensation may request the privilege of free parking through the Emeritus College.

I. Retired Faculty

It is the policy of the university to allow emeritus and other retired faculty and staff to use as many of its facilities and services as practicable. To this end the university provides a faculty identification card upon request to the university personnel division, which is used for Library and other privileges. Retired faculty may, upon application, be granted faculty parking privileges, receive reduced rates on athletic tickets, obtain membership in Fike Recreation Center, retain access to university computing services, and enjoy any other benefits accorded to faculty which do not exert undue financial burdens upon the university. In addition, they may request the use of available office and/or lab space and may apply, upon approval, for university research grants under the same rules as other faculty.

Those retired faculty who remain professionally active shall be allocated office and laboratory space to an extent commensurate with the level of their activity. Not less than three nor more than twelve months prior to retirement, the faculty member shall submit to the department chair a brief description of the nature and proposed level of activity. If the faculty member and chair cannot agree upon the allocation of space, the matter shall be referred to the dean of the college. If the matter cannot be reconciled at that level, it shall be adjudicated by an ad hoc committee consisting of a department chair from another college appointed by the Provost, a member of the Faculty Senate research committee appointed by the Faculty Senate President, and a chaired professor elected by the chaired professors. This committee shall conduct expeditious hearings, which shall include seeking input from faculty in the affected department, as well as from the retiree, the department chair, and the dean. The recommendation of this committee shall be final. Annually, three months prior to the anniversary of retirement, the retired faculty member shall submit to the department chair a concise report of activities in the previous year and a description of the proposed activities for the following year. Disagreements on the continuation of space assignments will be resolved in the manner described above.
Proposed Faculty Manual Change
Part 9, Section D, #11 (Evaluation of Teaching by Students)

Current Wording:

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

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

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

- evaluation of course materials, learning objectives, and examinations by peers and/or supervisors,
- in-class visitation by peers and/or supervisors,
- a statement by the faculty member describing his/her methodology,
- exit interviews/surveys with current graduates and alumni,
- additional criteria as appropriate to the discipline, and
- any rejoinders or comments on student evaluations provided by the faculty member.
11. Evaluation of Teaching by Students. The university provides a standard form that meets the minimum requirements of best current research-based practices for student evaluation of teaching faculty. 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 week 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. These forms will be distributed in every class near the end of the semester. The instructor will announce to the students that completed the completed evaluations forms will not be examined reviewed until course grades have been submitted. If instructors use class time for the on-line evaluation, it is required that instructors then they must leave the room during the evaluation while forms are being completed by students. A student proctor will conduct the evaluation.

Student assessment of instruction is mandatory for all instructors at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. Summary of statistical ratings from student assessment of instruction (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) electronic copies of all summaries of all statistical ratings and student comments for the purpose of verification to verify that the evaluations have been carried out and provide an archive for individual faculty who may need them in the future. Summary of statistical ratings from student assessment of instruction would be available to department chairs through the data warehouse but the actual responses from students (including comments) would not be available unless the faculty opted to submit them. Faculty may also opt to make available additional information regarding their teaching.

Other evaluation methods which must be given at least equal weight in the teaching evaluation process include one or more. 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 methodology,
- exit interviews/surveys with current graduates and alumni,
- additional criteria as appropriate to the discipline, and
- any rejoinders or comments on student evaluations provided by the faculty member.
Final Proposed Wording (with changes):

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 week of the semester, the instructor must activate the on-line evaluation and then inform the students that the evaluation should be completed by the end of the semester. The instructor will announce to the students that the completed evaluations will not be reviewed until course grades have been submitted. If instructors use class time for the on-line evaluation, then they must leave the room during the evaluation.

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

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

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

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

Rationale for changes:

This section has been rewritten for consistency with the current student evaluation procedure, which uses an on-line form. The proposed wording mandates that the student evaluation form be consistent with current research-based practices in teaching evaluation. The revisions also provide three important needed clarifications: the difference in chair access to University/department question statistical summaries versus instructor question statistical summaries; the right of a course instructor to make his/her evaluation question summaries and all comments available to his/her chair; and the role of the University in maintaining the evaluation database. The change reiterates current wording, which apparently goes unheeded in some
quarters, that evaluation of teaching in be carried out using other results in addition to student evaluations. Finally, the revisions establish that student comments are optional possible criteria for evaluation of teaching if the instructor elects to make them available.
MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
OCTOBER 12, 2010

1. Call to Order: The Faculty Senate Meeting was called to order at 2:35 p.m. by President Bill Surver, and guests were recognized and introduced.

2. Approval of Minutes: The Faculty Senate Minutes dated September 14, 2010 were approved as written.

3. “Free Speech”: None

4. Special Order of the Day: Debra Jackson, Vice Provost and Assistant to the President, provided information on the current status of the Reaffirmation Report of Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) including the implications of the Monitoring Report which is due April 15, 2011, and a reminder of the reaffirmation deadlines (Clemson’s reaffirmation date is 2013). She noted that this process is done every ten years (Attachment).

5. Committee Reports:
   a. Senate Committees:
      1) Finance Committee: Rich Figliola, Chair, submitted and explained the Committee Report dated September 7, 2010 (Attachment).
      2) Welfare Committee: Michelle Martin, Chair, submitted and explained the Committee Report dated September 16, 2010 (Attachment).
      3) Scholastic Policies Committee: Bob Horton, Chair, submitted and explained the Committee Report dated September 21, 2010 (Attachment).
      4) Research Committee: Dvora Perahia for Chair Paul Dawson, submitted and explained the Committee Report dated October 4, 2010 (Attachment).
      5) Policy Committee: Jeremy King, Chair, submitted and explained the Committee Report dated September 21, 2010 (Attachment).
   b. Select Faculty Senate Committees
      1) Budget Accountability Committee - Chair Antonis Katsiyannis submitted and explained the Committee Report dated October 1, 2010 (Attachment).
      2) Academic Calendar Committee – Chair Pat Smart provided an update on the work of this Committee which will be a long-term committee looking at
the impact on faculty and students of a change in the calendar and will identify red flags and ways to address the issues.

3) **Lecturer Committee** – Chair Dan Warner stated that there is no report but that he would like nominations for membership to this Committee. He will provide a report from a meeting he recently attended on contingent faculty in Canada which addresses many of the concerns regarding and from lecturers at Clemson.

4) **Workload Committee** – Chair Bill Bowerman stated that this Committee will meet on November 3, 2010.

c. **University Commissions and Committees:**
   1) **Compensation Advisory Group** – President Surver noted that this Committee is identifying criteria to incentivize faculty for bonuses, which will not be for everyone.

6. **President’s Report:** President Surver:
   a. described his visits to individual departments accompanying the three mission vice presidents;
   b. noted that the his Faculty Senate Newsletter #2 has been mailed to all faculty;
   c. announced that the Faculty Senate will lunch with the Staff Senate prior to the November 9th meeting (more information shortly);
   d. stated that the Faculty/Staff’s Social to which the Board of Visitors was invited was very successful (about 200 people were present);
   e. asked the Senate to think about the possibility of building a Habitat for Humanity House with the Staff Senate to be voted upon at a later date;
   f. stated that there will be a march to Columbia by the faculty, staff and students in February to highlight the diminishing funds for higher education to the new state government;
   g. announced that the faculty will be honored at tonight’s soccer game and
   h. informed the Senate of the passing of dear friend and former Faculty Senator and Alternate, Adly Girgis, Professor of Electrical and Computing Engineering.

7. **Old Business:** None

8. **New Business:**
   a. **Proposed Faculty Manual Change** – II.C. Procedures for Updating the Faculty Manual – Senator King submitted and explained which President Surver further explained. There was no discussion. Vote was taken and proposed change passed unanimously with required two-thirds vote.
b. Proposed *Faculty Manual* Change – III.7. H. Emeritus Faculty – Senator King submitted and explained. There was no discussion. Vote was taken and proposed change passed with required two-thirds vote.

c. Proposed *Faculty Manual* Change – IX.D.11. Evaluation of Teaching – Senator King submitted and explained. Much discussion followed. Vote was taken and proposed change passed with required two-thirds vote.

9. **Announcements:**
   a. The Board of Trustees Dinner will be held on Thursday, October 14th at the Owen Pavilion, Madren Center. President Surver encouraged Senators to respond to the invitation.

   b. The Class of ’39 Award for Excellence nominations are due to the Faculty Senate Office on October 20, 2010.

   c. The next Executive/Advisory Committee meeting will be held on November 30, 2010.

   d. The next Faculty Senate meeting will be held on November 9th during which the Faculty Senate will vote on the recipient of the 2010 Class of ’39 Award for Excellence.

10. **Adjournment:** President Surver adjourned the meeting at 4:40 p.m.

