MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
JANUARY 13, 2009

1. Call to Order: The Faculty Senate Meeting was called to order at 2:30 p.m. by President Bryan Simmons; guests were recognized and introduced.

2. Approval of Minutes: Approval of the following sets of Minutes was received unanimously: Faculty Senate Minutes of October 14, 2008; November 11, 2008; December 9, 2008 and the General Faculty and Staff Minutes dated December 17, 2008.

3. "Free Speech": None

4. Special Order of the Day: Matt Watkins, Alumni Giving Office, updated the Faculty Senate on the Furlough Relief Fund and requested the Senate’s advice as to whether the capital campaign should go forward during these difficult financial times. The Senate responded that, yes, the campaign should go forward.

5. Old Business: None

6. New Business:
   a. Grievance Counselor elections were held and Beth Kunkel (AFLS) and Jane Lindle (HEHD) were elected.
   b. Grievance Board elections were held and the following faculty were elected: Des Layne and Bill Surver (AFLS); Dan Warner (E&G); Nancy Porter (HEHD) and Camille Cooper, Library.
   c. Proposed Faculty Manual Change – Ombuds Section – Senator Surver submitted and explained the proposed change. There was no discussion. Vote was taken and proposed change passed unanimously (Attachment).
   d. Vice President/President-Elect Bill Bowerman moved to suspend the rules, noting that the Senate had not had an opportunity to see the proposed resolution one week in advance of the Senate meeting. Motion was seconded. Vote to suspend rules was taken and passed with the required two-thirds vote. Vice President Bowerman then submitted for approval and explained the Resolution on the Budget Crisis and Major Changes in the University. Motion was seconded. During discussion, a friendly amendment was offered and accepted. Vote to accept amended resolution was taken and passed unanimously (FS09-1-1 P) (Attachment).
   e. President Simmons introduced and welcomed the newly-elected Faculty Representative to the Board of Trustees, Dr. Windsor Sherrill, Department of Public Health Sciences.
7. **Committee Reports:**
   a. **Senate Committees:**
      1) **Scholastic Policies** - Chair Antonis Katsiyannis stated that Committee had met with Erin Swann, Legal Counsel, regarding the sale of textbooks and that this issue has been forwarded to the Policy Committee.

      2) **Finance Committee** - Senator Steve Stuart, for Chair Wayne Sarasua, stated that Committee will meet on January 20th to address the 2008 Salary Report. The Finance Committee will do a fact-finding study regarding graduate versus undergraduate fees.

      3) **Welfare Committee** - Chair Christina Wells submitted raw data from the Faculty Survey and noted that the results will be formally submitted to the Senate at the February meeting. (Attachment)

      4) **Research Committee** - Senator Hong Luo stated that the Committee met with Bruce Rafert and discussed GADs and will met again with him to continue the discussion. The Committee wants to better understand GADs and what GADs do for the University.

      5) **Policy Committee** - Chair Bill Surver noted that the issues regarding the Sale of Textbooks and the Title of Lecturer will be discussed at the next meeting.

   b. **University Commissions and Committees:** None

8. **President's Report:** President Simmons:
   a. Reminded senators of the upcoming Faculty Senate officer elections.

   b. Said that he Celebration of the Great Class of '39 hosted by the Faculty Senate last night was enjoyed by all who attended.

   c. Stated that he and Vice President Bowerman visited with John Kelly of the Clemson University Restoration Institute for two days last week on a fact-finding mission.

   d. Noted that the Clemson Student Government is leading an effort on September 17 at the Statehouse in Columbia.

   e. Stated that the presidents of South Carolina public institutions of higher education have met; they are in the process of re-establishing this organization to formalize a cohesive plan to present to legislators.

   f. Stated that plans are beginning to be made for the Faculty Senate spring forum. The subject will be the Clemson University Restoration Institute.
9. **Announcements:**
   
a. President Simmons stated that the next Executive/Advisory Committee meeting will be on January 27, 2009.

   b. President Simmons stated that the next Faculty Senate meeting will be on February 10, 2009.

   c. The Bell Tower Ceremony at the Carillon Gardens to honor Bill Pennington, 2008 Class of '39 Aware Recipient, was held this morning and President Barker and Provost Helms made especially nice comments about Dr. Pennington.

10. **Adjournment:** President Simmons adjourned the meeting at 3:45 p.m.

   
   Linda Howe, Secretary

   Cathy Toth Sturkie, Program Coordinator

Absent: G. Wang (C. Rice for), V. Shelburne, G. Tissera (K. Smith for), P. Rangaraju (S. Harcum for), W. Sarasua
Proposed Faculty Manual change to Part V Section B

Current language

“A Professional Ombudsman with experience as a faculty member and knowledge of faculty governance serves the Faculty, post-doctoral fellows, and graduate students. The Professional Ombudsman serves as an independent, informal, neutral and confidential resource to assist in exploring alternative dispute resolution options. Faculty, post-doctoral fellows, and graduate students are encouraged to use the confidential services of their Professional Ombudsman which are available free of charge. The Professional Ombudsman may discuss how to access formal processes appropriate in various circumstances but does not participate in any formal proceeding, including serving as a witness. Communications with the Professional Ombudsman do not constitute notice of claims against the university. The Professional Ombudsman and members of his/her office staff adheres to the International Ombudsman Association (IOA) Code of Ethics and Standards of Practice, as set forth at http://www.ombudsassociation.org/standards.html. Separate Professional Ombudsmen serve undergraduate students and classified staff.”

“The Professional Ombudsman reports to the Provost for administrative purposes and, without breaching confidentiality, provides both the Provost and a sub-committee of the Faculty Senate Executive/Advisory Committee with summary reports of the types of issues handled by his/her office. The sub-committee of the Faculty Senate Executive/Advisory Committee is composed of the immediate past president and the current Faculty Senate President, the faculty representative to the Board of Trustees, one faculty member appointed annually by the Faculty Senate Advisory Committee, and one faculty member appointed annually by the Professional Ombudsman. Members of this committee may not simultaneously serve on the Grievance Board. In conducting the affairs of this office the Professional Ombudsman shall be independent and free from any and all improper restraint, interference, coercion or reprisal. The Professional Ombudsman shall be protected from retaliation. Should these principles be violated, the violations should be brought to the attention of the Provost and, if necessary, to the President of the University.”

Proposed new language:

B. Assistance in dealing with complaints: Ombudsman for Faculty, Postdoctoral Fellows, and Graduate Students

The requirements for serving as the Ombudsman, as approved by the Board of Trustees in January 1998, are that the applicant for the position must be a tenured professor with at least 10 years of experience at Clemson University or an emeritus professor at Clemson University with knowledge of faculty governance.

The Ombudsman serves the Faculty, post-doctoral fellows, and graduate students and operates as an independent, informal, neutral and confidential resource to assist them in exploring alternative dispute resolution options. Faculty, post-doctoral fellows, and graduate students are encouraged to use the confidential services of the Ombudsman which are available free of charge. Communications with the Ombudsman are confidential to the extent permissible by law and considered off-the-record. The Ombudsman is not authorized to accept notice of claims against the University; anyone wishing to give the University notice of claims against it must contact one of the University’s formal channels such as a person in authority. The Ombudsman -can
discuss how faculty may access one of these formal channels as may be appropriate in various circumstances but does not participate in any formal proceeding, including serving as a witness with respect to confidential communications. The Ombudsman and members of his/her office staff adheres to the International Ombudsman Association (IOA) Code of Ethics and Standards of Practice, as set forth at http://www.ombudsassociation.org/standards.html. Separate Professional Ombudsmen serve undergraduate students and classified staff. For more information on the Ombuds Office, see its website at: www.clemson.edu/ombudsman

The Ombudsman reports to the Provost for administrative purposes and, without breaching confidentiality, provides both the Provost and a sub-committee of the Faculty Senate Executive/Advisory Committee with summary reports of the types of issues handled by his/her office. The sub-committee of the Faculty Senate Executive/Advisory Committee is composed of the immediate past president and the current Faculty Senate President, the faculty representative to the Board of Trustees, one faculty member appointed annually by the Faculty Senate Advisory Committee, and one faculty member appointed annually by the Ombudsman. Members of this committee may not simultaneously serve on the Grievance Board. In conducting the affairs of this office the Ombudsman shall be independent and free from any and all improper restraint, interference, coercion or reprisal. The Professional Ombudsman shall be protected from retaliation. Should these principles be violated, the violations should be brought to the attention of the Provost and, if necessary, to the President of the University.

Nondisclosure Agreement – The Ombuds Office asserts a privilege with respect to confidential communications, and this privilege is held by the Ombuds Office and cannot be waived by others. The Ombuds Office is not authorized to, and does not accept legal notice of claims against Clemson University. If you wish to go on record about a problem or put the University on notice of a claim, the Ombuds Office can provide information on how you may do so. The Ombuds does not participate in any formal grievance process. The Clemson University Ombuds office has no decision-making authority and maintains no official records or permanent records of confidential communications. Use of the Ombuds Office constitutes an agreement to abide by these principles and the principles of independence, neutrality, confidentiality and informality upon which the office was created. Use of the Ombuds Office also constitutes an agreement not to seek to compel an ombudsman to reveal confidential communications in formal or legal proceedings. This agreement fosters confidentiality to the extent permissible by law and helps provide a safe and neutral place for discussing any concern.

Proposed changes without tracking:

B. Assistance in dealing with complaints: Ombudsman for Faculty, Postdoctoral Fellows, and Graduate Students

The requirements for serving as the Ombudsman, as approved by the Board of Trustees in January 1998, are that the applicant for the position must be a tenured professor with at least 10 years of experience at Clemson University or an emeritus professor at Clemson University with knowledge of faculty governance.

The Ombudsman serves the Faculty, post-doctoral fellows, and graduate students and operates as an independent, informal, neutral and confidential resource to assist them in exploring alternative dispute resolution options. Faculty, post-doctoral fellows, and graduate students are encouraged
to use the confidential services of the Ombudsman which are available free of charge. Communications with the Ombudsman are confidential to the extent permissible by law and considered off-the-record. The Ombudsman is not authorized to accept notice of claims against the University; anyone wishing to give the University notice of claims against it must contact one of the University’s formal channels such as a person in authority. The Ombudsman can discuss how you may access one of these formal channels as may be appropriate in various circumstances but does not participate in any formal proceeding, including serving as a witness with respect to confidential communications. The Ombudsman and members of his/her office staff adheres to the International Ombudsman Association (IOA) Code of Ethics and Standards of Practice, as set forth at http://www.ombudsassociation.org/standards.html. Separate Professional Ombudsmen serve undergraduate students and classified-staff. For more information on the Ombuds Office, see its website at: www.clemson.edu/ombudsman

The Ombudsman reports to the Provost for administrative purposes and, without breaching confidentiality, provides both the Provost and a sub-committee of the Faculty Senate Executive/Advisory Committee with summary reports of the types of issues handled by his/her office. The sub-committee of the Faculty Senate Executive/Advisory Committee is composed of the immediate past president and the current Faculty Senate President, the faculty representative to the Board of Trustees, one faculty member appointed annually by the Faculty Senate Executive/Advisory Committee, and one faculty member appointed annually by the Ombudsman. Members of this committee may not simultaneously serve on the Grievance Board. In conducting the affairs of this office the Ombudsman shall be independent and free from any and all improper restraint, interference, coercion or reprisal. The Professional Ombudsman shall be protected from retaliation. Should these principles be violated, the violations should be brought to the attention of the Provost and, if necessary, to the President of the University.

Nondisclosure Agreement – The Ombuds Office asserts a privilege with respect to confidential communications, and this privilege is held by the Ombuds Office and cannot be waived by others. The Ombuds Office is not authorized to, and does not accept legal notice of claims against Clemson University. If you wish to go on record about a problem or put the University on notice of a claim, the Ombuds Office can provide information on how you may do so. The Ombuds does not participate in any formal grievance process. The Clemson University Ombuds office has no decision-making authority and maintains no official records or-permanent records of confidential communications. Use of the Ombuds Office constitutes an agreement to abide by these principles and the principles of independence, neutrality, confidentiality and informality upon which the office was created. Use of the Ombuds Office also constitutes an agreement not to seek to compel an ombudsman to reveal confidential communications in formal or legal proceedings. This agreement fosters confidentiality to the extent permissible by law and helps provide a safe and neutral place for discussing any concern.