   [Signature]

   Linda A. Howe, Secretary

   [Signature]

   Cathy Toth Sturkie, Program Coordinator

Absent: P. Dawson (M. Espey for); H. Luo (F. Chen for); R. Hewitt, X. Hu
Reaffirmation Deadlines

Current Status—Monitoring Report

October 12, 2010
Student Learning Outcomes

SACS Monitoring Report
The university has not sufficiently documented that it:

- is assessing the extent to which it achieves its program and student learning outcomes;
- is making improvements in its educational programs and student learning outcomes;
- is assessing the extent to which it achieves its program and student learning outcomes;

Insitutional Effectiveness: Educational Programs
Comprehensive Standard 3.3.1.1
Key Points

- Highlight and interpret the results of assessment measures as a function of the results
- Document improvements in programs/student or have not been achieved
- Reveal the extent to which the outcomes have
- Assessment measures
- Highlight and interpret the results of
Clemson has identified the expected outcomes, assessment measures, and achievement targets. However, there is insufficient evidence of improvements as a direct result (even when evidence showed minimum success). Insufficient evidence of improvements as a direct result was not achieved. The extent to which the outcomes were or were not achieved is insufficiently described in the report, with a focus on describing and interpreting the analyses rather than analyzing the extent to which the outcomes were achieved. Clemson has identified the expected outcomes, assessment measures, and achievement targets.
Completion of WEAVE online for 2009-01 academic year—the assessment results, analysis, and plans for improvement are needed. The analysis of the results, plans for improvement, and documentation of proposed changes are needed. Programs Academic Departments/
Sources of Documentation

- Adding a statement to the Curriculum and Course Change System
- Discussion of assessment results on departmental agendas and in minutes
- Include in department curriculum committee meeting minutes
- Include in University Curriculum minutes
- Discussion of assessment results on
Change in our policy is recommended

courses and dissertation
delineated in the graduate announcements
Handbooks must be online; number of hours
delineated in the Graduate Announcements
above the post baccalaureate (42 plus 18 = 60)
above the post masters (12 plus 18 = 30) or
hours above the masters (12 plus 18 = 30)
Policy versus Practice Regarding number of
Doctoral Program Length

Program Length

Federal Standard 4.4

UNIVERSITY
Clemson
Institutional Buuy-in Critical for QEP

Institutional Buy-in Critical for QEP

Student Learning and accomplishment the mission of the

Learning outcomes and/or the environment supportive

Emerging from institutional assessment and focuses on

includes an institutional process for identifying key issues

Quality Enhancement Plan

Compliance Report and Off Campus Review

Two Step Process

SACS Reaffirmation

UNIVERSITY

Clemson
Compliance with additional Federal Requirements (7)  

- Resources  
- Programs  
- Institutional mission, governance, and effectiveness  

Compliance with the Comprehensive Standards (14 [57 responses])  

Core Requirement 12 is the Quality Enhancement Plan  

Compliance with the Core Requirements (12 [16 responses])  

Commitment to Quality Enhancement  

Integrity
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Track B</th>
<th>Time Line for Institutions Offering Graduate and Undergraduate Programs or Only Graduate Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Orientation of Leadership Teams</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Nov. 2 - 5 | On-Site Peer Review Conducted  
Off-Site Certification Due                      |
| 2013    | On-Site Peer Review Conducted  
Quality Assurance Plan Due (and optional focused Report)                                      |
| Dec. 3 - 6 | Review by the Commission on Colleges                                                             |
| 2011    |                                                                                                  |
| 2012    |                                                                                                  |
| 2013    |                                                                                                  |
CLEMSON Documents and Reports

UNIVERSITY

offsight stage
- Institution submits Compliance Certification Document
- Off-site committee issues "Preliminary Findings"

On-site stage
- Institution submits Focused Report(s) and Quality Enhancement Plan
- On-site committee issues "Report of the Reaffirmation Committee"

Commission stage
- Institution submits Response to Report to the Visiting Commission Committee
- Commission issues "Action Letter"

- Reaffirm/Deny reaffirmation
- No monitoring/Monitoring

Documents and Reports
CLEMSON Readiness Audit

- Gain deep understanding of core requirements and comprehensive standards
- Identify the right people to do the work
- Identify problem areas (no surprises)
- Potential compliance issues
- Lack of documentation to provide evidence of compliance
- Implement solutions
- Have all technology and database support in place
- Be completely ready to start preparing the narratives

Readiness Audit

UNIVERSITY
Clemson
First Steps

Initial review activities conducted by small planning group:

- Provide initial interpretation of core requirements and comprehensive standards
- Identify potential compliance issues
- Identify potential documentation issues
- Identify who should be part of the Compliance Certification team
- Conduct initial research
The first step is an audit of the college and departmental faculty credentials. How many transcripts are missing? Is it complete and meaningful?

- Person teaching without credentials.review
- How many transcripts are missing?
- Departmental faculty
- First step is an audit of the college and Facult credentials
Faculty Senate Finance Committee Report

Meeting: 9/07/2010 Rm 215 Fluor Daniel EIB 2:30PM – 3:35PM

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

Submitted by: Senator Figliola

The Committee has organized for the year:

Task 1: Compensation Report Study (Lead: Wang)

The Committee will continue to work to ensure a clear and transparent annual compensation report. The committee is working towards “total compensation” reporting.

Task 2: University Budget Flow (Lead: Figliola; Second: Goddard)

The Committee is represented on the University Budget Accountability Committee (BAC). The BAC is scheduled to meet regularly this fall. Our interest is in transparent reporting of the money flow on campus, particularly to Programs, Centers and Institutes, a clear rationale for budget decisions, and the effects of budget cuts as they may pertain to faculty positions and realignments.

Task 3: Study on On-Line Education (Lead: Hewitt)

The Committee will review the financial conduct of on-line courses: (1) The money flow to/from courses; (2) Study the economics of on-line courses and the setting of tuition; (3) How on-line courses are monitored for quality/evaluation/assessment relative to campus lecture courses.

Task 4: University International Programs Study (Lead: Morris)

The growth of international programs brings questions as to administration and cost structures. The Committee will study the programs, fee structures, and administrative redundancies with an eye towards return on investment and efficiency.

Other Business:

The Committee will extend an invitation to the Graduate School Dean to discuss the activities of the Graduate School, its costs, and its outcomes. Later, we may extend the same courtesy to undergraduate studies.

A previous report from the College deans indicates that lab fees are for the most part return directly to the departments. Senator Meriwether will look into how lab fees are used and how they are factored into overall departmental budgets.

Senator Chapman will explore the origins of the mandate on collecting state taxes on all non-research equipment items.

Other business as brought to it by faculty.
Present: Michelle Martin (Chair), Denise Anderson, Wayne Stewart, Mary LaForge, Danny Smith
Absent: Prasad Rangaraju (teaching)

Called to order at 2:31

- **Emeritus Parking:** During the 2009-10 academic year, the one-line change to the Faculty Manual met with resistance in Advisory/Exec and never made it to the full floor of the Senate. We are in support of this change and will present it, again, to the Exec later this month. If Gary Powell, the representative from the Emeritus College, needs to come and speak to the Senate about this issue, he is willing. The change is to add this sentence to the end of Section III-7 of the Manual: “Emeritus faculty not receiving university compensation may apply for the privilege of free parking through the Emeritus College.”

- **Honor Code/Binge Drinking:** Michelle informed the committee that the Board of Trustees is pursuing this issue even though research has found that such a code has no impact on binge drinking. Denise Anderson asked whether this is even in the purview of our committee since it deals exclusively with students.

- **Child Care:** Danny Smith reported on Dori Helms’s discussion of child care at Clemson that followed the September 14 Faculty Senate meeting. She has been working on this since 1973 and has thus far failed to make it a priority for those at Clemson who could make it happen. The Welfare Committee decided that it’s time to craft a resolution concerning child care since faculty retention, quality of life, sense of community and the cost of replacing faculty who leave because of child care difficulties are all impacted by Clemson’s lack of child care. Michelle Martin will begin working on the resolution in support of the Provost’s assertion that without the rallying of a great deal of support from all over campus, Clemson will never have child care.

- **The outsourcing of Parking Services:** a Welfare Committee member raised the question of whether faculty, staff and students will have any input after the committee makes its decision. We have sent a question to a committee member to this effect.

Adjourned at 3:15
SCHOLASTIC POLICIES COMMITTEE – Bob Horton, Chair – (HEHD)
Sean Brittain (E&S)
David Tonkyn (AFLS)
Xiaobo Hu (BBS)
Kelly Smith (AAH)
Leslie Williams (AAH)
Also in attendance: Stan Smith

Meetings: Next meeting: 10/19 in 402 Tillman.

Graduate Credit from Other Institutions Applied to Undergraduate Degree
Jan Murdoch is crafting a draft statement for us to consider. Currently we allow 12 credits from CU to be applied for undergraduate, and initially the thought is do the same for other regionally accredited institutions.

Jan’s initial draft:

Draft policy proposal: To allow undergraduate students to apply up to 12 credits of graduate level coursework toward an undergraduate degree

Degree-seeking undergraduate students may apply up to 12 credits of graduate level coursework toward their undergraduate degree. If the credits were taken at another institution, they must be evaluated by the associated academic department at Clemson University. Ordinarily, credits will only be awarded from institutions in good standing with regional accrediting bodies and with professional accrediting organizations as applicable.

Scholastic Policies supports this and in fact questions why this would be limited to 12 hours. Horton has relayed our support and our question to Jan Murdoch and will pursue this with EAC.

Definition of Credit Hour
Stan Smith shared that with face-to-face instruction, 750 minutes per credit hour is the working guideline. We discussed the possibility of suggesting a guideline for online courses, though there is also concern that there will be a definition provided that we will have to follow.

Nevertheless, Williams will craft a draft statement for us to discuss at our next meeting.

Undergraduate Senate’s Academic Affairs Committee
Horton has met with Ben Boone to discuss communications, and will continue this on a regular basis. SP will also suggest that this committee appoint someone to serve ex-officio on SP and to keep communications open between both groups. In November, we will set up some type of joint meeting, though we will need to determine what we want to accomplish. Issues on their radar:
Reform of Academic Grievance. Should there be a standing committee? At the least, this should be linked with Academic Integrity. There is also a UG Judicial Branch that should perhaps be connected. **NOTE: If they pursue this, Scholastic Policies should be involved.**

Summer Calendar. There is some concern that students in travel abroad programs may not be able to do this and internships, as the short summers overlap others.

ENGL 103. There have been many complaints about the format and value of this course. Interactions with the library and CCIT renovations.

There are also concerns about the quality of distance and online courses. **We need more information from the students to see what their concerns are, but we do believe we need better oversight. Horton will check with the Curriculum Committee to see if there are requirements for courses to be offered online.**

Course registration. There are issues that arise with the enforcement of pre-requisites and general frustration with getting into needed sections.

Absentee policy. Redfern no longer gives out “excuses,” so students have to get notes from off-campus sources that may or may not be enforced. There is also a notification in BlackBoard but apparently faculty do not have to honor these.

They are also trying to make sense of CU’s financial books to see how funding is passed on to the colleges.

Gen Ed. Dori has asked for a student group to determine what students want for Gen Ed.

**Graduate Committees**
Currently, chairs should flag something in FAS to indicate who is allowed to serve on graduate students’ committees. Who should make this determination? What should the criteria be? Bruce Rafert will, I think, be putting a committee together on this, but does not want this to be dictated by the Graduate School. Horton will contact Rafert and ask that SP have a representative included on this committee.

**Faculty-Authored Textbooks**
Is there a plan in place at each college? Richard Cowden, auditor, 656-4899. There is a brief mention in Faculty Manual.

BBS has an active and functioning policy. Xiabo will send their policy to Horton to share and others will continue to check with their colleges to see what, if anything, is being done.

**Academic Integrity: Lead Kelly Smith**
See memo from Kelly. Should we expand issues of academic integrity beyond the classroom?
OLD/COMPLETED BUSINESS

Academic Redemption Policy
We discussed this and determined that there were not sufficient grounds or requests to re-open this in 2010-11. It was noted that any academic unit can establish their own standards, though they do have to follow university policy.

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. It would be helpful if there were a central place where all summer 2011 courses are listed, with registration not available until April.

Gen Ed
At this time, there is no movement on Gen Ed, so this is not an issue we need to consider at this time.

EPortfolios
All students are now required to provide documentation on 8 competencies.
1. The revised **Intellectual Property** review process which is being reviewed by the committee. [http://www.clemson.edu/research/technology/policies/patents.html](http://www.clemson.edu/research/technology/policies/patents.html) This revised policy is still being reviewed as it relates to research. One concern of the committee is:

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. 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 Research the Research committee found the description for the IP committee to be vague. The Intellectual Property Committee was only defined as "representatives from the faculty and administration." The 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 senior contract advisor 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 serving in an ex-officio, non-voting capacity.*
Report of the Faculty Senate Policy Committee
21 Sept 2010 Meeting

Committee members present: Claudio Cantalupo, Scott Dutkiewicz, Jeremy King, Dale Layfield, Jane Lindle, Pradip Srimani

Special guests: Fran Mcguire, Pat Smart, Cathy Sturkie, Dan Warner

The Policy Committee met on 21 Sept 2010 to continue work in the new Senate year as follows:

1. The committee discussed a Faculty Manual change related to the evaluation of teaching. This was an item postponed on the floor of the Senate last year due to concerns about instructor control of the temporal window of availability of the electronic evaluation instrument and about provision of additional useful data in the subsequent feedback to the instructor. The former concern has been remedied by changes in internal institutional procedure. As for the latter concern: the committee recommends that the Faculty Senate President confer with Senator Lindle, Dr. Wickes Wescott, and the Provost to assign or form a committee to examine gathering and reporting additional data (e.g., modulating factors such as expected course grades, gender, higher order statistical moments of the evaluation distribution, etc) in the student evaluation process.

The committee made minor wording changes to last year’s draft: calling attention to the importance of student evaluations being consistent with current research-based practices, and reiterating the mandate that student evaluations alone not be used to evaluate teaching. The proposed Faculty Manual change was sent to the EAC for review.

2. The committee considered and approved a proposed change to the Faculty Manual related to changes to the Faculty Manual. The proposed change would allow unusually urgent or critical updates to be immediately included in the Faculty Manual with the approval of the Executive Advisory Committee, 2/3 of the Senate, and the Provost (or BOT if required). For the historical record, the Policy Committee wishes to make clear its feelings that such immediate inclusions should be rare and intentionally difficult to accommodate. The proposed change also pushes back the date of the annual Faculty Manual update by one month to August 1st in order to allow sufficient time for revisions to be included.

3. The committee considered again a draft Faculty Manual change related to sabbatical leave. The draft would eliminate or loosen a rigid 6 year time requirement before or between sabbatical leaves. The committee believes this removal would enable the University to recruit, retain, professionally develop, and stimulate the productivity of high quality faculty. The draft also addresses concerns raised by General Counsel about certain forms of
remuneration received by faculty members during sabbatical leave—a concern for faculty who might otherwise unknowingly violate State law on dual employment—and about the necessity of returning to campus after sabbatical. The draft proposal has been sent to the Welfare Committee for its consideration.

4. Finally, the Committee heard from President Elect Dan Warner, who provided a synopsis of his forthcoming report on his recent attendance at a conference on contingent faculty. This intriguing summary led to a wide-ranging discussion of contingent faculty at Clemson and a host of other issues: the tie between tenure and academic freedom; fiscal, economic, and political constraints on the faculty infrastructure; the general education curriculum; and broadening the umbrella of regular faculty. President Elect Warner shared his perspective that the work of his committee on contingent faculty issues might be hampered if the Policy Committee proceeds too quickly with consideration of revisions to the Faculty Manual related to Senior Lecturers and a new Master Lecturer classification. The Policy Committee appreciated this concern, and eagerly anticipates concrete recommendations to the Policy Committee on how to proceed by President Elect Warner’s committee in the next 2-3 months.

Sabbatical Policies—an informal survey

U Maryland College Park—6 years of service AT UMCP (service at other U Md institutions considered at discretion of President)  http://www.president.umd.edu/policies/11200a.html

Michigan State University—6 years of service “TO THE UNIVERSITY”  http://www.hr.msu.edu/documents/facacadhandbooks/facultyhandbook/sabbatical.htm
Cornell—12 semesters of “active, on-campus professional service”
http://www.dfa.cornell.edu/dfa/cms/ treasurer/policyoffice/policies/volumes/humanresources/upload/vol6_2_1.pdf

U Colorado Boulder—6 years of service “to the University”
http://www.colorado.edu/facultyaffairs/deskref/part6sabbaticals.htm

U Michigan—6 years of service in regular professorial ranks “at the University”
http://spg.umich.edu/pdf/201.30-2.pdf

U Florida—6 years of continuous full time service “to the university”
http://www.hr.ufl.edu/academic/sabbatical.asp

U Wisconsin—6 years of service “at the University of Wisconsin”
http://www.ohr.wisc.edu/grants/facsabb.html

LSU—6 years of service “on the campus”
http://www.lsusystem.edu/userfiles/file/PMs/pm-12.doc.pdf

UIUC—“served the University”...different options, either 6 or 8 or 3-4 years
http://www.uillinois.edu/trustees/statutes.cfm#sec97

U Alabama—“after six academic years of full-time employment at The University of Alabama”
http://facultysenate.ua.edu/handbook/chapter-3.html

U Delaware—FT member of “the faculty” for six full years...six appointment years of full-time service. I reasonably construe this as being at U Del, but unclear

WVU—unclear...six years of full time employment “in a faculty rank”
http://eberly.wvu.edu/r/download/14555

USC—unclear...six years of service “as a full-time faculty member”
http://www.sc.edu/provost/forms/sabbaticalrequest20092010.pdf

U Ky—unclear...6 years of “continuous eligible service”
http://www.as.uky.edu/WORKING/FACULTY-RESOURCES/POLICIES/Pages/Sabbatical.aspx

U Washington—unclear

Purdue—unclear
Georgia Tech—unclear

UNC—unclear
http://www.northcarolina.edu/policy/index.php?pg=dl&id=7851&inline=1&return_url=%2Fpolicy%2Findex.php%3Fpg%3Dtoc%26id%3D7486

U Georgia—apparently no system sabbatical policy; individual dept’s do though

UVa—no university policy...each Dean maintains own policy
Present: Helms, Warner, Westcott, Katsiyannis

1. Lab Fees. Major projects funded in the past 3 years. 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

2. Salary report. The format of last year's report will be maintained(e.g., explanation on raises)

3. Academic infrastructure-classrooms, dorms, commons, FIKE like facility...Funding is limited...lots of options are being considered!

Capital Improvement Project Plans?

4. Set 2010-2011 Committee goals

For Information:

Agenda Items - Tuesday, October 26, 2010 – 3:30pm – 206 Sikes Hall

1. President's Compensation Committee- Update (Brett Dalton, CFO)

2. CU Budget 2010-11 Overview (Brett Dalton, CFO )

3. Student Fees-break down; trends over the last 5 years (Brett Dalton, CFO )
MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
NOVEMBER 9, 2010

1. Call to Order: The Faculty Senate Meeting was called to order at 2:35 p.m. by President Bill Surver, and guests were recognized and introduced.

2. Approval of Minutes: The Faculty Senate Minutes dated October 12, 2010 were approved as written.

3. Election of the 2010 Recipient of the Class of '39 Award for Excellence – Election of this year’s Award recipient was held by secret ballot. Following the election, Pat Smart (Provost’s Designee) and Dale Layfield (appointed by Faculty Senate President Bill Surver) counted the secret ballots and delivered the results to President Surver.

4. “Free Speech”: None

5. Special Order of the Day: David W. Grigsby, VP/Director of International Affairs, informed the Senate of the activities of this office, “it’s programs and services designed to develop an academic environment at Clemson, in which global awareness and cultural diversity are emphasized (Attachment).”