Rationale for the change: The new language clarifies the role of the Ombudsman and explains the privileged nature of its functioning.
Issues Ranked by Faculty Satisfaction

- Trust in your department chair
- Academic freedom at Clemson
- Efficiency of department chair administrative structure
- Availability of instructional technology
- Promotion and tenure (P&T) procedures
- Adequacy of library resources
- Effectiveness of Blackboard/myCLE
- Trust in your college Dean
- Adequacy of faculty office space
- Affordability of faculty parking
- Annual faculty evaluation procedures
- Effectiveness and fairness of faculty grievance procedures
- Support for undergraduate instruction
- Consistency between annual faculty evaluations and P&T evaluations
- Availability of research laboratory space
- Efficiency of College/Dean administrative structure
- Adequate classroom space
- Support for public service/outreach/Extension activities
- Faculty and staff diversity
- Trust in Provost
- Support for non-traditional students
- Availability of laboratory equipment
- Relationships among faculty and administration
- Importance of teaching in annual performance and P&T evaluations
- Support for graduate instruction
- Effectiveness of the Office of Sponsored Programs
- Student diversity
- Support for research activities
- Inclusion of lecturers in faculty governance
- Efficiency of administrative activities in the Provost's office
- Trust in VP for Public Service and Agriculture
- Trust in VP for Research and Economic Development
- Trust in Clemson administration
- Effectiveness of the Office for International Affairs
- Internal funding for research activities
- Financial support for research technicians
- FAS: effectiveness and ease of use
- Faculty input to university decision-making
- Availability of faculty parking
- University-provided dependent care
- Transparency of university decision-making
- Efficiency of Clemson administrative structure
- Financial support for graduate students
- Procedures for evaluation of administrators
- Tuition reduction/waiver for faculty spouses and dependents
- The GAD process
- Salary increases for administrators
- Adequacy of funding for your College
- Salary increases for faculty
- Adequacy of funding for your department

- Importance
- Satisfaction
- Difference
The Faculty Senate Research Committee met on Thursday 8 January with Dr. Bruce Rafert, the Dean of the Graduate School, to discuss the feature known to Clemson PIs as the GAD, otherwise known as the Graduate Assistantship Differential. This is an expense that represents the amount of graduate school tuition to be paid by PIs from a research award as part of the support provided by the University to the graduate student performing the duties of a research assistant. The amount of this charge is variable from one discipline to another depending upon which tier a PI happens to be in. This charge can be waived by the Dean if the proposal is submitted to an agency that does not support such research expense. This charge has been the subject of considerable debate as to whether it is equitable across colleges and disciplines and whether it ends up making Clemson University proposals less competitive. The Research Committee with the support of the Executive Committee thought it would be timely to examine the basis for this charge to understand the need for this expense and to consider how the PIs at Clemson University might become better informed regarding this feature of graduate student support.

Dr. Rafert presented a detailed summary in regard to the use of this charge and how the funds from this charge are distributed within the University. This conversation was continued offline with several e-mail messages. The Committee will meet with Dr. Rafert again in February. We are considering whether a white paper should be written as a document that can be accessed for reference for any PI. Clearly, there is a need for finding a way to disseminate information across the University to improve the understanding by PIs about why this charge is necessary.

John W. Meriwether
1. **Call to Order:** The Faculty Senate Meeting was called to order at 2:35 p.m. by President Bryan Simmons, and guests were recognized and introduced.

2. **Approval of Minutes:** Approval of the January 13, 2009 Minutes was received unanimously, as written and distributed.

3. **"Free Speech":** Professor Emeritus John Bednar expressed his concerns regarding a comparison of salary data for the past three years in the Offices of the President, Provost and University Advancement (attachment).

4. **Presentation of Slate of Officers:** The Slate of Officers was presented by the Executive/Advisory Committee of the Faculty Senate: Vice President/President-Elect candidates are Linda Howe (HEHD), Antonis Katsiyannis (HEHD) and Bill Surver (AFLS) and for Secretary, Alan Grubb (AAH) and Deborah Willoughby (HEHD). The floor was opened for nominations from the floor. There being no nominations, the floor was closed.

5. **Special Order of the Day:** Larry LaForge, Faculty Athletics Representative; Bill D’Andrea, Senior Associate Athletic Director and Terry Don Phillips, Athletic Director, provided information on the state of athletics – in particular, athletics/academics; academic integrity and student life in addition to various aspects of the Athletic Department.

6. **Old Business:** None

7. **New Business:**
   a. Senator Bill Surver submitted and explained the first paragraph of a proposal to appoint a committee to establish procedures to implement recommendations created in 2006 to review the status of lecturers and other unclassified employees (attachment). Following discussion, vote to accept proposal was taken and passed. President Simmons will appoint this committee in the near future.

   The second paragraph of the proposal to establish the aforementioned committee was explained and submitted for approval. There was no discussion. Vote to approve second paragraph of proposal was taken and pass unanimously (attachment). This information will be forwarded to the Provost and Deans and will be monitored by the Faculty Senate.

   b. **Assignment and Sale of Textbooks and Other Course Materials to Students** – Senator Katsiyannis submitted and explained the proposed new language
regarding this policy. There was no discussion. Vote was taken and proposal to change the language was passed unanimously (Attachment).

8. Committee Reports:
   a. Senate Committees:
      1) Scholastic Policies – Chair Antonis Katsiyannis submitted the Committee Report dated January 20, 2009 (attachment). Senator Katsiyannis then asked for Senate endorsement of a change to the Latin Honors grade point centered threshold. Following an explanation, vote to endorse was taken and passed unanimously (attachment).

      2) Finance Committee – Chair Wayne Sarasua submitted and explained an Analysis of Salary Data noting that a detailed summary will be presented at the March Senate Meeting.

      3) Research Committee – Senator Prasad Rangarau stated that the Committee continues to meet with Bruce Rafert and discuss the issue of GADs and plans to submit their findings in a white paper later this Senate session.

      4) Policy Committee – Chair Bill Surver submitted the Policy Committee Report dated January 26, 2009 (attachment).

      5) Welfare Committee – Chair Christina Wells presented, submitted and explained the final results of the 2008-09 Faculty Survey. This information will be available on line and in the Library to University employees at the end of this week. Applause and statements of thanks and appreciation were offered to Senator Wells and the Welfare Committee for their diligent efforts on behalf of all faculty at Clemson to create and distribute the Survey and ensure the validity of the Survey results.

   b. University Commissions and Committees: None

   c. Senator Dan Warner, member of the University Grievance Board, presented both the Category I and II Grievance Activity Reports (attachment).

9. President's Report: President Simmons:
   a. Noted that he will present a report to the Board of Trustees later this week;

   b. Stated that he attended the Clemson University Foundation meeting this week; and

   c. Stated that most of his Faculty Senate efforts lately were in regards to the 2008-09 Faculty Survey.
10. **Announcements:**
   a. Faculty Senate Alan Schaffer Service Award nominations are due to the Faculty Senate Office on February 16, 2009.
   
   b. President Simmons stated that the next Executive/Advisory Committee meeting will be on February 24, 2009.
   
   d. President Simmons stated that the next Faculty Senate meeting will be on March 10, 2009.
   
   e. The CURI Forum will be held from 9-11:30 a.m. on March 24, 2009 in the Jacks Ballroom of the Hendrix Center.

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

   [Signature]
   Linda Howe, Secretary

   [Signature]
   Cathy Toth Sturkie, Program Coordinator

Absent: P. Dawson, G. Wang, V. Shelburne, Y. An (K. Smith for), P. Srimani
Observations:

It is obvious from the data before you that, over the past three years, while the Clemson University Family in general has experienced painful budget cuts, close to or below-cost-of-living pay increases, stringent reductions in programs and personnel, freezes in filling or outright elimination of vital positions in many departments, reductions in academically related travel, and many other reminders of the economic crisis gripping not only our community but the country as a whole ... the President’s office, the Provost’s office and the Office of University Advancement clearly have not. Without any significant increase in the size of the student body or the faculty ... in fact, quite to the contrary as far as the faculty and staff are concerned ... the offices of the President, the Provost and University Advancement have burgeoned, apparently prospering in these desperate times, and increasing their budgetary expenses dramatically.

Moreover, beyond this raw and very public data, considerable monies are provided to the Administration of Clemson University every year from the Clemson Foundation without any detailed publishing of from whom and for what those funds were raised and are spent. A full and open accounting of these funds, particularly those related to the offices of the President and the Provost, is necessary in order for our community to have full transparency concerning the fiscal operations of Clemson University. Without it, we simply do not have the information required to formulate sound opinions about the financial well-being of our institution and the fiduciary conduct of our top administrators. In appearance, large sums of money spent on and/or by our administrators are being hidden from us. In other terms, we do not enjoy the knowledge which, in the spirit of our state’s laws and the stated goals of our Administration concerning transparency, we are supposed to have as members of this Family.

It is time for a full accounting. As this brief overview suggests, there are troubling signs in the Administration of Clemson University that mirror the conduct of those who have paid themselves outrageous bonuses as their institutions fail financially. And even more questionable decisions lead from the President’s office directly to the Board of Trustees. Why, for example, is the daughter of a member of the Board working in the President’s office as an attorney? Why has she received such high raises over the past two financially difficult years (11.4% and 24.2%)?? And why is President Barker’s son currently employed in the Office of University Advancement? The vast majority of Clemson Family employees do not enjoy this kind of relationship. And why are former members of the Faculty Senate or their spouses employed in the Administration? Does that suggest the possibility of inappropriate or undue influence over the Senate leadership when it comes (or came) to criticism of the Administration? And why are these salary reports, small portions of which are in front of you, dated October 1st and only made available in January? Does the Administration not want this information made available in a timely manner?
Sadly, the list goes on. It is time for a full accounting. It is time for the bare facts and hard truths to surface. It time for all of us to have access to them and to face them as a family. It is time for this community to assume its full collective fiscal responsibility. No one in any position of leadership at Clemson University ... from the Board of Trustees to the President and on down ... can expect the Clemson Family to stick together as a family, to make the collective sacrifices that close-knit families have to make if they want to survive, if it is not provided with all of the information pertinent to that survival ... by the family leaders whose duty it is to keep them informed. Family members left in the dark will only feel greater anger and frustration and bitterness when all of these questions are eventually answered.

Thank you.
Clemson University Salary Reports 2006-2008

Office of the President
2006 – over $50,000
Total employees: 8 over $50,000
Total salaries: $849,359
Percentage increases above 3%:
President Barker (21.5%) Agency Head
2006: $30,000 - $49,999 (Note: Since exact salaries are not reported, the mean has been calculated. For example, if the report states that an employee made between $46,000 and $49,999, the figure used for that person is $47,999.50.)
Total employees: 6 from $30,000 to $50,000
Total salaries: $231,997
206 Total Personnel Cost (without fringe): $1,081,356

2007 – over $50,000
Total employees: 9 over $50,000
Total salaries: $966,415
Percentage increases above 3%:
President Barker (4.9%) Agency Head
Clayton Steadman (12.0%) Lecturer
Renee Roux (15.4%) Attorney IV
Erin Swann (11.3%) Attorney III
Sandra McKinney (13.3%) Executive Assistant II
Linda Allen (14.6%) Administrative Coordinator
2007: $30,000 - $49,999 (Note: Since exact salaries are not reported, the mean has been calculated. For example, if the report states that an employee made between $46,000 and $49,999, the figure used for that person is $47,999.50.)
Total employee: 7 from $30,000 to $50,000
Total salaries: $403,994.50
2007 Total Personnel Cost (without fringe): $1,370,409.50

2008 – over $50,000
Total employees: 14 over $50,000
Total Salaries: $1,670,121
Percentage increases above 3%:
Clayton Steadman (7.1%) Lecturer Non-teaching
Angela Leidinger (26.8%) Lecturer Non-teaching
Renee Roux (20.0%) Attorney V
Erin Swann (24.2%) Attorney V
Elizabeth McInnis (4.0%) Assistant Academic Program Director
2008: $30,000 - $49,999 (Note: Since exact salaries are not reported, the mean has been calculated. For example, if the report states that an employee made between $46,000 and $49,999, the figure used for that person is $47,999.50.)
Total employees: 13 from $30,000 to $50,000
Total salaries: $511,993.50

2008 Total Personnel Cost (without fringe): $2,182,114.50

Office of the Provost
2006 – over $50,000
Total employees: 45 over $50,000
Total salaries: $3,964,185
Percentage increases above 3%:
  - Janice Murdoch (4.0%) Dean
  - Brett Dalton (6.0%) Lecturer
  - Robert Halfacre (20.4%) Visiting Professor
  - Barbara Speziale (13.0%) Associate Dean
  - Robert Barkley (4.0%) Lecturer
  - Stanley Smith (4.0%) Academic Program Director
  - Linda Nilson (4.0%) Lecturer
  - Lamont Flowers (4.7%) Academic Program Director
  - Jane Gilbert (10.5%) Administrative Manager I
  - Lois Petzold (7.7%) Lecturer
  - James Williams (10.0%) Lecturer
  - Brenda Goodman (12.5%) Administrative Coordinator I
  - Susan Whorton (10.0%) Lecturer
  - Jeffrey Neal (7.0%) Lecturer

2006: $30,000 - $49,999 (Note: Since exact salaries are not reported, the mean has been calculated. For example, if the report states that an employee made between $46,000 and $49,999, the figure used for that person is $47,999.50.)
Total employees: 59 from $30,000 to $50,000
Total salaries: $2,243,969.50