6. Committee Reports:
   a. Senate Committees:
      1) Finance Committee: Rich Figliola, Chair, submitted and explained the Committee Report dated October 19, 2010 (Attachment).

      2) Welfare Committee: Senator Denise Anderson for Michelle Martin, Chair, submitted and explained the Committee Report dated October 21, 2010 (Attachment).

      3) Scholastic Policies Committee: Bob Horton, Chair, submitted and explained the Committee Report dated October 19, 2010 (Attachment) and noted that items for consideration will be addressed during New Business.

      4) Research Committee: No verbal report (The October 4, 2010 Committee Report is attached.)

      5) Policy Committee: Jeremy King, Chair, submitted and explained the Committee Report dated October 19, 2010 (Attachment).

   b. Select Faculty Senate Committees
      1) Budget Accountability Committee - Chair Antonis Katsiyannis submitted and explained the Committee Report dated October 26, 2010 (Attachment).
2) Academic Calendar Committee – Chair Pat Smart stated that this Committee will meet on November 11, 2010.

3) Lecturer Committee – Chair Dan Warner stated that the Committee will meet within the next two weeks. He had a preliminary meeting with Provost Helms regarding lecturers and where the Committee will go.

4) Workload Committee – Chair Bill Bowerman stated that this Committee met last week. Committee has attempted to establish which colleges have been completing information regarding workload and, it seems, that Engineering & Sciences has the closest procedure. Committee will complete its charge and then forward findings to the Welfare and Policy Committees to address in respective capacities.

c. University Commissions and Committees: None

7. President’s Report: President Surver:
   a. stated that a letter was sent to Provost Helms and Wickes Westcott regarding faculty serving on Graduate Committees;
   b. stated that the email from him to faculty on the Policy on Conflict of Interest (COI) resulted in lots of comments from faculty and staff. This policy has not been enacted and the committee that authored it will consider the faculty and staff concerns;
   c. reminded Senators and faculty that SACS requires that courses and certificates that are taught off-campus must be reported;
   d. reminded Senators and faculty that they must provide a skeleton syllabus to the syllabus repository;
   e. stated that the Board of Trustees Dinner was very successful;
   f. announced that the February Faculty Senate/Staff Senate trip to Columbia is being planned;
   g. Larry LaForge, the current Faculty Athletic Representative, is going to retire. The process to replace him will begin soon; and
   h. Asked Senators about the environment on campus.

8. Old Business: None

9. New Business:
   a. Senator Horton submitted and explained the Statement on Graduate Level Credits toward Undergraduate Degree for endorsement by the Senate. There was no discussion. Vote was taken and proposed endorsement passed unanimously. Endorsed statement will be forwarded to Dean Jan Murdoch.

   b. Three proposed Faculty Manual Changes were explained and submitted as one by Senator King (V. G. Paragraph 2, The Grievance Board; V. I. Paragraph 1, Grievance Hearings; V. I. 3. Grievance Hearings). A friendly amendment was offered and seconded; there was no discussion and vote on amendment was taken and passed unanimously. The floor was then opened for discussion on the entire proposed
change. There was no discussion. Vote was then taken on amended proposed change that passed unanimously with required two-thirds vote.

c. Proposed Faculty Manual Change – X. C. 1. Professional Activities – Senator King submitted and explained. There was no discussion. Vote was taken and proposed change passed unanimously with required two-thirds vote.

d. Habitat for Humanity – In an effort to help with morale, President Surver explained an opportunity to build a house in Central, South Carolina for Habitat for Humanity beginning in spring. This would be a Faculty Senate and Staff Senate endeavor. President Surver then made a motion to pursue this joint project of the Faculty and Staff Senates which was seconded. There was no discussion. Vote to pursue project was taken and passed unanimously.

9. Announcements:
a. The next Executive/Advisory Committee meeting will be held on November 30, 2010.

b. The next Faculty Senate meeting will be held on December 14th.

10. Adjournment: President Surver adjourned the meeting at 4:32 p.m.

Linda A. Howe, Secretary

Cathy Toth Sturkie, Program Coordinator

Faculty Senate Finance Committee Report

Meeting: 11/16/2010  Rm 215 Fluor Daniel EIB  2:30PM – 3:20PM

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

Submitted by: Senator Figliola

Task 1: Compensation Report (Lead: Wang)

Senator Wang discussed with Wickes Westcott the annual University Compensation Report. The next report will be published in January 2011 and will include prior Senate Finance Committee suggestions. The Committee is suggesting that total compensation (from all University sources) be included in next year’s report.

Task 2: University Budget Flow (Lead: Figliola)

The Committee is represented on the University Budget Accountability Committee (BAC). The BAC meets November 22, 2010 to go over numerical details of the current fiscal budget (revenues, expenses, sources). Brett Dalton will visit the Senate in December to go over these details.

Task 4: University International Programs Study (Lead: Morris)

The Finance Committee discussed the invited Nov 9 presentation to the Senate by David Grigsby on the budget, costs, and goals of the International Studies programs. We will continue dialogue with this Office as to whether it would be useful to include more faculty involvement tied to the quality, delivery, and assessment/continuing improvement of these International Study programs. We are also interested in knowing the total cost of delivery and revenues, including College-level costs that he did not report on, and will suggest considerations for having one single University office to be able to account fiscally for these programs.

Other business:

Senator Chapman explored the basis behind applying a sales and use tax to all purchases. She reported that the “Sales and Use Tax” is applied to all supplies and services, both research and educational. Grant awarding bodies defer to state tax laws and allow sales and use taxes to be paid. To qualify for the sales tax exemption, both of the following questions MUST be answered YES.

1. Will more than 50% of total use will be directly for research and development?

2. Does the equipment (machine) meets the description of SC Code 12-36-2120(56) below?

    SC Code 12-36-2120(56): Machines used in research and development. “Machines” includes machines and parts of machines, attachments, and replacements which are used or manufactured for use on or in the operation of the machines, which are necessary to the operation of the machines, and which are customarily used in that way. “Machines used in research and development” means machines used directly and primarily in research and development, in the experimental or laboratory sense, of new products, new uses for existing products, or improvement of existing products.

    Advice: Fill-out those “research and development use only forms” with each appropriate purchase – faculty should keep a filled out standard form on their computer desktop and attach to all acceptable orders.
Faculty Senate Welfare Committee Minutes  
Thursday, November 18, 2010, 2:30  
Strode 206  
Present: Denise Anderson, Michelle Martin, Wayne Stewart

- Head/Chair Change consideration: Michelle explained the difference between Head (appointed, serves at the pleasure of the Dean) and Chair (elected by the faculty for usually a limited time period) and explained that we changed the title from Head to Chair several years ago but continued the practice of Heads (appointed). The committee would like to see Chairs elected, but we were not in favor of the time limit since that is appropriate for some and less so for others. We also wanted more information on HOW the elections would be done.

- Parking outsourcing – Lead: Prasada Rangaraju reported only to the committee

- Faculty Manual Change concerning sabbatical leave: has been passed back to Policy, who will send it on to the EAC.

- Binge Drinking- Lead: Denise Anderson has invited Gail DiSabatino, who is planning to come to a Welfare meeting soon.

- Child Care – Lead: Michelle Martin—all below is just for information as we begin to consider our own resolution.
  
  o Cornell just had a resolution about continuing/discontinuing their contract with Bright Horizons; decided to keep it through 2013 but create an advisory board to address problems: the resolution [http://theuniversityfaculty.cornell.edu/pdfs/childcareres.pdf](http://theuniversityfaculty.cornell.edu/pdfs/childcareres.pdf); letter from Cornell’s President: [http://www.news.cornell.edu/stories/Nov10/UAannouncement.html](http://www.news.cornell.edu/stories/Nov10/UAannouncement.html) (Nov. 2010); problems with Bright Horizons: [http://cornellsun.com/section/news/content/2010/09/22/faculty-propose-cutting-ties-day-care-service](http://cornellsun.com/section/news/content/2010/09/22/faculty-propose-cutting-ties-day-care-service)

  o University of Alabama Resolution: [http://www.ua.edu/academic/facsen/06-07/ResolutionOnChildCareNeeds032505.htm](http://www.ua.edu/academic/facsen/06-07/ResolutionOnChildCareNeeds032505.htm) (March 2005)

  o UC Santa Cruz Resolution, August 2004 (perhaps a model for our own?):

  In the spring, CFW [Committee of Faculty Welfare] brought a resolution to the Senate, which passed unanimously.

  The resolution read:

  WHEREAS high quality, affordable child care is critical to faculty and staff parents and should be a cornerstone of a healthy campus community,

  WHEREAS child care is recognized as crucial for faculty and staff morale, as well as faculty and staff recruitment and retention, even by those who do not currently need it themselves,

  WHEREAS the number of child care spaces on campus does not meet the need of our faculty and staff,

  WHEREAS there is limited availability of affordable child care in the larger Santa Cruz community,

  THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT we urge the UCSC administration to move forward with speed to provide for additional childcare for the campus community, and in particular for the families of faculty and staff.
Academic Eligibility Policy Committee
At the Council of Undergraduate Studies meeting on November 12, Scholastic Policies was asked to have a member on a committee that will investigate our academic eligibility policy. Jeff Appling had proposed giving students three semesters, instead of two, prior to academic suspension. The policy and proposal are available. David Tonkyn will be our representative.

Academic Integrity and Academic Redemption
Currently these policies are somewhat at odds with each other. SP was asked to make a recommendation on a proposal. Currently Academic Integrity states, “If a student if 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 do not support this proposed change to the Academic Redemption Policy. While we agree that the two policies need to match, we believe the Academic Integrity Policy should be modified to match the Academic Redemption Policy. 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 is to leave the current Academic Redemption Policy alone.

Undergraduate Senate’s Academic Affairs Committee
Ben Boone led a discussion of items that the Academic Affairs of the Undergraduate Senate is considering. Among these are the following:
- Reform of Academic Grievance and how Grievance interacts with Academic Integrity. Though Academic Integrity seems to run smoothly, Academic Grievance does not always. There are many issues that overlap and a lack of cohesion between these organizations and others that are
similar. The issue of an Honor Code is related to this, though no real progress in deciding whether an Honor Code is desirable.

- The quality of distance and online courses. Debbie Jackson has shared a document from SACS that has some good information, and I've forwarded this document to Ben. Unfortunately, many online courses do not follow the guidelines outlined here. Academic Affairs is seeking more information from the students to see what their concerns are, but there is agreement that better oversight is needed. Debbie Jackson is setting up a committee to look into this. Dr. Smith indicated that how this committee states its goal and task is important as faculty will insist on their right to control the curriculum and their courses. However, if the committee states that they are investigating to see if there is a problem, then they should be okay.

- Course registration. Initially some concerns were voiced about the enforcement of pre-requisites and general frustration with getting into needed sections. Enforcement of pre-requisites is not a big issue, though there are other concerns and questions with registration.
  - How is it determined when students register within their class? A freshman was last to register in both summer and for spring, while another freshman with a similar name was allowed to register a week earlier.
  - Some labs are closed so a student is kicked out of lecture on a daily basis, even though she cannot register for the lab, and even if the class is in her major field.
  - There are not sufficient spots in required courses or General Education courses, especially for those with late registration times.
  - Even though there is no guarantee of enrollment when a student requests a class, requested hours are counted toward the 19 hour limit. Thus many students are registered for 11 or fewer (perhaps even 5!) hours until the semester starts. This is a pretty significant problem.

However, it doesn’t seem that much head-way can be made without investment in a replacement system for SIS, so this project has been largely dropped in the meantime.

- Absentee policy. Redfern no longer gives out “excuses,” so students have to get notes from off-campus sources for medical excuses. Though there is a notification in BlackBoard, this notification carries little weight. Tyler Goff (HHS chair on Student Senate) is working on this. This is still a touchy subject. There is a problem with communication. Redfern’s likely perspective is that this isn’t their job, though other medical facilities regularly provide documentation for students who are ill. Perhaps there is a checkbox that Redfern could complete to alert faculty. Ben, Tyler, and Jeff Appling are meeting to see what they can do. Students should not have to go outside Redfern to get documentation.

- Gen Ed. Dori has asked for a student group to determine what students want for Gen Ed. This will be a “brainstorming” group, with four student representatives from each college who will meet at the end of November with the Provost. This may be wrapped into QEP (Quality Enhancement Program) for SACS in some way. Dr. Tonkyn pointed out that there are two very different views of General Education: 1) Skills for the job market (e.g., technical writing and communications) and 2) a broad-based education (e.g., arts and literature).

- Departmental exams are often a problem when non-instructors grade sections of an exam. However, this practice seems very entrenched and this has been dropped as a project.

- Teacher use of BlackBoard. They would like to provide means for helping faculty use BlackBoard more effectively. Joey has received many complaints from students about teachers’ inability to upload assignments or use the grade book feature. One possibility is that they will ask CCIT to provide training sessions in departmental meetings and then ask faculty members to take a test or become certified. SP commented that certification or testing would not be well received by the faculty. Perhaps something on this could be included in FAS or on student evaluations of faculty. A related concern was that there have been many complaints about freshmen not being
able to interpret midterm grades. A broader issue could be the lack of appropriate communication on the part of some faculty members.

- Publicizing Teacher Evaluations and their importance. The new placement on BlackBoard may help this. No major developments there.

- The Summer Calendar committee is looking into a long-term “staggering up” of courses, with more 300 and 400-level courses being offered in the summer, and a “staggering down” of tuition as course enrollments come up. They are putting together a survey for the student body to find out why students do or do not come to CU for summer school. Departments are encouraged to think about what courses might be offered at summer to bring in more demand.

- Logan has worked on giving greater purpose to student senators who were elected to represent their respective colleges. The thought is to create an advisory board under each college. This melds with another initiative about helping students looking to change majors make that choice. Perhaps some type of Townhall meeting or open house meeting could be set up to have professors explain what their programs might be like for students. Some colleges have intro courses that help students decide whether a change of major might be a good idea; perhaps other colleges could follow suit.

- Dr. Smith suggested thinking about laptop usage in classes. Many classes don’t allow laptops in classes. There are some legitimate questions about usage, but not to allow them when students are required to purchase them may be something to think about.

- Academic Redemption. Ryan Barker and Academic Affairs are waiting on data from the Registrar’s Office as to who has used AR the most before making a recommendation. They believe the current policy is unfair as failing students have an advantage over B and C students. The original intent was to help freshmen who get off to a rough start. Options are to eliminate it, expand it, or perhaps leave it alone. Dr. Smith indicated that faculty would not support expanding Academic Redemption to C’s (much less B’s).

**Faculty-Authored Textbooks**
Richard Cowden, auditor, 656-4899. There is a brief mention in Faculty Manual.

We have discussed a possible form and are seeking clarification from Richard Cowden on some issues. Our intention is to have some type of form readily available in every college office. At this point, we are still waiting a response to our questions.

**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). This is something we need to look at in future meetings.
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. It would be helpful if there were a central place where all summer 2011 courses are listed, with registration not available until April.

Gen Ed
At this time, there is no movement on Gen Ed, so this is not an issue we need to consider at this time.

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 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.
Report of the Faculty Senate Policy Committee
16 November 2010 Meeting

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

Special guests: Fran Mcguire, Pat Smart, Cathy Sturkie

The Policy Committee met on 16 October 2010 and conducted the following business:

1. The committee discussed, revised, and approved a proposed Faculty Manual change regarding sabbatical policy returned from the Welfare Committee. The proposed change: softens the currently hard 6-year service eligibility criterion for sabbatical, prohibiting employment elsewhere while on sabbatical (consulting/independent contracting is allowed), requiring faculty to sign an agreement to return to University service after sabbatical, and describing a clear procedure for administrative Faculty to apply for sabbatical. The proposed change has been sent to the E/A Committee, who suggested revisions concerning the 6-year service eligibility criterion and sought clarification of the meaning of employment. Rebecca Alley and Clay Steadman (General Counsel office) are kindly assisting in making needed clarifications.

2. The committee discussed a Faculty Manual change—kindly offered and endorsed by President Barker, Marvin Carmichael, and Clay Steadman—recognizing the President’s Sustainability Commission as a committee reporting to the President. The committee endorsed the idea, but had questions concerning the proposed composition of the committee that were echoed by feedback from University staff members received by Senator Dutkiewicz. Senator King will contact Marvin Carmichael and Clay Steadman for clarification and further input.

3. The committee discussed and approved a Faculty Manual change concerning faculty awards having financial remuneration from public funds. The change notes the existence of HR policy (consistent with State appropriations statutes) concerning eligibility for publicly funded remuneration. The change was forwarded to the E/AC for consideration.

4. The committee discussed a Faculty Manual change—kindly offered and endorsed by President Barker, Marvin Carmichael, and Clay Steadman—that would remove the Athletic Council as an entity reporting to the President. While the committee appreciated the good intention of the proposal was to improve the logical structure of the Faculty Manual in the best spirit of cooperative governance, the committee believed that because final authority for
oversight of athletics does reside with the office of the President, this Council/Commission should remain in its present location in the Faculty Manual. Subsequent discussions with the NCAA faculty representative Larry LaForge revealed that altering the location of the Athletics Council within the structure of the Faculty Manual would likely be in conflict with the NCAA Constitution. As a result of these considerations, the proposers withdrew their proposed Faculty Manual change.
CU Budget 2010-11-An overview of the budget for fiscal year ending in June 30, 2011 was presented by Brett Dalton, CFO. Information was provided on unrestricted and restricted revenue as well as restricted and unrestricted expenditures. 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 fell as percentage of CU Budget from 5.2% to 3.9 (more cuts forthcoming in this category)

Dalton will provide an overview of the current budget and projected budget at the December faculty senate meeting

Next Meeting: TBA
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.
Office of International Affairs

David Grigsby
Vice Provost for International Affairs

E-302 Martin Hall
656-1455

http://www.clemson.edu/ia

grigsby@clemson.edu

http://www.clemson.edu/ia
OlA's Mission is to...
...offer a wide range of programs, activities, and services designed to develop an academic environment at Clemson, in which global awareness and cultural diversity are emphasized.

...Mission is to...
OIA was established in 2004 to consolidate international activity across the campus. Two main departments were organized.

- International Programs
- International Services

All offices are located on the 3rd floor of the Martin "E" section.
International Programs
Director: Dr. Teresa Wise

- Advise, support, and assist study abroad students (910 students studied abroad in AY 2009-10)
- Collaborate with faculty on study abroad
- Establish and maintain exchange agreements
- Implement new programs – development, approval, and implementation
- Advise, support, and assist study abroad students (910 students studied abroad in AY 2009-10)

Director: Dr. Teresa Wise
International Programs
International Services

Director: Mr. Peter Li

• Provide Immigration services to over 1,600 international students, scholars and visitors.
• Assist employees in obtaining U.S. permanent resident status.
• Verify status for 200 others.
• Verify employment, compute benefits and payroll taxes for all members of the international community, and for visitors.
OIA Finances - Sources of funds

- Total OIA budget: $793,440.
- We receive $576,888 in E&G funds.
- The remaining 25.6% comes from fees:
  - Study Abroad fees - schedule on our website
  - International Student fee: $15 per semester
  - International Visitor fee: $150 (one-time)
  - Small Grants: approx $10,000-$15,000/yr
  - Small grants: approx $10,000-$15,000/yr

We receive $576,888 in E&G funds.