2006 Total Personnel Cost (without fringe): $6,208,154.50

Office of the Provost
2007 – over $50,000
Total employees: 49 over $50,000
Total salaries: $4,647,448
Percentage increases above 3%:
  - Provost Helms (15.0%) Provost
  - David Grigsby (12.5%) Professor
  - Janice Murdoch (26.2%) Dean
  - James Rafert (15.3%) Dean
  - James Cross (23.8%) Professor
  - Robert Halfacre (4.0%) Visiting Professor
  - Marvin Carmichael (7.6%) Lecturer: Non-teaching
  - Robert Barkley (24.3%) Lecturer: Non-teaching
Frankie Felder (7.4%)  
Linda Nilson (22.1%)  
Diane Smathers (4.0%)  
Daniel Wueste (3.5%)  
Lamont Flowers (3.5%)  
Elizabeth Lomas (13.3%)  
David Fleming (4.5%)  
Jeffrey Neal (9.6%)

Associate Dean
Lecturer: Non-teaching
Professor
Associate Professor
Academic Program Director
Student Services Manager I
Research Associate
Lecturer

2007: $30,000 - $49,999 (Note: Since exact salaries are not reported, the mean has been calculated. For example, if the report states that an employee made between $46,000 and $49,999, the figure used for that person is $47,999.50.)
Total employees: 68 from $30,000 to $50,000
Total salaries: $2,587,966

2007 Total Personnel Cost (without fringe): $7,235,414

***********************************************************************

2008 - over $50,000
Total employees: 61 over $50,000
Total salaries: $5,689,087
Percentage increases above 3%:
  Provost Helms (15.5%)  
  Debra Jackson (20.7%)  
  Frederick Baus III (4.0%)  
  Jane Gilbert (32.3%)  
  Alfred Bundrick (4.0%)  
  Teresa Fishman (73.3%)  
  Debra Sparacino (34.7%)  
  Brenda Smith (16.1%)  
  Jerome Reel, Jr. (5.0%)  
  Robert Bennet (6.0%)  
  Brian Cass (22.0%)  
  Audrey Bodell (5.7%)  
  Christopher Wood (55.8%)  
  Rebecca Pearson (5.7%)  
  Cathy Sturkie (16.1%)  
  Provost
  Professor
  Academic Program Director
  Lecturer: Non-teaching
  Academic Program Director
  Assistant Academic Program Director
  Associate Academic Program Director
  Executive Assistant II
  Visiting Professor
  Student Services Manager I
  Information Resource Consultant II
  Student Services Manager I
  Administrative Manager I
  Student Services Manager I
  Program Coordinator

2008: $30,000 - $49,999 (Note: Since exact salaries are not reported, the mean has been calculated. For example, if the report states that an employee made between $46,000 and $49,999, the figure used for that person is $47,999.50.)
Total employees: 86 from $30,000 to $50,000
Total salaries: $3,211,957

2008 Total Personnel Cost(without fringe): $8,901,044

***********************************************************************
University Advancement

2006 – over $50,000
Total employees: 29 over $50,000
Total salaries: $2,363,574
14% received raises above 3%.

$30,000 – $49,999
Total employees: 56
Total salaries: $1,835,980.50

Total personnel cost (without fringe): $4,199,554.50

2007 – over $50,000
Total employees: 49 over $50,000
Total salaries: $3,999,856
43% received raises above 3%

$30,000 - $49,999
Total employees: 56
Total salaries: 2,271,971.50

Total personnel cost (without fringe): $6,271,827.50

2008 – over $50,000
Total employees: 58
Total salaries: $4,671,243
14% received raises above 1%

$30,000 - $49,999
Total employees: 61
Total salaries: $7,091,212.50

Total personnel cost (without fringe): $9,363,184
SLATE OF OFFICERS

VICE PRESIDENT/PRESIDENT-ELECT

Linda Howe
Antonis Katsiyannis
Bill Surver

SECRETARY

Alan Grubb
Deborah Willoughby
The Policy Committee moves that the President of the Faculty Senate appoint a committee or task force to establish forthwith the necessary procedures to implement the recommendations of the Task Force created by President Barker in 2006 to review the status of lecturers and other unclassified employees. The three-person committee shall consist of the President of the Faculty Senate (or his designee), Clay Steadman of University Counsel (or his designee) and the appropriate person from Human Resources. A copy of the recommendations of the President Barker's 2006 Task Force is attached.

In the meantime the "lecturer" title should only be used for those positions matching the requirements specified in the Faculty Manual. According to Part III, section E, the "lecturer" title is a special faculty rank limited to individuals in academic units under the jurisdiction of the Provost, and is assigned to individuals with special qualifications or for special functions in which the assignment of other faculty ranks is not appropriate. Therefore, appointments with the "lecturer" title to non-academic positions violate the letter and intent of the Faculty Manual. This being the case, we request that all new hires and reclassifications using the "lecturer" title meet the Faculty Manual requirements.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Clemson University Administrative Council

FROM: Brett Dalton  
Lawrence Nichols  
Dan Schmiedt  
Clay Steadman  
Gene Troutman  
Dr. Hap Wheeler

DATE: April 10, 2006

SUBJECT: Status of Lecturers and Other Unclassified Employees

The Task Force appointed by President Barker to review the status of lecturers and other unclassified employees at Clemson University has completed its review and makes the following recommendations to Administrative Council:

1. All current "lecturer" or "research aide/assistant" job titles should be reviewed to see if there is a corresponding unclassified job description that would be appropriate. Human Resources is compiling information on lecturer, research assistant and unclassified positions and will assist departments in identifying individuals who would be candidates for re-classification into an unclassified position. Where a lecturer or research assistant does not perform significant academic or research duties and an appropriate unclassified position is available, persons will be encouraged to change from a lecturer or research assistant position to an unclassified position. Due consideration will be given to any proprietary or emotional attachments individuals may feel towards their current position and title.

2. The current employee (non-faculty) grievance procedure does not distinguish between classified and unclassified employees. Therefore, there is no need to make any changes to this existing policy or procedure. However, to avoid confusion and misperception, we recommend adding a statement to the current policy which notes that the policy and procedures apply equally to classified and unclassified employees.

3. We recommend that unclassified employees be allowed to participate with classified employees in the classified staff senate. This would essentially entail eliminating the distinction between classified and unclassified employees and having a "Staff Senate" that represents all staff employees.

4. We recommend that lecturers, who are by definition members of the faculty, continue to have access to the faculty grievance procedure as they do now, with one variation. We recommend that the Faculty Grievance Procedure be modified to specify that in the case of a grievance by a non-instructional lecturer, the hearing panel appointed to review the grievance be composed of other non-instructional lecturers and not instructional faculty. The reason for this is to
Assignment and Sale of Textbooks and Other Course Materials to Students

Current Language- Part IX, D(13)

Sale of Textbooks and Other Course Materials to Students. Under no circumstances should the faculty member engage in the direct sale of textbooks or other course materials to students. This restriction does not limit the freedom of faculty members to assign their own textbooks or other materials or to develop course materials that can be sold through the bookstore or other suppliers.

Proposed Language

Assignment and Sale of Textbooks and Other Course Materials to Students. Under no circumstances should the faculty member engage in the direct sale of textbooks or other course materials to students. Faculty members who wish to assign textbooks or other course materials that they authored or edited as part of a Clemson University course must first complete a written disclosure form identifying the economic interest they may have in the textbook or materials. This disclosure form should be submitted to the faculty member's Department Chair — or if the faculty member is the Department Chair, to their Dean — for final approval in accordance with the SC Ethics Act. This restriction does not limit the freedom of faculty members to develop course materials that can be sold through the bookstore or other suppliers.

Draft disclosure form (see next page). This form is designed to comply with the statutory requirements of SC Code 8-13-700(A) & (B) and advisory opinions issued by the SC Ethics Commission — i.e., when a public employee is required to make a decision which affects his economic interest, the public employee must (1) prepare a written statement describing the matter requiring action/decision and the nature of the potential conflict of interest with respect to the action/decision and (2) furnish the statement to his superior for the final approval determination.


Act defines “economic interest” as follows: (11)(a) "Economic interest" means an interest distinct from that of the general public in a purchase, sale, lease, contract, option, or other transaction or arrangement involving property or services in which a public official, public member, or public employee may gain an economic benefit of fifty dollars or more.
SC ETHICS ACT DISCLOSURE FORM

Name of Faculty Member: _______________________________________________

Title: ______________________________________________________________

Department/College: _________________________________________________

Name of textbook or other course materials to be assigned: __________________

_____________________________________________________________________

Name of course(s) in which these materials will be assigned: __________________

_____________________________________________________________________

Number of students enrolled in course(s): _________________________________

Semester(s) for which authorization is sought: _____________________________

_____________________________________________________________________

Anticipated amount of royalties &/or other income from these materials: ______

_____________________________________________________________________

In compliance with the SC Ethics Act, I hereby request approval by my Department Chair (or Dean) to assign the above-named materials, which I deem pedagogically appropriate for the specified course(s).

Signature of Faculty Member: __________________________________________

Date: ____________________________

Approved: _________________________

Department Chair (or Dean)

Date: ____________________________
Latin Honors
Effective with fall semester 2010, implement a grade point centered minimum threshold of 3.70 cum laude, 3.85 magna cum laude and 3.95 summa cum laude for Latin honors (current min GPAs 3.40 cum laude, 3.7 magna cum laude and 3.9 summa cum laude. In 2006, 45% received honors (from 1996-2005 it has been steadily rising)

Using data from the 2006-2007 academic year, over 20% of our graduates will continue to graduate with honors putting Clemson University squarely in the middle of honors criteria used by the 2007 US News Top Thirty public universities.

Student government had the opportunity to provide feedback-as a result, implementation date and min GPA for summa have been changed

The scholastic Policy Committee unanimously endorsed this proposal

Evaluation of Academic Advising
Possibility of a uniform system of evaluation for advising (department /college level); evaluation of current system in advising across the university; separation of “course scheduling” advising from career advising; Academic advising web site to provide useful tips to students on advising.

The Scholastic Policies supports efforts to “improve” academic advising at Clemson

Next meeting: February 17, 2009 in 420 Tillman Hall; Initial discussion on “transfer credit” from foreign institutions
Analysis of Salary Data

Background

Salary reports for Fall 2008 (October 1) are published on the web and are made available by the Office of Institutional Research (OIR). Concerns were raised in the faculty senate on the distribution of raises. Comments received by members of the finance committee based on news articles and view by various faculty of the on-line salary data has influenced this year’s salary analysis. The finance committee contacted OIR to request salary data broken down in an Excel spreadsheet or database so that queries and sorts could be done. Additionally, the committee requested a breakdown of categories and dates of raises. OIR provided an Excel spreadsheet to allow the finance committee to sort and stratify data how ever we wished. The files include salaries > $50,000. This analysis is preliminary. A detailed summary should be available at the March senate meeting. Please send any comments or suggestions to Wayne Sarasua (sarasua@clemson.edu).

50 K Report Column Headings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Dept Desc</th>
<th>Factbook</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Preliminary Table Column Headings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Dept Desc</th>
<th>Factbook</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Effective Date</th>
<th>CUBS Reason</th>
<th>a. Perf</th>
<th>b. Prom</th>
<th>c. Cola</th>
<th>d. Cont</th>
<th>e. Misc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Individuals received salary adjustments

- 1763 Cost of Living Adjustments
- 33 Performance Equity Increases
- 109 Performance Pay
- 75 Promotion
- 34 Additional Duties
- 15 Assigning Supplemental Pay
- 26 Job Reclassification
- 99 Other

Individuals:

- 10 received <0%
- 71 received 0%
- 0 received between 0 and <0.5%
- 36 received between 0.5% and <1%
- 1411 received 1%
- 2 received between 1 and 2%
- 5 received between 2 and 3%
- 4 received between 3 and 4%
- 21 received between 4 and 5%
- 29 received between 5 and 6%
- The rest received 6% or above (245)

Note that the above is based on ALL Employees with a salary of $50k or above. We’ll apply filters atification in next month’s report.
COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Chair: Bill Surver (surverw); Tom Boland (tboland); Alan Grubb (agrub); Lydia Schleifer (schleif); Jeremy King (jking2@clemson.edu); Kelly Smith (KCS@clemson.edu); Dan Warner (warner@clemson.edu)

The Policy Committee met on January 20. The following were discussed.

1. A proposal from the Scholastic Policies Committee on the sale of textbooks and other materials. The committee endorsed this proposal.

2. Procedures to follow regarding changes to the title of Lecturer. A motion was endorsed and will be presented at the January Ex/Ad Committee meeting. It is as follows:

POLICY COMMITTEE MOTION ON LECTURER DESIGNATION

The Policy Committee moves that the President of the Faculty Senate appoint a committee or task force to establish forthwith the necessary procedures to implement the recommendations of the Task Force created by President Barker in 2006 to review the status of lecturers and other unclassified employees. The three-person committee shall consist of the President of the Faculty Senate (or his designee), Clay Steadman of University Counsel (or his designee) and the appropriate person from Human Resources. A copy of the recommendations of the President Barker's 2006 Task Force is attached.

In the meantime the "lecturer" title should only be used for those positions matching the requirements specified in the Faculty Manual. According to Part III, section E, the "lecturer" title is a special faculty rank limited to individuals in academic units under the jurisdiction of the Provost, and is assigned to individuals with special qualifications or for special functions in which the assignment of other faculty ranks is not appropriate. Therefore, appointments with the "lecturer" title to non-academic positions violate the letter and intent of the Faculty Manual. This being the case, we request that all new hires and reclassifications using the "lecturer" title meet the Faculty Manual requirements.

The next meeting of the Policy Committee is scheduled for Tuesday, February 17.
### CLEMSON UNIVERSITY GRIEVANCE BOARD
#### GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE ACTIVITY

**CATEGORY I PETITIONS**
January, 2008 through January, 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Number of Grievances</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Yet Determined Grievable Or Non-Grievable</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grievances In Process</td>
<td>0</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</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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>0</td>
<td>0</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, 2008 through January, 2009

Total Number of Grievances 2
Grievances Found Non-Grievable by Grievance Board 0
Grievances Found to be Grievable by Grievance Board 2
Not Yet Determined Grievable Or Non-Grievable 0
Grievances In Process 1
Suspended Grievances 0
Withdrawn Grievances 0
Petitions Supported by Hearing Panel 1
Petitions Not Supported By Hearing Panel 0
Hearing Panel Grievance Recommendations Supported By Provost Provost Recused
Grievances Appealed to President 0
Presidential Decisions Supporting Petitioner 0
Grievances Appealed to Board of Trustees 0
Male 1
Female 1

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>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Proposed Change to Section III - 3 D. Insert the following at the end of the introductory paragraph before the listing of the regular faculty ranks.

Unless indicated otherwise, when the term "regular faculty" is used throughout the Faculty Manual it is limited to faculty with the ranks described below who have no administrative appointment.

"Regular" would then be inserted throughout the manual where only faculty is now used and will clarify regular faculty where this appears.
Proposed Change to Appendix B – Selection of Faculty Representative to the Board of Trustees

Appendix B

Current Policy

FACULTY REPRESENTATIVE TO THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES

The Clemson University Board of Trustees has approved the concept of a Faculty Representative to the Board of Trustees using the process outlined below. This individual is recognized as the official representative of the Faculty and is granted privileges beyond those accorded to visitors to Board meetings. This includes receipt of Minutes, Agendas, and attachments of all Board and Committee meetings and an opportunity to be included on the Agenda upon approval of request.

Selection Procedures
A Faculty Representative to the Board of Trustees Selection Committee, composed of one Distinguished Alumni Professor from each College, one Library representative, and the President of the Faculty Senate, will solicit nominations for the Faculty Representative to the Board of Trustees in the Fall, 1998, and every third year thereafter.
Any individual holding tenure at Clemson University will be eligible for nomination. The nomination period will run for fourteen days from the date of the Call for Nominations. Each nomination must include a complete curriculum vitae and a statement of interest from the nominee.

The Faculty Manual Editorial Consultant will examine all nominations to verify the faculty status of each nominee. The names of all eligible nominees will be distributed to the members of the Selection Committee. The Committee will consider the nominations and make the final selection based on nominee’s curriculum vitae and statement of interest.
The Faculty Representative will serve a three-year term commencing with the first Board meeting following selection.

Faculty Manual
Proposed new policy:

FACULTY REPRESENTATIVE TO THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES

The Clemson University Board of Trustees has approved the concept of a Faculty Representative to the Board of Trustees using the process outlined below. This individual is recognized as the official representative of the Faculty and is granted privileges beyond those accorded to visitors to Board meetings. This includes receipt of Minutes, Agendas, and attachments of all Board and Committee meetings and an opportunity to be included on the Agenda upon approval of request.

Selection Procedures

A Faculty Representative to the Board of Trustees Selection Committee, composed of two previous Board Representatives, selected by all previous Representatives, two Distinguished Alumni Professors, selected by the Alumni Professors, the President-Elect of the Senate, the President of the Faculty Senate, and the lead Faculty Senators from all Colleges not otherwise represented, will solicit nominations for the Faculty Representative to the Board of Trustees three months prior to the expiration of the term of the incumbent Faculty Representative.

Any regular faculty (as defined by the Faculty Manual) member holding tenure at Clemson University will be eligible for nomination. Self-nominations will be accepted. The nomination period will run for fourteen days from the date of the Call for Nominations. Each nomination must include a complete curriculum vitae, a statement of interest from the nominee, and a statement from the nominee detailing experience in faculty governance (including areas such curriculum, promotion and tenure policies, faculty/administration relations, faculty senate or academic policies).

The Faculty Manual Editorial Consultant will examine all nominations to verify the faculty status of each nominee. The names of all eligible nominees will be distributed to the members of the Selection Committee. The Committee will consider the nominations and make the final selection based on nominee’s curriculum vitae, statement of interest, and faculty governance experience.

The Faculty Representative will serve a three-year term commencing with the first Board meeting following selection. If during the term of office the Faculty Representative assumes administrative duties a replacement will be selected using the above procedures. The newly selected Faculty Representative will serve a full three-year term. The Faculty Representative may not serve successive terms in the office.
Maymester scheduling change
Committee endorsed the proposal “Monday through Friday class meeting times for Clemson Maymester courses be changed from the present 5:30 – 8:30 PM time period to 3:30 – 6:30 PM beginning Maymester 2010. The time for the two Saturday classes would remain the same, 9 AM to 12 noon.”

Academic Eligibility Re-enrollment Deadline Proposal
Committee endorsed proposal to “add a re-enrollment application deadline (two days before the first day of classes) to encourage re-enrolling students to be more prepared to begin classes and to provide an opportunity for students to meet with an advisor prior to registering for classes. This deadline would appear on the re-enrollment application and other re-enrollment materials (registrar’s web-site, withdrawal packet, etc.).”

Issues related to international transfer credits
Maymester scheduling change
Committee endorsed the proposal "Monday through Friday class meeting times for Clemson Maymester courses be changed from the present 5:30 – 8:30 PM time period to 3:30 – 6:30 PM beginning Maymester 2010. The time for the two Saturday classes would remain the same, 9 AM to 12 noon."

Academic Eligibility Re-enrollment Deadline Proposal
Committee endorsed proposal to "add a re-enrollment application deadline (two days before the first day of classes) to encourage re-enrolling students to be more prepared to begin classes and to provide an opportunity for students to meet with an advisor prior to registering for classes. This deadline would appear on the re-enrollment application and other re-enrollment materials (registrar's web-site, withdrawal packet, etc.)."

Currently there is not a deadline to submit the application for re-enrollment and students can apply for re-enrollment as late as the last day to add a course (a week after classes begin). This situation does not allow re-enrolling students time to meet with an advisor or to register for appropriate courses.

Issues related to international transfer credits
Issues associated with international transfer credit were identified. There is a proliferation of study abroad programs; faculty input in the process-course content/credit hours; SACS related requirements on policies regarding transfer credit; European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System (Bologna agreement); TCEL (Transfer Credit Equivalency List); World Education Services; Articulation agreements...

The Registrar's office in coordination with the Office of Undergraduate Studies, the Office of International Affairs, and faculty with expertise/experiences in programs abroad would draft a policy/procedures to be presented to Scholastic Policies, Senate, Undergraduate Council, Student Government...

Next meeting: March 10, 2009 at 1:45 in the Madren Center (just before the senate meeting)
A Review of the GAD at Clemson University

Faculty Senate Research Committee

The Graduate Assistant Differential (GAD) at Clemson University (CU) is a confusing concept that is more controversial than it should be. The Faculty Senate Research Committee has devoted several meetings to a review of what the GAD is and how the funds derived from the GAD are dispensed by the University. The participation of Dr. Bruce Rafert, Graduate Dean, in these discussions is very much appreciated. Much of what has been written in this review comes from Dr. Rafert’s white paper which provides an exhaustive review of the GAD process and its history that is very informative.

A number of facts regarding the GAD are presented here. Three documents available on the CU web that provides further details regarding the GAD are:

www.clemson.edu/public/gss/grant_proposals/grad_rates.html
www.clemson.edu/public/gss/grant_proposals/grad_calc-by_tier.pdf
www.clemson.edu/caah/research/images/sponsored_programs_quick_reference_guide.pdf

Introduction

Along with access to nationally and internationally recognized faculty and some of the world’s foremost research facilities, the graduate assistantship stands as one of the cornerstones of the success of graduate education in the United States. The graduate assistantship provides the mechanism whereby high aptitude and highly motivated students can be compensated for their participation in the graduate education and research enterprise. Compensation for individuals who hold a graduate assistantship typically has two portions: a stipend (‘salary’) and a method of ‘waiving’ graduate tuition. Notwithstanding a stipend and some sort of tuition reduction, graduate students are also attracted to a university for the graduate courses and programs offered, quality of the faculty, on-going research activities, industry collaborations, and opportunities and facilities for graduate students. These are all important factors for attracting and retaining top quality graduate students. The scope of this report, however, will focus on graduate stipends and the GAD.

Graduate assistantships may be given with duties that span teaching (“GTA”), research (“GRA”), extension (“GEA”), and administration (“GAA”). Graduate assistantships require each assistantship holder to engage in a set number of hours per week of formally assigned duties, as appropriate given one (or more) of those areas cited above. In recognition of the need to graduate students to have time to prepare for course work, qualifying examinations, and to engage in thesis or dissertation research in addition to their duties for their assistantship, a ‘full time’ assistantship is typically set at 20 hours per week. Clemson allows graduate assistantships to be offered in 10, 20, and in a limited number of special cases, 30 hours per week levels.
Definitions

Assistantship. An assistantship is a formal position. It should be offered using a formal offer letter, which should contain a minimal set of parameters describing the stipend, period of appointment, conditions under which the assistantship can be continued or revoked, other program-relevant provisions, and should contain a signature line indicating acceptance of the offer by the graduate student. As noted above, the assistantship is composed of two portions: the stipend, and the tuition and fees. The value of an assistantship in dollars can be expressed as:

\[
\text{Graduate Assistantship}= (\text{Graduate Stipend}) + (\text{Graduate Tuition and Fees})
\]

Stipend. The stipend is an amount of money that is paid to the student via the university payroll system. The sources of funds can be Educational and General funds (E&G), funds from external research sponsors, or in special cases, funds from foreign governments or from corporations. The stipend level is set at the department level, either by the faculty or the department chair. In most cases, the stipend for a student who is being provided with an assistantship comes from an external research sponsor and is determined by the Principal Investigator (PI).

Tuition and Fees. Graduate tuition and fees are set by the Clemson Board of Trustees upon the recommendation of the programs, graduate school, and administration. They represent competitive market and/or cost-derived rates that are appropriate for graduate students at Clemson University. Tuition and Fees for graduate assistantship holders are composed of two portions: one portion paid for the student by the university, and one portion paid by the student to the university. Graduate tuition for a graduate program at Clemson is currently set at one of four 'Tiers' assessments. Each tier was determined by a formal process in which departments were asked to provide the names of specific competitor programs, for which representative tuition, stipend, and health subsidy information was obtained. By definition, each tier represents a competitive market level given the list of competitors provided by each program.

Graduate Fee. The graduate fee is set by the Board of Trustees, and represents an amount that is charged to the assistantship holder each term. This is the portion of tuition and fees that is paid by each student. Currently, the Graduate Fee is $959 per semester and $315 per summer session.

What is GAD?

The Graduate Assistantship Differential is the difference between the Tuition and Fees set by the Board of Trustees, and the Graduate Fee, also set by the Board of Trustees. The Graduate Assistantship Differential represents the portion of tuition and fees paid for the student by the university.

\[
(\text{Graduate Assistantship Differential})= (\text{Graduate Tuition and Fees}) - (\text{Graduate Fee})
\]
Graduate Fund. A pool is maintained in the Provost’s office which receives revenue from two sources. The first source is 100% of any tuition charged to an external sponsor (currently estimated to be $1,600,000 for FY08); the second source is (for FY08) $815,000 of E&G funds provided by the Provost. The entirety of those funds was used to supplement stipends of PhD students in FY08. One hundred percent (100%) of the funds were disbursed for that purpose, without any debt service, IT, or graduate fees being charged to them. What this means is that every dollar of tuition obtained from a sponsor is being ‘matched’ by $0.51 from the University. At most universities, these funds are taken directly by the CFO (as is the case for undergraduate tuition unless the institution is using a Resource Center Management approach).