Total OIA budget: $793,440.
OIA Finance - Uses of funds

• Payroll expenses: $704,060
  13 staff & 2 grad students

• Travel: $33,520

• Other: Supplies & miscellaneous:
  $176,419

- Operating leases
- Advertising & promotional materials
- Operating leases
- Membership dues & subscriptions
- Office expenses, telephones
- Postage & express
- Advertising & promotional materials
- Membership dues & subscriptions
- Operating leases
## OIA Budget, FY 2010-2011

### Sources of Funds:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;G funds</td>
<td>$576,888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int. Visitor fee</td>
<td>$10,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int. student fee</td>
<td>$33,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA fees</td>
<td>$173,052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$793,440</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Use of Funds:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Payroll exp</td>
<td>$704,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>$33,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$55,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int. Visitor fee</td>
<td>$10,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int. student fee</td>
<td>$33,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.A. fees</td>
<td>$173,052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$793,440</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ExC funds** $576,888
Clemson's students and faculty will be known as global citizens who are –

- Familiar with, and comfortable in, cultures other than their own;
- Sensitive to the differences among people, yet cognizant of their similarities; and
- Responsive to the needs of people from a diversity of origins.

Our Vision
The Committee has organized for the year:

**Task 2: University Budget Flow** (Lead: Figliola)

The Committee is represented on the University Budget Accountability Committee (BAC). The BAC is scheduled to meet Tuesday October 26, 2010 at 3:30.

**Task 4: University International Programs Study** (Lead: Morris)

Professor Morris has arranged for David Grigsby to visit with the faculty senate in November to discuss the activities of the international programs office, and tuition and fees, how funds are used, and assessment methods to ensure quality.

**Other Business:**

Senator Meriwether discussed lab fees and how a portion of these fees are used for administrative directives and the remainder returned to the Colleges and eventually to the departments that earned them. A question for discussion was brought up both electronically and during the meeting concerning the purpose of lab fees. If lab fees are imposed and collected with the notion of replacing the direct cost items associated with a students use of lab equipment, then should they be used for indirect cost purposes, such as renovations of depleted facilities (and not necessarily of that lab) and space around campus or other expenses, as explained by the Provost? Where should lab facility renovation funds come from and where then does assessing such extra fees stop and tuition costs take over? The dilemma may be of differing points of view: central spending versus local spending decisions, and the ease of imposing fees versus the politics of increased tuition. Is there an ethical issue at hand? The Committee will continue to discuss this issue at its next meeting while collecting more data.
Faculty Senate Welfare Committee
Minutes
Thursday, October 21, 2010, 2:30
Strode 206

Present: Denise Anderson, Michelle Martin, Danny Smith

- Faculty Manual Change regarding Sabbatical – Lead: Wayne Stewart
  Wayne Stewart included his comments on the document that came from the Policy Committee, and the only additional request the committee made is that the following sentence be removed: “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 chair, dean and Provost.” The committee felt that as the university moves toward being a Research One institution where (we hope) it might eventually be possible to offer pre-tenure sabbaticals to accelerate faculty research productivity, this reference to six years would need to be removed. This, we feel, is a forwarding-thinking move that will allow Chairs more flexibility.

- Child Care – Lead: Michelle Martin
  Michelle is gathering information from around campus and from other universities that will help her with writing a resolution.

- Board of Trustees meeting report on Student Affairs Committee – Lead: Denise Anderson
  Denise attended the Board of Trustees meeting but was asked to leave as soon as it began because the Board of Trustees went into Executive Session for the entire meeting. She was not able to gather any information about their concerns about binge drinking among the students, and we, as a committee, are still uncertain of why this is a Faculty Senate issue since it deals with students.

- Question from Emeritus Prof. Vader on monitoring of retiree benefits/pensions
  Emeritus Vader has called Michelle Martin several times with concerns about reductions in retiree salaries and benefits in other states and worried that SC would follow suit. Michelle contacted Cathy Sturkie, who put her in touch with Michelle Piekutowski in HR, who assured her that they are always monitoring university and state decisions affecting retirees. Again, Dr. Vader called Michelle Martin on 10/21, alarmed about something he read in the newspaper. Michelle Martin will now put Dr. Vader in touch with Michelle Piekutowski directly since.

- Parking outsourcing – Lead: Prasada Rangaraju – no report

- Emeritus Parking Faculty Manual Change: voted on and passed by Faculty Senate this month: one committee accomplishment.

Meeting adjourned at 3:00.
SCHOLASTIC POLICIES COMMITTEE – Bob Horton, Chair – (HEHD)

Meetings: Next meeting: 2:30 on 11/16 in 102 Tillman. This will be a joint meeting with Academic Affairs of the Undergraduate Senate.

Graduate Credit from Other Institutions Applied to Undergraduate Degree
We have approved the following statement and are forwarding it to the EAC:

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.

Definition of Credit Hour
We discussed the definition of a credit hour and reviewed a starting point that Senator Williams had written. Scholastic Policies believes this is an important issue that needs to be addressed. However, particularly in light of the increase in online courses, we recognize our lack of expertise and will recommend to Bill Surver that an ad-hoc committee be appointed to assess the quality of online courses. This information will, in turn, help us in the development of a definition and possible policy. We further recommend that the committee include, but not be limited to, faculty members with experience and expertise in online courses. Horton is also checking with Debbie Jackson to see if she can provide information on how SACS may consider online courses.

Undergraduate Senate’s Academic Affairs Committee
Ben Boone shared issues of concern to the Academic Affairs of the Undergraduate Senate. Among these are the following:

- Reform of Academic Grievance and how Grievance interacts with Academic Integrity. NOTE: If they pursue this, Scholastic Policies should be involved.
- The quality of distance and online courses. We need more information from the students to see what their concerns are, but we do believe we need better oversight. As stated above, we will begin the process of seeking more information.
- Course registration. There are issues that arise with the enforcement of pre-requisites and general frustration with getting into needed sections.
- Absentee policy. Redfern no longer gives out “excuses,” so students have to get notes from off-campus sources that may or may not be enforced. There is also a notification in BlackBoard but apparently faculty do not have to honor these.
They are also trying to make sense of CU's financial books to see how funding is passed on to the colleges.

Gen Ed. Dori has asked for a student group to determine what students want for Gen Ed. This will be primarily a "brainstorming" group.

Departmental exams are often a problem when non-instructors grade sections of an exam.

Teacher use of BlackBoard. They would like to provide means for helping faculty use BlackBoard more effectively.

Teacher Townhall Meetings to review expectations. This is just an idea at this point.

Publicizing Teacher Evaluations and their importance

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 recommend 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.

Faculty-Authored Textbooks
Richard Cowden, auditor, 656-4899. There is a brief mention in Faculty Manual.

We have discussed a possible form and are seeking clarification from Richard Cowden on some issues. Our intention is to have some type of form readily available in every college office.

Academic Integrity: Lead Kelly Smith
Senator Smith was unable to attend. We will discuss this at our next meeting.

Academic Redemption Policy
Undergraduate Senate may wish to reopen this issue. Ryan Barker, another member of the Academic Affairs of the Undergraduate Senate, met with Horton earlier and indicated his concern over the policy. Currently, students may redeem up to 10 hours of grades of D or F. Ryan suggested it is unfair to give struggling students a benefit that other students don't receive and may recommend either expanding it to other grades or to eliminate it. He and his group will investigate further. We discussed this as well and have agreed to re-open discussion if the Undergraduate Senate asks us to do so.
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. It would be helpful if there were a central place where all summer 2011 courses are listed, with registration not available until April.

Gen Ed
At this time, there is no movement on Gen Ed, so this is not an issue we need to consider at this time.

EPortfolios
All students are now required to provide documentation on 8 competencies.
Faculty Senate Research Committee Report from 10-04-10

1. The revised Intellectual Property review process which is being reviewed by the committee. [http://www.clemson.edu/research/technology/policies/patents.html](http://www.clemson.edu/research/technology/policies/patents.html) This revised policy is still being reviewed as it relates to research. One concern of the committee is:

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. 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 Research the Research committee found the description for the IP committee to be vague. The Intellectual Property Committee was only defined as "representatives from the faculty and administration." The 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 senior contract advisor 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 serving in an ex-officio, non-voting capacity.
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.

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?

5. Reviewing New **Conflict of Interest Policy**. Still under review. Some interaction with consulting and research money acquisition.

6. New consulting policy was 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.
Report of the Faculty Senate Policy Committee
19 Oct 2010 Meeting

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

Special guests: Fran Mcguire, Pat Smart, Kelly Smith

The Policy Committee met on 19 October 2010 and conducted the following items of business:

1. The committee discussed and approved a proposed Faculty Manual change making available 2 Senior Lecturers, elected by the Executive/Advisory Committee, to the Grievance Board. These Senior Lecturers would be able, at the discretion of the Board, be able to observe and provide perspective or feedback on the grievance process to the Board in cases involving lecturers. This concept was unanimously approved by the Grievance Board in September. The proposed change has been sent to the E/A Committee for review.

2. The committee discussed and approved a related proposed Faculty Manual change that would enable to the 2 Senior Lecturers to act as non-examining and non-voting observers on Hearing Panels formed by the Grievance Board. This concept was unanimously approved by the Grievance Board in September. The proposed change has been sent to the E/A Committee for review.

3. The committee discussed and approved a proposed Faculty Manual change that would provide a deadline for parties in a grievance to challenge hearing panel members without cause. The deadline, 7 weekdays before the initial hearing panel meeting, is the same one that applies to the submission of material to a Grievance I hearing panel. This deadline was unanimously approved by the Grievance Board in September. The proposed change has been sent to the E/A Committee for review.

4. The committee discussed and approved a proposed Faculty Manual change that would delete reference to the obsolete distinct Patent and Copyright policies in the informational Part X of the Manual. These proposed change would replace these with an informational note about the existence and availability of the comprehensive single Intellectual Property Policy approved in November 2009 by the Administrative Council. The proposed change has been sent to the E/A Committee for review, and provided to the new VPR as an informational item.
5. Senator (and Grievance Board member) Lindle and Grievance Board Chair Kelly Smith provided perspective to the committee concerning features of a faculty termination policy in the context of grievances. They advocated particular attention to the connection between tenure and institutional mission in the context of a termination policy and to concerns about effective or de facto targeting of individuals with such a policy.

6. Senator Pennington provided an update of his work with Clay Steadman (office of General Counsel) on a termination policy. Considerable agreement has been reached on many points of such a policy, the sole exception thus far being the period of notice provided to released faculty. The committee expressed the need to consider more carefully the expectations and meaning of tenure in the context of such a policy, the timing of grievance filings associated with termination policy, the burden of proof in termination proposals, further illumination of procedural details in the termination evaluation process, and the specific role and authority of a faculty body in evaluating and making recommendations regarding such proposals. Senator Pennington agreed to consider these points in developing a future draft, which would also incorporate the points of agreement reached with the administration.
1. President’s Compensation Advisory Committee-Update (Brett Dalton, CFO)
   - The challenge of balancing compensating “high” performers against budget restraints and the possibility of layoffs (morale/performance tied to compensation)
   - Counter offers appear to be the “means” to raise increases; not proactive.
   - Suggested steps-Allow for participation in SC retirement system beyond the 5th year; study for a system of “rotating” chairs-3 years/elected by faculty; examine the possibility of reassigning associate deans (savings involving associate deans close to $3 million), or consider elimination of Dean positions and regroup under a “School” approach.
   - Student center construction on-board; life science building construction to start in the spring

2. Student Fees-break down; trends over the last 5 years (Brett Dalton, CFO)
   - 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.
   - 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.
   - CFO Dalton will present this info to the senate in an upcoming meeting

3. Other-Lab fees
   - 15 years ago these fees were tied to consumables; Board of Trustees approved a change that increased fees-half to be used by the provost’s office and address major infrastructure projects (labs and classrooms) (see handout distributed on how this money was spent in the last 3 years. Other colleges (College of Charleston) have an across the board facility fee for this purpose. Supports teaching labs (indirects primarily fund research labs...)
   - Deans get the other half of lab fees and distributed across departments/labs-only general info is available on how Deans allocate this money.

4. CU Budget 2010-11 Overview (Brett Dalton, CFO)
Handout was distributed; main item for discussion in the next meeting

Next Meeting: November 23 at 1:00 in 206 Sikes Hall
Statement

Graduate Level Credits towards Undergraduate Degree

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.

Approved by the Scholastic Policies Committee
October 19, 2010

Approved by the Executive/Advisory Committee
October 26, 2010
Proposed Faculty Manual Change
Part V, Section G (The Grievance Board), numbered Paragraph 2

Current Wording:

2. Members of the Grievance Board must be tenured regular faculty at the time of their election, 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 with two-year terms of service. Training for Grievance Board members as well as grievance counselors will be offered annually and both groups are strongly encouraged to participate. The Board, through selected hearing panels, hears grievances brought to it in accordance with the faculty grievance procedure.

Proposed Changes:

2. Members of the Grievance Board must be tenured regular faculty at the time of their election, 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 with two-year terms of service. Training for Grievance Board members as well as grievance counselors will be offered annually and both groups are strongly encouraged to participate. The Board, through selected hearing panels, hears grievances brought to it in accordance with the faculty grievance procedure.

The Faculty Senate Executive/Advisory Committee shall elect two Senior Lecturers 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 elected Senior Lecturers, who may provide perspective and feedback to the Board or its Hearing Panels during the grievance process at the invitation of the Board, shall not hold appointments in the same college and shall have two-year terms of service. Inasmuch as the Senior Lecturers are non-members of the Grievance Board, they may not vote on grievance cases or other matters considered by the Board, and may not examine witnesses during hearings; otherwise, the extent and form of their participation in a grievance is determined by the Grievance Board on a case-by-case basis.

Final Wording:

2. Members of the Grievance Board must be tenured regular faculty at the time of their election, 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 with two-year terms of service. Training for Grievance Board members as well as grievance counselors will be offered annually and both groups are strongly encouraged to participate. The Board, through selected hearing panels, hears grievances brought to it in accordance with the faculty grievance procedure.
The Faculty Senate Executive/Advisory Committee shall elect two Senior Lecturers 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 elected Senior Lecturers, who may provide perspective and feedback to the Board or its Hearing Panels during the grievance process at the invitation of the Board, shall not hold appointments in the same college and shall have two-year terms of service. Inasmuch as the Senior Lecturers are non-members of the Grievance Board, they may not vote on grievance cases or other matters considered by the Board, and may not examine witnesses during hearings; otherwise, the extent and form of their participation in a grievance is determined by the Grievance Board on a case-by-case basis.

**Rationale:** The proposed change would make available two Senior Lecturers to the Grievance Board to act in an advisory role in which they could provide insight, information, and perspective in grievances involving lecturers. The concept of Senior Lecturers serving the Board in an advisory fashion was unanimously endorsed by the Grievance Board in September 2010.
Proposed Faculty Manual Change

Part V, Section I (Grievance Hearings), numbered Paragraph 1

Current Wording:

1. The Grievance Board shall create a hearing panel of five members for each Category I grievance and a panel of three members for each Category II grievance from among the members of the Board. The Board will, within 20 weekdays after reaching the decision to hear the petition, set a date for the initial hearing, which will be a single hearing for Category I and one or more hearings as needed for Category II. For a Category I hearing, the chair shall give each party to the grievance 20 weekdays written notice of the hearing. Notification of the hearing date will include: i) the time, place and nature of the hearing; ii) the procedure to be followed during the hearing; iii) a statement of the basis or bases on which the petition is to be heard; and iv) references to pertinent university statutes and portions of the Faculty Manual. For Category II, the initial hearing will be scheduled within 20 weekdays of the Board’s determination of grievability.

Proposed Changes:

1. The Grievance Board shall create a hearing panel of five members for each Category I grievance and a panel of three members for each Category II grievance from among the members of the Board. At its discretion, the Board may authorize one of the duly elected Senior Lecturers (Part V, Section G) to serve as a non-voting and non-examining observer/consultant on a hearing panel associated with grievances involving lecturers. The Board shall ensure that the Senior Lecturer it authorizes to observe and consult during a particular grievance case is free from conflicts of interest and does not have an appointment in the same college as the petitioner or any respondent(s). Should both duly elected Senior Lecturers be ineligible to serve the Board on the basis of conflicts, College of appointment, or challenge, then the President of the Faculty Senate shall make a temporary appointment from the remaining campus body of Senior Lecturers after consultation with the Chair of the Grievance Board.

The Board will, within 20 weekdays after reaching the decision to hear the petition, set a date for the initial hearing, which will be a single hearing for Category I and one or more hearings as needed for Category II. For a Category I hearing, the chair shall give each party to the grievance 20 weekdays written notice of the hearing. Notification of the hearing date will include: i) the time, place and nature of the hearing; ii) the procedure to be followed during the hearing; iii) a statement of the basis or bases on which the petition is to be heard; and iv) references to pertinent university statutes and portions of the Faculty Manual. For Category II, the initial hearing will be scheduled within 20 weekdays of the Board’s determination of grievability.

Final Wording:

1. The Grievance Board shall create a hearing panel of five members for each Category I grievance and a panel of three members for each Category II grievance from among the members of the Board. At its discretion, the Board may authorize one of the duly elected Senior Lecturers (Part V, Section G) to serve as a non-voting and
non-examining observer/consultant on a hearing panel associated with grievances involving lecturers. The Board shall ensure that the Senior Lecturer it authorizes to observe and consult during a particular grievance case is free from conflicts of interest and does not have an appointment in the same college as the petitioner or any respondent(s). Should both duly elected Senior Lecturers be ineligible to serve the Board on the basis of conflicts, College of appointment, or challenge, then the President of the Faculty Senate shall make a temporary appointment from the remaining campus body of Senior Lecturers after consultation with the Chair of the Grievance Board.

The Board will, within 20 weekdays after reaching the decision to hear the petition, set a date for the initial hearing, which will be a single hearing for Category I and one or more hearings as needed for Category II. For a Category I hearing, the chair shall give each party to the grievance 20 weekdays written notice of the hearing. Notification of the hearing date will include: i) the time, place and nature of the hearing; ii) the procedure to be followed during the hearing; iii) a statement of the basis or bases on which the petition is to be heard; and iv) references to pertinent university statutes and portions of the *Faculty Manual*. For Category II, the initial hearing will be scheduled within 20 weekdays of the Board’s determination of grievability.