Cost Share. Clemson has the ability to commit to pay the Graduate Assistantship Differential itself in response to a variety of strategic situations:

1. A sponsor does not allow tuition to be charged. Solution— to be in accord with Trustee policy Clemson provides an amount of cost share equal to the tuition which is not allowed by the sponsor.
2. A highly competitive program, in which the university wishes to display an exceptional level of competitiveness to gain a particular award, such as an NSF IGERT or ERC.
3. A program in which the maximum award amount is so small that it barely even covers the stipend portion of an assistantship at a competitive level.

Dr. Rafert routinely provides cost share to all categories, so there is no ‘penalty’ for a PI at Clemson who wishes to pursue a grant in any of these categories.

What Does All of this Signify?

Perhaps the first point to be emphasized in regard to the misunderstanding manifested in the recent survey report is that the GAD represents the equivalent of graduate school tuition that has been mandated by the Board of Trustees.

Were the graduate student not to receive any financial support (self-paying student), the Clemson University graduate student would pay the GAD (typically $3,000) plus a fee ($954). If the student were to receive stipend support via a teaching assistantship (GTA) or a research assistantship (GRA), then the GTA’s GAD is covered either by the University (E&G funds) or the GRA’s GAD is covered by the Principal Investigator (PI). In addition to the stipend, the graduate student receives medical insurance coverage.

In the cases where the research sponsor allows the expense (most agencies), the PI pays for the GAD with an add-on in the budget of the PI award (‘other’ category). The GAD for a GRA can be waived as a cost-sharing contribution by the Graduate Dean for cases in which the funding agency does not allow such an expense in the budget. The amount of the GAD expense
is determined by the tier classification that is dependent upon the particular PI's department. The expense of the GAD ranges from $3,600 (tier 1) to $2,000 (tier 4). It is also true that the GAD expense can be pro-rated between a GRA and a GTA.

The second point to be noted is that the present system of the GAD has two positive aspects. Given that GRA students are supported by funding by research awards from agencies, the PI benefits from the GAD for two reasons. The first is that the GAD funding improves the chances of recruiting good graduate students because the graduate student stipend is increased by a supplement. The second is that there is no overhead charge to the PI for any GAD funding received from the research sponsor.

**Concerns**

- According to Faculty Senate Survey (February 2009), the GAD is overly complicated, confusing, and poses a burden on PIs. The present GAD process at Clemson does not take into account such variables as grant/contract size (which can vary from a few thousand dollars to several hundred thousand dollars), the diversity of the graduate student population (GRA, GTA, GAA, Master’s, PhD’s, distance-learning, etc), and the wide range of graduate student stipends (from $3,500/yr to $40,000/yr).

- Currently, the assessment of the GAD is that it represents a “one size fits all” type of approach. Although the tier system attempts to address this, there is only a $1600 difference between the 4 tiers ($3600 for Tier 1 to $2000 for Tier 4). This is a small variance when one considers the wide range of stipends and grant sizes.

- It is very difficult for small projects (in the tens of thousands of dollars) to support even one graduate student via stipend and GAD amounts. Often waivers have to be granted from the Graduate Dean, which results in other sources (E&G and GAD fees from larger research projects) subsidizing graduate students on small projects. The feeling is that small projects are being unfairly incentivized, yet there are colleges that have difficulty finding large research grants. Often the PIs in these colleges, who often have full teaching loads, cannot even cover a course buyout and a graduate student from such small projects. Thus, is it even worth pursuing a small grant?

- The accounting of the funds associated with the fees collected from all graduate students ($12 million for FY 09) is not very transparent. Even the Graduate Dean does not know how these collected funds are used.

**Recommendations**

The Faculty Senate Research Committee has reviewed the details regarding the GAD process including the comments proffered by the CU Faculty Survey and Dr. Rafert’s white paper and has arrived at the following recommendations:
1. Communications between the CU administration and CU PIs should be improved so that the purpose and utilization of the GAD are better understood. The Rafert Report represents an exhaustive overview that brings together all of the details regarding the GAD in regard to the history and evolution of graduate student tuition. The Research Committee recommends that information regarding the web posting of GAD documentation be more clearly circulated to prospective PIs via the Sponsored Programs Office and the Vice President Office of Research. Other means of fostering communications should be considered.

2. Communications between the CU administration and CU PIs should be improved so that the accounting of the fees collected from graduate students is better understood. Without some transparency of accounting, it will be impossible to suggest ways of making improvements to the GAD and ensuring the money is used to support its intended goal which is to produce an increase in the graduate student stipend so that better quality graduate students may be recruited to come to CU.

3. When the GAD was originally established, there was no faculty input. The GAD is not working in its current state. It needs to be reviewed and revised based on the consideration of several variables mentioned previously (grant/contract size, the diversity of the graduate student population, and the wide range of stipend amounts). The Faculty Senate research committee recommends accordingly that a taskforce be appointed with the goal of making GAD less cumbersome and more equitable for all PIs and graduate students across all colleges. It is further recommended that this taskforce include faculty representatives from all colleges with experience on grants of various amounts.

Note: The intention of this report is to raise the different concerns about the effectiveness and application of the GAD. The report recommends that a task force be established allowing for faculty input to make specific recommendations for changing the GAD.
Maymester scheduling change
The ad hoc committee recommends that the Monday through Friday class meeting times for Clemson Maymester courses be changed from the present 5:30 – 8:30 PM time period to 3:30 – 6:30 PM beginning Maymester 2010. The time for the two Saturday classes would remain the same, 9 AM to 12 noon.

Issues related to international transfer credits
The registrar’s office anticipates a proposal to be shared in April or may 2009.

The Year in Review
Faculty Scholarship Award (9-23-08): It was established by the faculty senate in 1959 to be given annually to the member of the graduating class with the highest academic achievement. Until 1975, only one student per year received the award... most recently, 49 students received in 2006 and 30 in 2008.

• Issue #1. Plaque has not been updated since 1998. The committee recommended a video display of recipients (original plaque to direct individuals to the new mode of display...) also names to appear on Clemson web site in a prominent manner.
• Issue #2. Observe criteria as written... highest GPA required for the award.
• Issue #3. Medals to be awarded similar to those awarded in 2008 (Gold electroplate); ribbon to match Clemson colors-orange, white, and purple
• Issue #4. Certificate to be updated (new format to be circulated through the committee)

Safe Teaching Committee (10-21-08): A new committee to review teaching activities involving safety hazards. Committee members suggest that departments in which such hazards are used or are present in the laboratory setting develop “Best Practices” to address this issue (CAFLS - biological sciences and Engineering-chemistry have expressed concern). At the college level, the expertise of Departmental safety coordinators should be utilized and these Best Practices should be written by the Faculty of each department. Committee members reiterated that department/college level mechanisms are best.

Online Exams (10-21-08). Committee members suggested that the current exam policy be revised by adding: “for online courses, the syllabus will designate when during the exam week, the final examination will be given (date/time) or due.

Summer Reading Committee (10-21-08)-Committee proposed to add the Chief Diversity Officer as an ex officio member.
Undergraduate Integrity Policy (9-23-08; 10-21-08)-Simplified procedure for first time offenders of plagiarism
Committee members endorsed the proposed procedure for first time offenders for plagiarism; editorial suggestions regarding the circulated form were suggested Academic Integrity provisions on page 29 of the undergraduate Announcements need minor editing (see C1

Assignment and Sale of Textbooks and Other Course Materials to Students (12-9-08.) Under no circumstances should the faculty member engage in the direct sale of textbooks or other course materials to students. Faculty members who wish to assign textbooks or other course materials that they authored or edited as part of a Clemson University course must first complete a written disclosure form identifying the economic interest they may have in the textbook or materials. This disclosure form should be submitted to the faculty member’s Department Chair – or if the faculty member is the Department Chair, to their Dean – for final approval in accordance with the SC Ethics Act. This restriction does not limit the freedom of faculty members to develop course materials that can be sold through the bookstore or other suppliers.

Latin Honors (1-20-09)
Effective with fall semester 2010, implement a grade point centered minimum threshold of 3.70 cum laude, 3.85 magna cum laude and 3.95 summa cum laude for Latin honors (current min GPAs 3.40 cum laude, 3.7 magna cum laude and 3.9 summa cum laude. In 2006, 45% received honors (from 1996-2005 it has been steadily rising)

Evaluation of Academic Advising 91-20-09)-PENDING
Possibility of a uniform system of evaluation for advising (department /college level); evaluation of current system in advising across the university; separation of “course scheduling” advising from career advising; Academic advising web site to provide useful tips to students on advising.

Maymester scheduling change (2-17-09)
Committee endorsed the proposal “Monday through Friday class meeting times for Clemson Maymester courses be changed from the present 5:30 – 8:30 PM time period to 3:30 – 6:30 PM beginning Maymester 2010. The time for the two Saturday classes would remain the same, 9 AM to 12 noon.”

Academic Eligibility Re-enrollment Deadline Proposal (2-17-09)
Committee endorsed proposal to “add a re-enrollment application deadline (two days before the first day of classes) to encourage re-enrolling students to be more prepared to begin classes and to provide an opportunity for students to meet with an advisor prior to registering for classes. This deadline would appear on the re-enrollment application and other re-enrollment materials (registrar’s web-site, withdrawal packet, etc.).”

Issues related to international transfer credits (21-17-09)-PENDING
Issues associated with international transfer credit were identified. There is a proliferation of study abroad programs; faculty input in the process-course content/credit hours; SACS related requirements on policies regarding transfer credit; European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System (Bologna agreement); TCEL (Transfer Credit Equivalency List); World Education Services; Articulation agreements...

Scholastic Policies Committee Contact Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Antonis Katsiyannis</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>407-C Tillman</td>
<td>656-5114</td>
<td><a href="mailto:antonis@clemson.edu">antonis@clemson.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Dawson</td>
<td>Food Science</td>
<td>204 Poole</td>
<td>656-1138</td>
<td><a href="mailto:pdawson@clemson.edu">pdawson@clemson.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne Goddard</td>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>311 McAdams</td>
<td>656-0186</td>
<td><a href="mailto:goddard@clemson.edu">goddard@clemson.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vic Shelburne</td>
<td>Forestry</td>
<td>212 Lehotsky</td>
<td>656-4855</td>
<td><a href="mailto:vshlbrn@clemson.edu">vshlbrn@clemson.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Weisenmiller</td>
<td>Graphic Comm</td>
<td>G-01 Tillman</td>
<td>656-3653</td>
<td><a href="mailto:emweise@clemson.edu">emweise@clemson.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah Willoughby</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>409 Edwards</td>
<td>656-1437</td>
<td><a href="mailto:willoud@clemson.edu">willoud@clemson.edu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Class Meeting Times for Clemson Maymester Courses

Background
On September 12, 2008, the Council on Undergraduate Studies appointed an ad hoc committee to investigate possibly changing Clemson’s Maymester Monday through Friday course times, now 5:30 to 8:30 PM, to an earlier time. The courses also meet 9 AM to 12 noon on two Saturdays.

Committee members were Student Jeremy Digorio (HEHD), Student Joel Dixon (AAH), Rick Jarvis (Staff), Professor Richard Klein (BBS), Student David Randolph (BBS), Professor Joe Sample (AAH), and Registrar Stan Smith (Staff).

The committee met on October 9, October 30, and November 11.

At the October 9 meeting, the committee reviewed 2008 summer school data collected by Rick Jarvis. The data revealed that less than 4% of the students enrolled in both Maymester and first summer session would have had a time conflict if their Maymester class began after 3:00 PM. Also, the data revealed that 78% of the students enrolled in Maymester are equally divided between two colleges, the college of Architecture, Arts, and Humanities and the College of Business and Behavioral Science.

At the October 30 meeting, the committee reviewed data collected via a web based Maymester survey sent to all enrolled undergraduate students. One thousand and eighty-two students responded. One question was, “What time would be preferable for a Maymester class?” Among those students who expressed a preference (757 students), 76% preferred 3:30 PM - 6:30 PM, 15% preferred 4:30 - 7:30 PM, and 17% preferred 5:30 - 8:30 PM. Of those students who had taken a Maymester course, the percentages were 65%, 25%, and 25% respectively. (In both instances, the percentages add to greater than 100% because some students indicated multiple preferences.) These values were substantially the same when grouped by college and whether students planned on taking a future Maymester course.

At the November 11 meeting, the committee reviewed data collected via a web based Maymester survey sent to all faculty. 238 responded. One question was, “If you teach a Maymester class in the future, which time would you prefer?” The response was 3:30 – 6:30 PM (79.4%), 4:30 – 7:30 PM (12.5%), and 5:30 – 8:30 PM (8.2%). These percentages were independent of college and whether the respondent had previously taught a Maymester course.

Recommendation
The ad hoc committee recommends that the Monday through Friday class meeting times for Clemson Maymester courses be changed from the present 5:30 – 8:30 PM time period to 3:30 – 6:30 PM beginning Maymester 2010. The time for the two Saturday classes would remain the same, 9 AM to 12 noon.

Additional Info...A study ran by Javrey indicated that only a 3.4% conflict existed between Maymester at the proposed time and 1st summer (773-Maymester; 6510 Summer 1); 2010 implementation date (3-7-09)
Salaries 2009
Salary Tables Analyzed

Over 50 K Report Column Table

1834 Records

Salary Tables Analyzed

Supplemental Table Column Headings

2154 Salary adjustments

Cont-change in contract (e.g. conversion from 9 to 12 mo)

(PeR-performance, Prom-promotion, Cola-cost of living adjustment,

e-Per-change in contract (e.g. conversion from 9 to 12 mo)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Misc</th>
<th>Bud</th>
<th>Prev</th>
<th>Ctr</th>
<th>Dept</th>
<th>Factbook</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Effective Date</th>
<th>Category Name</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Table with columns and data entries.

Notes | Monthly | PreVailing | Salary | %Change | Salary | Perm | Prev | Band | Group | Title | Title Name | State | Category | Description | Notes | Bud | Year |
The State Report

The State reported salary increases to a number of individuals on July 28, 2008. Many administrators appeared to receive mid-year raises. One thing to note is that Employees with Salaries \( \geq 150,000 \) must go through Compensation Committee Review. Thus many of these salary increases that were given in 2007 actually didn't get approved until after October 1, 2007 which gives the appearance of a mid-year raise. 2008. Many administrators appeared to receive mid-year raises. A number of individuals on July 28, 2008.
For example: Administrator Clemson Tiger

CT Salary as of Oct. 1, 2008 according to OIR 2008 report: $173,316
CT State July 28, 2008 salary: $173,316. (An increase of $8,316 or 5.04%)
CT Salary as of Oct. 1, 2007 according to OIR 2007 report: $165,000.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$1,716</th>
<th>Cost-of Living Adjustment</th>
<th>13-Jun-08</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$6,600</td>
<td>Performance Pay</td>
<td>15-Jun-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Cost-of Living Adjustment</td>
<td>15-Jun-07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the supplemental data,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>US News Top 20</th>
<th>8 Targeted Institutions</th>
<th>Comparison Group Description</th>
<th>Min Salary</th>
<th>Avg Salary</th>
<th>Max Salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mascot</td>
<td>Mascot</td>
<td>Tiger</td>
<td>$189,400</td>
<td>$210,985</td>
<td>$250,001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$173,250</td>
<td>$210,985</td>
<td>$250,001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$220,553</td>
<td>$210,985</td>
<td>$250,001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$252,938</td>
<td>$250,001</td>
<td>$250,001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Board of Trustees Compensation Committee Review of Clemson Tiger

Min - Minimum Salary
Avg - Average Salary
Max - Maximum Salary
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Min Salary</th>
<th>Avg Salary</th>
<th>Max Salary</th>
<th>Comparison Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$706,800</td>
<td>$326,438</td>
<td>$706,800</td>
<td>US News Top 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$706,800</td>
<td>$326,438</td>
<td>$706,800</td>
<td>8 Targeted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Example 2: Provost Comparison**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provost \ Chief Academic Affairs &amp; Provost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Min Salary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$192,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$192,390</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chief Academic Affairs & Provost**
Sorted by Budget Center

Deleted Athletics leaves 1,762 records (2,073 salary adjustments)

Of the salary adjustments:

- 1,708 Cost of Living Adjustments
- 32 Performance Equity Increases
- 107 Performance Pay
- 63 Promotion
- 26 Job Reclassification
- 32 Additional Duties
- 105 Other

Of the salary adjustments:

salary adjustments

Deleted Athletics leaves 1,762 records (2073 salary adjustments)

- Sorted by Budget Center

Filter Athletics
Who received raises?

- The rest received 6% or above (195)
- 31 received between 6 and 7%
- 27 received between 5 and 6%
- 18 received between 4 and 5%
- 4 received between 3 and 4%
- 4 received between 2 and 3%
- 2 received between 1 and 2%
- 1367 received 1%
- 36 received between 0.5% and >1%
- 68 received between 0 and >0.5%
- 10 received >0%
Who received performance raises?

Notes: Some of these may include a promotion in addition to a performance raise. A raise due to a change of duties is a promotion.

- Facilities 6/33
- Service 35/67
- Cooperative Extension 3/137
- COES 12/340
- CBBS 1/177
- CAAH 2/159
- CARLS 6/253
- CCIT 9/186
- Chief Administrative Officer 6/22
- University Advancement 13/58
- Student Affairs 8/54
- Research 2/27
- Agriculture 13/117
- Public Service and Provost 7/61
- President 2/14
- Library 3/21
- Financial Affairs 3/28
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College of Agriculture, Forestry &amp; Life Science</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of employees over $50,000</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of employees receiving increases above guidelines</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of employees whose increase reflects a promotion/contract change</td>
<td>16/24</td>
<td>21/32</td>
<td>17/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total employees over $50,000 &amp; receiving increases above guidelines</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Employee increases above guidelines: 0% to 6% in 2006, 2007; 1% in 2008.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>College of Engineering</th>
<th>% Increase over $50,000</th>
<th># Employees</th>
<th># Employees Receiving Increases Above Guidelines</th>
<th>Promotions/Contract Changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>340</td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Employee Increases above Guidelines: 0% to 6% in 2006, 2007, 1% in 2008.
Employee increases above guidelines
0% to 6% in 2006, 2007; 1% in 2008

College of Architecture, Arts, & Humanities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| $50,000
Number of employees over | 159 152 137 | 25 27 19 | 19 8 17 |
<p>| Promotion/contract change increase reflects a promotion/contract change above guidelines | 17 8 7 | 19 27 25 | 17 8 19 |
| Number of employees whose increase reflects a promotion/contract change above guidelines | 19 8 17 | 19 8 17 | 19 8 17 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of employees over $50,000</th>
<th>Number of employees receiving increases above guidelines</th>
<th>Number of above whose increase reflects a promotion/contract change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Employee increases above guidelines

0% to 6% in 2006, 2007; 1% in 2008
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Employees Over $50,000</th>
<th>Employees Receiving Increases Above Guidelines</th>
<th>Promotion/Contract Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Employee increases above guidelines for 0% to 6% in 2006, 2007, 1% in 2008.

College of Health, Education, & Human Development
The next slides do not include records that have promotions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Research Associate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Human resources manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Director/Computational Science director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1 Global Bus Dev Director (ICAR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1 Alumni Dev Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1 Research Prof</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2 Asst. Profs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2 Prof</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3 Assoc Prof</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1 Production Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1 Eng./Assoc. Eng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>11 senior extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2 info research consult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>7 extension or senior extension associate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2 info research consult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2 info research consult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>2 info research consult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>2 info research consult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>2 info research consult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>2 info research consult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>2 info research consult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>2 info research consult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>2 info research consult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>2 info research consult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>2 info research consult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>2 info research consult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>2 info research consult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>2 info research consult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>2 info research consult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>2 info research consult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>2 info research consult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>2 info research consult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>2 info research consult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>2 info research consult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>2 info research consult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>2 info research consult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>2 info research consult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>2 info research consult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>2 info research consult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>2 info research consult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>2 info research consult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>2 info research consult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>2 info research consult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>2 info research consult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>2 info research consult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>2 info research consult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>2 info research consult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>2 info research consult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>2 info research consult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>2 info research consult</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Only 8 are 9 month employees

Notes: Top 50 Based on %
Top 50 Based on $ Increase

5 Asst Profs
1 Alumni Dev Manager
1 Director (ICAR)
5 Global Bus Dev Science
1 Director/Computational
1 Public Relations Director
1 Human Resources
3 Assoc Profs
1 Research Associate
18 Administrators

1 Exec Dir of CURF
1 Program Leader
1 Program Leader Office
Including 1 from Provost
2 Info Research Consultant
5 Senior Extension Agents
2 Extension Associates
2 Extension or Senior
1 Lecturer Non-Teaching
3 Assoc Prof
3 Prof
11 of 50 are instructional faculty

Notes: Top 50 Based on $
Summary of Salary Increases
Stratified by Factbook Category
(Fall 2008 Data)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factbook Category</th>
<th>Average Increase</th>
<th>Median Increase</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Average Increase</th>
<th>Median Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Faculty</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2746</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Faculty</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Faculty</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Service Faculty</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Professional Faculty</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Annual Increase: $1341
Average Monthly Increase: $125
Average Annual Increase: $1493
Average Monthly Increase: $124

Salary Category

Administrator
Administrative Faculty
Instructional Faculty
Research Faculty
Public Service Faculty
Other Professional Faculty
Administrator
All Other
Performance/Salary Increases Over 1% by Fact Book Category Not Including Promotions
Who are Administrators?

- Associate Academic Program Director
- Associate Director of Residential Life
- Student Services Manager at the Health Center
- Extension Director, Colleton Dee Research and Education Center
- Building/Grounds Manager for the Pee Dee Research and Education Center
Who Are Administrators with Faculty Rank?

- Provost
- Associate Dean/Dean
- Visiting Professor/University Historian
- Lecturer
- 3 Administrators w/Faculty Rank of Associate Dean or above received Salary Increases > 1%
Staff Receiving Performance/Salary Increases

Over 1% Not Including Promotions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Extension Agent</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director I/II</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant II</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Resource Consultant</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate/Extension Agent</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension Director</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager I/II/III</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Faculty and Staff Senate

by a committee that includes members of the administration, or go through special review. Faculty and Staff Senate would be avoided or go through special review. Separate promotions that do not include a change in title should be avoided. Targeting certain groups regardless of reason should be avoided.

- Separate promotions that do not include a change in title should be avoided.
- Targeting certain groups regardless of reason should be avoided.
- The finance committee will meet (possibly with administration) and make recommendations.

Recommendations
The Policy Committee met on February 17. The following were discussed.

1. A change in the selection process for the Faculty Representative to the Board of Trustees. A proposed Manual change will be presented under New Business.

2. A clarification in the Manual definition of the title Faculty and who may be appointed to various committees. A proposed Manual change will be presented under New Business.

3. Began a discussion on the length of service for Visiting Faculty. The Manual indicates that these appointments are to be for a brief period. However, some Visiting Faculty have served for several years and there is a question as to whether such an individual may be promoted (from a Visiting Assistant Professor to a Visiting Associate Professor). We will continue this discussion at our March meeting. The Provost’s Office is gathering information as to how many such persons are in departments.

4. We have received a request from Graphic Communications to change the Manual wording regarding the makeup of the Departmental Advisory Committee. We will discuss this request at our March meeting.

Due to Spring Break, the Policy Committee met again on Monday, March 9. Proposals from that meeting will be presented at the March Advisory/Executive Committee meeting.
Memorandum

TO: Dr. Bryan Simmons, President, Faculty Senate
FROM: Dr. William Bowerman, Vice-President, Faculty Senate
CC: Dr. Vic Shelburne, Lead Senator, CAFLS
     Ms. Cathy Sturkie, Program Coordinator, Faculty Senate
DATE: March 5, 2009
RE: Proxy for Voting on March 10, 2009

On March 10, 2009, I will be in transit to South Africa for the foreign travel portion of WFB 493 Section 631, Ecology of the South African Savannah, which is an approved Study Abroad Spring Semester course. I will not be in attendance at the March Faculty Senate meeting.

I am therefore providing my proxy to Dr. Vic Shelburne to vote in my place for any resolution, proposal, or motion that consists of a “vote of no confidence” in any of the higher level administrators at Clemson University. I ask that Dr. Shelburne, in my stead, cast my vote against the passage of any “vote of no confidence”.

This proxy is solely for any “vote of no confidence” and I withhold my proxy for any other business of the Senate, including, but not restricted to, any other resolution, proposal, or motion that has the purpose of admonishing, censuring, or otherwise showing the Senate’s displeasure of the scale of upper administrative pay raises.

William W. Bowerman, Ph.D.
Vice-President/President-elect
Faculty Senate
MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
MARCH 10, 2009

1. Call to Order: The Faculty Senate Meeting was called to order at 2:39 p.m. by President Bryan Simmons.

2. Approval of Minutes: Approval of the February 10, 2009 Minutes was received unanimously, as written and distributed.

3. “Free Speech”: Professor Emeritus John Bednar reiterated his concerns presented at the February Faculty Senate meeting and suggested a motion of no confidence in the President and Provost and their resignation (attachment).

4. Election of Officers: The floor was opened for nominations from the floor. There being no nominations, the floor was closed. Elections were held by secret ballot resulting in the election of Bill Surver (AFLS) as Vice President/President-Elect and Alan Grubb (AAH) as Secretary.

5. Special Order of the Day: President James F. Barker joined the Senate meeting as Special Order of the Day. He provided a budget update, including a timetable, and responded to questions pertaining to the budget and to general questions from many audience members.