**Rationale:** The change would allow the Grievance Board to authorize one of its Senior Lecturer observers to observe or consult with a hearing panel in order to provide expertise and perspective to its voting members in the case of grievances brought by or involving lecturers. The judgment and authority to do so would be at the full and sole discretion of the Grievance Board. The change also provides for the temporary appointment of additional Senior Lecturers if both elected Senior Lecturers available to serve the Board in this fashion are excused due to conflicts of interest or challenges. The concept of Senior Lecturers serving the Board in the grievance process in an advisory fashion was unanimously endorsed by the Grievance Board in September 2010.
Proposed Faculty Manual Change
Part V, Section I (Grievance Hearings), numbered Paragraph 3

Current Wording:
3. Members of the Grievance Board shall remove themselves from the case if they deem themselves disqualified for reasons of bias or conflict of interest, and shall not serve if they are from the same college as the petitioner or any respondent(s). The named parties shall each have a maximum of two challenges without stated cause. If such removals and challenges reduce the membership of the hearing panel below five for Category I and below three for Category II, the President of the Faculty Senate shall make additional appointments from the Senate to ensure a hearing panel composed of the required number of members.

Proposed Changes:
3. Members of the Grievance Board shall remove themselves from the case if they deem themselves disqualified for reasons of bias or conflict of interest, and shall not serve if they are from the same college as the petitioner or any respondent(s). The named parties shall each have a maximum of two challenges of hearing panel members or Senior Lecturers without stated cause. These challenges must be communicated to the Chair of the Grievance Board not less than seven weekdays before the initial meeting of the hearing panel in order to be honored. If such removals and challenges reduce the membership of the hearing panel below five for Category I and below three for Category II and other members of the Board are not able to serve, the President of the Faculty Senate shall make additional appointments from the Senate to ensure a hearing panel composed of the required number of members.

Final Wording:
3. Members of the Grievance Board shall remove themselves from the case if they deem themselves disqualified for reasons of bias or conflict of interest, and shall not serve if they are from the same college as the petitioner or any respondent(s). The named parties shall each have a maximum of two challenges of hearing panel members or observers without stated cause. These challenges must be communicated to the Chair of the Grievance Board not less than seven weekdays before the initial meeting of the hearing panel in order to be honored. If such removals and challenges reduce the membership of the hearing panel below five for Category I and below three for Category II and other members of the Board are not able to serve, the President of the Faculty Senate shall make additional appointments from the Senate to ensure a hearing panel composed of the required number of members.

Rationale: The Faculty Manual currently provides named parties with the right to strike 2 hearing panel members without cause, but provides no deadline for doing so. The proposed change provides a deadline of 7 weekdays before the initial hearing panel meeting; this deadline is the same deadline as that to submit material to the hearing panel in Grievance I proceedings. The addition of this 7 weekday deadline was unanimously endorsed by the Grievance Board in September 2010.
Proposed Faculty Manual Change
Part X, Section C (Professional Activities), #1 (Copyright Policy) and #4 (Patent Policy)

Proposed Changes:

Delete current X.C.1 and X.C.4 in their entirety

Replace X.C.1:

1. Intellectual Property. Clemson University has established a policy regarding the rights of employees, students, the University, its contractors, and users of its facilities in matters regarding copyright, patents, and intellectual property (including pedagogical materials, creative works, software, trademark, and research data). The Intellectual Property Policy may be found at http://www.clemson.edu/research/technology/policies/patents.html

Final Wording:

1. Intellectual Property. Clemson University has established a policy regarding the rights of employees, students, the University, its contractors, and users of its facilities in matters regarding copyright, patents, and intellectual property (including pedagogical materials, creative works, software, trademark, and research data). The Intellectual Property Policy may be found at http://www.clemson.edu/research/technology/policies/patents.html

Rationale: The University’s Intellectual Property policy, approved by the Administrative Council in November 2009, supersedes the copyright and patent policies currently summarized in the Faculty Manual. [Note: Part X of the Faculty Manual provides information concerning policies not controlled by the faculty (e.g., University or federal policies)]. The proposed change alerts faculty to the existence of the University IP policy, its broad nature, and how it can be accessed for review or to obtain further details.
MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
DECEMBER 14, 2010

1. Call to Order: The Faculty Senate Meeting was called to order at 2:35 p.m. by President Bill Surver and guests were recognized and introduced. President Surver noted that Bruce Rafert, Graduate School Dean, spoke with Senators and others immediately following the November Senate meeting.

2. Approval of Minutes: The Faculty Senate Minutes dated November 9, 2010 were approved as written.

3. Special Orders of the Day
   Gerald Sonnenfeld, Vice President for Research, spoke with the Senate regarding his ideas and plans for this position and for the office. His goal is to make the Research Office user-friendly for faculty and to find new resources of funding. He noted that faculty will receive a high quality level of service across colleges. An electric grants system will be implemented and coordinated with the Business Office and CCIT. A question and answer period followed Dr. Sonnenfeld’s presentation.

   President Jim Barker joined the Senate meeting to everyone’s surprise. He spoke with members of the Senate on: the state budget and how it will affect Clemson University; building projects that have recently been approved; a comparison with other institutions of higher education in other states; the value of a Clemson University degree; accountability; and the capital campaign. President Barker stated that the campaign focus has always been and will continue to be students and faculty. A question and answer period followed President Barker’s visit.

   Jill Evans, Executive Director of the Pickens County Habitat for Humanity, shared information regarding the Faculty Senate and the Staff Senate house that will be built beginning in spring. A single Hispanic mother with three children have been chosen to receive this house. Senators were then encouraged to ask questions regarding this endeavor. Following this presentation, President Surver signed the official Habitat Covenant, a promise of the Faculty Senate’s participation in this exciting adventure.

4. “Free Speech”: None

5. Committee Reports: Due to time constraints, Standing Committee Chairs each submitted their respective monthly Committee Reports (Attachments).

   Select Faculty Senate Committees
   1) Academic Calendar Committee – Chair Pat Smart stated that this Committee will meet in January, 2011.
2) **Lecturer Committee** – Chair Dan Warner stated that informal discussions have been held and that the Committee will charge ahead next month.

3) **Workload Committee** – For Chair Bill Bowerman, President Surver stated that this Committee is about to complete its work. He also noted that subcommittees regarding the evaluation of teaching form and on-line courses will begin in January.

**University Commissions and Committees:** None

6. **President’s Report:** President Surver:
   a) reminded Senators to be careful of the advice they give to other faculty; to encourage faculty to speak with the Faculty Ombudsman and/or Grievance Counselors and to remind fellow faculty that there are mechanisms and policies contained within the *Faculty Manual* that should and must be followed;
   b) encouraged Senators to attend the Celebration of the Class of ’39 Reception hosted by the Faculty Senate on January 10, 2011 and to attend the Bell Tower Ceremony honoring Alumni Distinguished Professor Melanie Cooper, this year’s recipient of the Class of ’39 Award for Excellence on January 11, 2011;
   c) provided an update on his departmental visits with the Vice Presidents; and
   d) stated that the Faculty Senate may host a “Forum on Change at Clemson University” in the spring.

7. **Old Business:** None

8. **New Business:**
   a. Proposed *Faculty Manual* Change – III. J. Faculty Awards – Senator King submitted and explained. There was no discussion. Vote was taken and proposed change passed unanimously with required two-thirds vote.

9. **Announcements:**
   a. The next Executive/Advisory Committee meeting will be held on January 25, 2011.
   b. The next Faculty Senate meeting will be held on January 11, 2011.
   c. Chief Financial Officer, Brett Dalton, will present “Budget 101” to Senators and others immediately following this meeting.

10. **Adjournment:** President Surver adjourned the meeting at 4:10 p.m.
Faculty Senate Finance Committee Report

Meeting: 10/19/2010  Rm 215 Fluor Daniel EIB  2:30PM – 3:00PM

Attending Senators: Figliola (Chair), Morris, Meriwether (by email)

Submitted by: Senator Figliola

The Committee has organized for the year:

Task 2: University Budget Flow (Lead: Figliola)

The Committee is represented on the University Budget Accountability Committee (BAC). The BAC is scheduled to meet Tuesday October 26, 2010 at 3:30.

Task 4: University International Programs Study (Lead: Morris)

Professor Morris has arranged for David Grigsby to visit with the faculty senate in November to discuss the activities of the international programs office, and tuition and fees, how funds are used, and assessment methods to ensure quality.

Other Business:

Senator Meriwether discussed lab fees and how a portion of these fees are used for administrative directives and the remainder returned to the Colleges and eventually to the departments that earned them. A question for discussion was brought up both electronically and during the meeting concerning the purpose of lab fees. If lab fees are imposed and collected with the notion of replacing the direct cost items associated with a student's use of lab equipment, then should they be used for indirect cost purposes, such as renovations of depleted facilities (and not necessarily of that lab) and space around campus or other expenses, as explained by the Provost? Where should lab facility renovation funds come from and where then does assessing such extra fees stop and tuition costs take over? The dilemma may be of differing points of view: central spending versus local spending decisions, and the ease of imposing fees versus the politics of increased tuition. Is there an ethical issue at hand? The Committee will continue to discuss this issue at its next meeting while collecting more data.
1. The revised Intellectual Property review process which is being reviewed by the committee. [http://www.clemson.edu/research/technology/policies/patents.html](http://www.clemson.edu/research/technology/policies/patents.html) This revised policy is still being reviewed as it relates to research. One concern of the committee is:

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. 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 Research the Research committee found the description for the IP committee to be vague. The Intellectual Property Committee was only defined as "representatives from the faculty and administration." The 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 senior contract advisor 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 serving in an ex-officio, non-voting capacity.*
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.

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?

5. **Reviewing New Conflict of Interest Policy**. Still under review. Some interaction with consulting and research money acquisition.

6. New consulting policy was 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.