6. Old Business: None

7. New Business:
   a. Senator Bill Surver submitted for approval and explained the proposed Faculty Manual change, Definition of “Faculty.” There being no discussion, vote to accept proposal was held and passed (Attachment).

   b. Senator Surver submitted for approval and explained the proposed Faculty Manual change, Faculty Representative to the Board of Trustees. There being no discussion, vote to accept proposal was held and passed unanimously (Attachment).

   c. Senator Surver then explained the issue of classified versus unclassified staff serving on University committees and asked that this issue be postponed until the April Faculty Senate meeting. Vote to postpone was taken and passed unanimously.

   d. Asking for endorsements, Senator Antonis Katsiyannis submitted and explained three proposed changes regarding the composition of the Calhoun Honors Committee, the Maymester schedule and a proposed Academic Eligibility Re-enrollment Deadline. There was no discussion. Vote was taken on the individual proposals:
Calhoun Honors College was passed unanimously; Maymester schedule, was passed; Deadline for Academic Eligibility Re-enrollment passed unanimously (Attachments).

Senator Katsiyannis thanked his Committee members for their work this session and also thanked members of the Faculty Senate for their support.

e. Senator John Meriwether submitted the draft report, A Review of the GAD at Clemson University, including recommendations, and asked that it be postponed until the April Faculty Senate meeting. Vote to postpone was taken and passed unanimously (attachment).

8. Committee Reports:
   a. Senate Committees:  
      1) Scholastic Policies – Senator Wayne Goddard submitted and briefly explained the Committee Report dated March 10, 2009 (attachment).

      2) Finance Committee – Chair Wayne Sarasua submitted and explained a draft report, Salaries 2009, noting that recommendations will be formally submitted at the April Senate Meeting following a review by the Executive/Advisory Committee which will meet on March 31st.

      3) Research Committee – Senator Prasad Rangarau stated that the Committee continues to meet with Bruce Rafert and discuss the issue of GADs and plans to submit their findings in a white paper later this Senate session.

      4) Policy Committee – Chair Bill Surver stated that the Committee business was previously discussed under New Business.

      5) Welfare Committee – Chair Christina Wells stated that there was no report. Dr. Wells received applause for the diligent efforts provided by her Committee to prepare and analyze the 2009 Faculty Survey.

b. University Commissions and Committees: None

9. President’s Report: President Simmons:
   a. noted that he went to the Columbia to support students rally on the steps of the statehouse. He and Dave Crockett, Chair of the Staff Senate, were not as successful as the students in getting into the inner sanctum of the legislature.

   b. presented a report to the Board of Trustees this week and will do so again in April;

   c. responded to rumors and innuendo regarding the Bednar issue. In his response, he asked people to await the Finance Committee Salary Report, which the Senate will digest this month.
10. **Announcements:**
   a. The CURI Forum will be held from 9-11:30 a.m. on March 24, 2009 in the Jacks Ballroom of the Hendrix Center.
   
   b. President Simmons stated that the next Executive/Advisory Committee meeting will be on March 31, 2009.
   
   c. President Simmons stated that the next Faculty Senate meeting will be on April 14, 2009 immediately followed by the Faculty Senate Annual Spring Reception in the FirstSun Connector.

11. **Adjournment:** President Simmons adjourned the meeting at 5:02 p.m.

   [Signature]

   Linda Howe, Secretary

   [Signature]

   Cathy Toth Sturkie, Program Coordinator

Absent: H. Luo, B. Bowerman, Y. An (C. Adams for), E. Weisenmiller (C. Cantalupo for), T. Boland
Since the last meeting of the Faculty Senate, a certain amount of interest in my remarks has been expressed, both in the regional press and throughout the Clemson community ... and new information has also come to light. Some of that information, in my mind, was sufficient to provoke an emergency meeting of the Faculty Senate in order to confront the Administration with it. Following the Senate rules for calling such a meeting, I sent an email to President Simmons asking him to do so (for he can) and I copied the Advisory Council (for by a majority vote they can)... I was denied even the courtesy of a response to my request, either from President Simmons or the Advisory Council, whose members had been apprised of it before their last meeting. The only path left open to me was to try to obtain a 10% vote of the entire Faculty (which is the third and final option). I asked that my request be communicated by email to everyone on the Faculty, copying President Barker and Provost Helms and asking them to forward my request. Silence was again my answer, a silence that meant refusal, a refusal that denied me the right to apply the Senate’s very own rules. My original intention for today’s presentation was to talk more at length about that.

For a number of reasons, however, not the least of which is the realization that so many faculty and staff members have been seething for some time with anger and frustration about the issues I have raised, I have decided to speak openly today for them ... and not harp on my failed attempts to get the Faculty Senate and the Administration of Clemson University, and even the local Press to support the democratic process at Clemson.

About a week ago, a friend of mine called me and said that a member of the Board of Trustees at Clemson University was overheard referring to me as “that lone rebel griping about everything” ... or something to that effect.

For those of you who may be thinking exactly the same thing, given the amount of time and effort I have put into bringing these important and controversial subjects to the surface, I have a suggestion: READ THE FACULTY SURVEY. Read it carefully, as I have ... all 357 pages of it ... and formulate your own opinions about how many educators in this institution are just as critical as I am ... or perhaps more so. Read the charges and criticisms they level about: Top Twenty Propaganda, President Barker, Provost Helms, Administrative Salaries (one of their most frequent complaints), International Affairs, Differential Tuition, Faculty Morale, In-breeding at the Administrative Level, False Promises, Incompetence and Lack of Integrity.

My preoccupation with President Barker’s compensation as a member of the Board of The Shaw Group ($174,132 last year) ... a group that reportedly has an exclusive contract for flooring with Clemson ... and other compensation from the Clemson Foundation ($172,344 in 2007), in addition to his published salary of $227,656 ... or the fact that his son is employed at Clemson and that members of the Administration have falsely stated that the Ethics Commission in Columbia gave its approval for this hire (Cathy Hazelwood , legal counsel at the Commission, told me on Friday that no formal or
Administration has wallowed in its own selfishness and desire for self-preservation ... at the future expense of many faculty and staff members and the students it appears ... while the most important parts of Clemson, the Faculty, Staff and Students, have seen injustice after injustice committed in the name of Top Twenty.

There have been too many lies and false promises. There have been too many abuses of power and money. There has been too much hypocritical talk and too much simple human greed. The Faculty of Clemson University must now stand up and take the lead in saving the academic quality and integrity of this institution. I therefore urge you to move and pass a motion of no-confidence in President Barker and Provost Helms. And I further suggest that it would appropriate, under the circumstances, for these top two administrators to resign, effective immediately and for Clemson University to put its house in order.

Thank you.
Members present: Goddard, Dawson, Shelburne, Katsiyannis

**Maymester scheduling change**
The ad hoc committee recommends that the Monday through Friday class meeting times for Clemson Maymester courses be changed from the present 5:30 – 8:30 PM time period to 3:30 – 6:30 PM beginning Maymester 2010. The time for the two Saturday classes would remain the same, 9 AM to 12 noon.

Additional clarification was provided regarding issues considered in proposing the change...once the proposed schedule is adopted (in 2010), only approved exceptions will be allowed...
F. Terminology

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

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

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

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

4. faculty -- a generic term including all of the above.
Proposed Change to Appendix B – Selection of Faculty Representative to the Board of Trustees

Appendix B

Current Policy

FACULTY REPRESENTATIVE TO THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES

The Clemson University Board of Trustees has approved the concept of a Faculty Representative to the Board of Trustees using the process outlined below. This individual is recognized as the official representative of the Faculty and is granted privileges beyond those accorded to visitors to Board meetings. This includes receipt of Minutes, Agendas, and attachments of all Board and Committee meetings and an opportunity to be included on the Agenda upon approval of request.

Selection Procedures
A Faculty Representative to the Board of Trustees Selection Committee, composed of one Distinguished Alumni Professor from each College, one Library representative, and the President of the Faculty Senate, will solicit nominations for the Faculty Representative to the Board of Trustees in the Fall, 1998, and every third year thereafter.
Any individual holding tenure at Clemson University will be eligible for nomination. The nomination period will run for fourteen days from the date of the Call for Nominations. Each nomination must include a complete curriculum vitae and a statement of interest from the nominee.

The Faculty Manual Editorial Consultant will examine all nominations to verify the faculty status of each nominee. The names of all eligible nominees will be distributed to the members of the Selection Committee. The Committee will consider the nominations and make the final selection based on nominee’s curriculum vitae and statement of interest.
The Faculty Representative will serve a three-year term commencing with the first Board meeting following selection.

Faculty Manual
Proposed new policy:

FACULTY REPRESENTATIVE TO THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES

The Clemson University Board of Trustees has approved the concept of a Faculty Representative to the Board of Trustees using the process outlined below. This individual is recognized as the official representative of the Faculty and is granted privileges beyond those accorded to visitors to Board meetings. This includes receipt of Minutes, Agendas, and attachments of all Board and Committee meetings and an opportunity to be included on the Agenda upon approval of request.

Selection Procedures

A Faculty Representative to the Board of Trustees Selection Committee, composed of two previous Board Representatives, selected by all previous Representatives, two Distinguished Alumni Professors, selected by the Alumni Professors, the President-Elect of the Senate, the President of the Faculty Senate, and the lead Faculty Senators from all Colleges not otherwise represented, will solicit nominations for the Faculty Representative to the Board of Trustees three months prior to the expiration of the term of the incumbent Faculty Representative.

Any regular faculty (as defined by the Faculty Manual) member holding tenure at Clemson University will be eligible for nomination. Self-nominations will be accepted. The nomination period will run for fourteen days from the date of the Call for Nominations. Each nomination must include a complete curriculum vitae, a statement of interest from the nominee, and a statement from the nominee detailing experience in faculty governance (including areas such curriculum, promotion and tenure policies, faculty/administration relations, faculty senate or academic policies).

The Faculty Manual Editorial Consultant will examine all nominations to verify the faculty status of each nominee. The names of all eligible nominees will be distributed to the members of the Selection Committee. The Committee will consider the nominations and make the final selection based on nominee’s curriculum vitae, statement of interest, and faculty governance experience.

The Faculty Representative will serve a three-year term commencing with the first Board meeting following selection. If during the term of office the Faculty Representative assumes administrative duties a replacement will be selected using the above procedures. The newly selected Faculty Representative will serve a full three-year term. The Faculty Representative may not serve successive terms in the office.
Proposed Change to Section III - 3 D. Insert the following at the end of the introductory paragraph before the listing of the regular faculty ranks.

Unless indicated otherwise, when the term "regular faculty" is used throughout the Faculty Manual it is limited to faculty with the ranks described below who have no administrative appointment.

"Regular" would then be inserted throughout the manual where only faculty is now used and will clarify regular faculty where this appears.
Proposed Faculty Manual Change – Part VII Section B, 1-e

Current Language:

e. Calhoun Honors College Committee formulates and recommends policies and procedures for Calhoun Honors College to the Council on Undergraduate Studies. The faculty members on the committee serve as the curriculum committee for the honors program. Membership consists of five faculty members, one from each college elected for a three-year term. Colleges shall elect from their ranks faculty with experience and interest in the Honors College as indicated by such activities as teaching honors courses, directing honors theses and research projects, and serving on honors committees at the department and college level. Other voting members are: one member of the Faculty Senate elected for a one-year term; two faculty members, each serving two-year terms and appointed by the director of the Honors College from the combined constituencies of the Dixon Senior Fellows, Calhoun Honors seminar instructors, and Bradbury Award recipients; one student member of the Dixon Fellows program elected by the other fellows; one student member of the Calhoun Society elected by the members of the Society; one honors student appointed by the director of the Honors College. All student members shall serve one-year terms. Non-voting members are the director, associate director, and assistant director of the Honors College, and one representative from the office of undergraduate admissions.

Proposed New Language:

e. Calhoun Honors College Committee formulates and recommends policies and procedures for Calhoun Honors College to the Council on Undergraduate Studies. The faculty members on the committee serve as the curriculum committee for the honors program. Membership consists of six faculty members, one from each college and one representative from the Library elected for a three-year term. Colleges shall elect from their ranks faculty with experience and interest in the Honors College as indicated by such activities as teaching honors courses, directing honors theses and research projects, and serving on honors committees at the department and college level. Other voting members are: one member of the Faculty Senate elected for a one-year term; two faculty members, each serving two-year terms and appointed by the director of the Honors College from the combined constituencies of the Dixon Senior Fellows, Calhoun Honors seminar instructors, and Bradbury Award recipients; one student member of the Dixon Fellows program elected by the other fellows; one student member of the Calhoun Society elected by the members of the Society; one honors student appointed by the director of the Honors College. All student members shall serve one-year terms. Non-voting members are the director, associate director, and assistant director of the Honors College, and one representative from the office of undergraduate admissions.

Rationale – A representative from the Library has been serving on the Committee for several years but position has never been added to the Manual.
Maymester scheduling change
Committee endorsed the proposal "Monday through Friday class meeting times for Clemson Maymester courses be changed from the present 5:30 – 8:30 PM time period to 3:30 – 6:30 PM beginning Maymester 2010. The time for the two Saturday classes would remain the same, 9 AM to 12 noon."

Academic Eligibility Re-enrollment Deadline Proposal
Committee endorsed proposal to "add a re-enrollment application deadline (two days before the first day of classes) to encourage re-enrolling students to be more prepared to begin classes and to provide an opportunity for students to meet with an advisor prior to registering for classes. This deadline would appear on the re-enrollment application and other re-enrollment materials (Registrar’s web-site, withdrawal packet, etc.)."

Issues related to international transfer credits
FACULTY SENATE SCHOLASTIC POLICIES COMMITTEE  
MONTHLY MEETING MINUTES  
ANTONIS KATSIYANNIS, CHAIR  
February 17, 2009 (420 Tillman Hall) 

Members presents: Goddard, Dawson, Willoughby, Shelburne, Katsiyannis  
Guests: Teresa Wise, Office of International affairs; Johannes Schmidt, Languages; Mark McKnew, Management; Stan Smith, Registrar; Cal Becker, Registrar; Jan Murdoch, Undergraduate Dean; David Randolph, Student Government.  

Maymester scheduling change  
Committee endorsed the proposal “Monday through Friday class meeting times for Clemson Maymester courses be changed from the present 5:30 – 8:30 PM time period to 3:30 – 6:30 PM beginning Maymester 2010. The time for the two Saturday classes would remain the same, 9 AM to 12 noon.” 

Academic Eligibility Re-enrollment Deadline Proposal  
Committee endorsed proposal to “add a re-enrollment application deadline (two days before the first day of classes) to encourage re-enrolling students to be more prepared to begin classes and to provide an opportunity for students to meet with an advisor prior to registering for classes. This deadline would appear on the re-enrollment application and other re-enrollment materials (registrar’s web-site, withdrawal packet, etc.).” 

Currently there is not a deadline to submit the application for re-enrollment and students can apply for re-enrollment as late as the last day to add a course (a week after classes begin). This situation does not allow re-enrolling students time to meet with an advisor or to register for appropriate courses.  

Issues related to international transfer credits  
Issues associated with international transfer credit were identified. There is a proliferation of study abroad programs; faculty input in the process-course content/credit hours; SACS related requirements on policies regarding transfer credit; European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System (Bologna agreement); TCEL (Transfer Credit Equivalency List); World Education Services; Articulation agreements…  

The Registrar’s office in coordination with the Office of Undergraduate Studies, the Office of International Affairs, and faculty with expertise /experiences in programs abroad would draft a policy/procedures to be presented to Scholastic Policies, Senate, Undergraduate Council, Student Government…  

Next meeting: March 10, 2009 at 1:45 in the Madren Center (just before the senate meeting)
A Review of the GAD at Clemson University

Faculty Senate Research Committee

The Graduate Assistant Differential (GAD) at Clemson University (CU) is a confusing concept to many and as a result, it has become controversial. The Faculty Senate Research Committee has devoted several meetings to a review of what the GAD is and how the funds derived from GADs obtained from sponsored project activity are dispensed by the University. The participation of Dr. Bruce Rafert, Graduate Dean, in these discussions is very much appreciated. Dr. Rafert’s has written a white paper

http://www.grad.clemson.edu/Faculty/documents/The%20Graduate%20Assistantship%20Differential%20at%20Clemson%20University.pdf

which provides an exhaustive review of the GAD process and its history that is quite informative.

Three documents available on the CU web that provides further details regarding the GAD are:

www.clemson.edu/public/gss/grant_proposals/grad_rates.html

www.clemson.edu/public/gss/grant_proposals/grad_calc_by_tier.pdf

www.clemson.edu/caah/research/images/sponsored_programs_quick_reference_guide.pdf

Perhaps the first point to be emphasized in regard to the misunderstandings manifested in the recent Faculty Senate survey report is that the GAD is the portion of the graduate school tuition that is in excess of student fees.

Were a Clemson University graduate student not to receive any financial support via an assistantship or fellowship (self-paying student), that person would pay full tuition and fees composed of the GAD (typically $3,000 per semester) plus a fee ($954). If the student were to receive stipend support via a teaching assistantship (GTA) or a research assistantship (GRA), then the GTA’s GAD is covered either by the University (E&G funds) or the GRA’s GAD is covered by the Principal Investigator (PI) in the event that the sponsor allows graduate tuition support. In addition to the stipend, the graduate student receives a medical insurance coverage subsidy.

In the cases where the research sponsor allows the expense (most agencies), the sponsor pays for the GAD via a budget category (‘other’ category). The GAD for a GRA can be waived as a cost-sharing contribution by the Graduate Dean for cases in which the funding agency does not allow such an expense in the budget. The amount of the GAD expense is determined by the tier classification that is dependent upon the particular PI’s department. The expense of the GAD ranges from $3,600 (tier 1) to $2,000 (tier 4). It is also true that the GAD expense can be prorated between a GRA and a GTA.

The second point to be noted is that the Clemson GAD has two unappreciated features.

Given that GRA students are supported by funding by research awards from agencies, the PI benefits from the GAD for two reasons. The first is that the GAD funding improves the chances
of recruiting good Clemson University graduate students because of increased stipends generated from the combination of GAD funds and E&G money that is provided solely for the purpose of increasing stipends (see http://www.grad.clemson.edu/Faculty/documents/The%20Graduate%20Assistantship%20Differential%20at%20Clemson%20University.pdf).

The second feature is that there is no overhead charge to the PI for any GAD funding received from the research sponsor.

Concerns

- According to the Faculty Senate Survey (February 2009), the GAD appears to be overly complicated and confusing. Replies from faculty who are PIs indicate a perceived burden. Many who responded have never even heard of the GAD, or know what it is. Part of the problem is that the present GAD process at Clemson tries to take into account such variables as grant/contract size (which can vary from a few thousand dollars to several hundred thousand dollars), the diversity of the graduate student population (GRA, GTA, GAA, Master’s, PhD’s, distance-learning, etc), and the wide range of graduate student stipends (from $3,500/yr to $40,000/yr). The GAD revenue for FY08 amounted to $1.3 million total as compared with the total of $150 million for research awards received. The Research Committee views this amount to be limited compensation when compared with the magnitude of the administrative difficulties that the GAD represents to all parties.

- It is very difficult for small projects (in the tens of thousands of dollars) to support even one graduate student via stipend and GAD amounts, although multiple small projects can be bundled together for that purpose. Often waivers have to be granted from the Graduate Dean, which has the effect of providing a benefit (stipend supplement) to a student on a small grant from which no GAD is obtained; instead, the funds come from other grants as well as E&G. The feeling is that small projects are being unfairly burdened by the GAD expense, yet there are colleges that have difficulty funding large research grants that include graduate student support. Often the PIs in these colleges, who generally have full teaching loads, cannot even cover a course buyout and a graduate student with the award proceeds for such small projects. Thus, the question is whether it is even worth submitting such a small grant proposal.

- The accounting of the funds associated with the tuition for self-pay students, fees collected from all graduate students ($12 million for FY 08), and how the stipend supplement is financed is not transparent with regard to how these funds are spent.
Recommendations

The Faculty Senate Research Committee has reviewed the details regarding the GAD process including the comments proffered by the CU Faculty Survey and Dr. Rafert's white paper and has arrived at the following recommendations:

1. Communications between the CU administration and CU PIs should be improved so that the purpose and utilization of the GAD are better understood. The Rafert Report represents an exhaustive overview that brings together all of the details regarding the GAD in regard to the history and evolution of graduate student tuition. We urge anyone who wishes to make suggestions pertaining to modification of the current process to carefully study the Rafert Report. The Research Committee recommends that information regarding the web posting of GAD documentation be more clearly circulated to prospective PIs via the Sponsored Programs Office and the Vice President Office of Research. Other means of fostering communications should be considered.

2. Communications between the CU administration and CU PIs should be improved so that the accounting of graduate tuition and fees collected from graduate students is better understood. Without transparency regarding how these funds are spent, it is difficult to suggest ways of making improvements to the GAD and ensuring the money from that source is used to support its intended goal, namely, an increase in the graduate student stipend so that better quality graduate students may be recruited to CU.

3. When the GAD was originally established, there was no faculty input. The GAD process should be continuously reviewed and revised based on the consideration of several variables mentioned previously (grant/contract size, the diversity of the graduate student population, and the wide range of stipend amounts). The Faculty Senate research committee recommends accordingly that a taskforce be appointed with the charge of considering whether the GAD can be made less cumbersome and more equitable for all PIs and graduate students across all colleges. It is further recommended that this taskforce include faculty representatives from all colleges with experience on grants of various amounts, and also, that this task force include representatives from the Graduate School.
Call to Order: The meeting was called to order by President Bryan Simmons at 2:37 p.m. and guests were welcomed and recognized.

Approval of Minutes: The Faculty Senate meeting minutes dated March 10, 2009 were approved as distributed.

"Free Speech": Webb Smathers spoke to the Senate on Transit Fees: Supply and Demand in Reference to Parking.

Old Business:
   a. Bill Surver, Chair of the Policy Committee, submitted and explained the proposed Faculty Manual Change, Calhoun Honors College Membership. There was no discussion. Vote to accept change was taken and passed unanimously.

   b. Bill Surver submitted and explained the proposed Faculty Manual Change, Title Change - Classified Staff to Staff. There was no discussion. Vote to accept change was taken and passed unanimously.

   c. Bill Surver submitted and explained the proposed Faculty Manual Change which was approved by the Provost and in which she offered friendly amendments. Motion was made to accept friendly amendments to proposed changes. There was no discussion. Vote was taken and amended version of proposed change passed unanimously.

   d. John Meriwether, Research Committee Chair, stated that "A Review of the GAD at Clemson University" was presented to the Senate last month for review. Discussion was held during which questions were answered. Motion was made from Committee to accept the Report and recommendations contained therein. Vote was taken and Report was unanimously accepted.

   e. Wayne Sarasua, Chair, Finance Committee, moved that the Senate accept the 2009 Salary Report that was submitted at the March meeting. Vote to accept Report was taken and was unanimously accepted.

   f. Resolution on Disproportionate Administrative Raises was submitted and explained by President Simmons. Discussion was held. Vote to approve resolution was passed unanimously (FS09-04-01 P).
President Simmons submitted the Salary Report Recommendations (also from the Faculty Survey) for approval by the Senate. There was no discussion. Vote to approve recommendations was taken and passed unanimously.

5. Committees:
   a. Senate Committees
      1) Finance Committee – Wayne Sarasua, Chair, thanked this Committee for the hard work undertaken this year and submitted the Committee Report dated March 26, 2009 and the 2008-09 Finance Committee Annual Report. Committee member Shima Clarke provided information regarding fee structures.

      2) Welfare Committee – Chair Christina Wells thanked her Committee for their diligent efforts resulting in the 2009 Faculty Survey. The April 14, 2009 Welfare Committee Report was submitted and explained.

      3) Scholastic Policies Committee – Chair Antonis Katsiyannis submitted and briefly explained the Committee Report of 2008-09 Year in Review and thanked his Committee members.

      4) Research Committee – Chair John Meriwether submitted and briefly explained the Final Report of the Research Committee.

      5) Policy Committee – Bill Surver, Chair, thanked this Committee for their work this year and submitted and explained the 2008-09 Annual Policy Committee Report.

   b. Other University Committee/Commissions: None

6. President Simmons presented a plaque and a copy of the book, Life Death & Bialys by Dylan Schaffer to Francis A. McGuire, the 2009 Recipient of the Alan Schaffer Faculty Senate Service Award; congratulated retiring Faculty Senators by thanking them for their service, and introduced William Bowerman, as the 2009-10 Faculty Senate President.

7. Outgoing President’s Report: Outgoing President remarks were made by President J. Bryan Simmons, who then introduced William W. Bowerman, as the Faculty Senate President for 2009-010. New officers were installed at approximately 4:00 p.m.

Linda Howe, Secretary

Cathy Toth Sturkie, Program Coordinator
8. **New Business:** President William Bowerman:
   a. asked Senators to introduce themselves, informed the Senate that Fran McGuire will be the Senate’s parliamentarian and introduced Windsor Sherrill, Faculty Representative to the Board of Trustees;
   b. informed the Senate that an Orientation/Retreat will be held on May 12th prior to the meeting and asked Senators to return their committee preference forms as quickly as possible so that the new session may proceed;
   c. noted that he was in the process of setting standing committee chairs and committee membership;
   d. announced that a Faculty Senate Orientation/Retreat will be held on May 12, 2009. New Senators will arrive at 9:00 a.m. and all Senators will meet at 10:00 a.m. for the retreat to plan this Senate Session’s year. Invitations forthcoming.
   e. noted that Cathy Sams will present a seminar on how to deal with the media one hour prior to the Executive/Advisory Committee meeting on April 28th;
   f. stated his plans for the Senate noting that he needed the Senators’ input, help and hard work.
   g. encouraged Senators to notify the Senate Office with the two names of Executive/Advisory Committee members and

10. **Adjournment:** 4:45 p.m.

---

Alan Grubb, Secretary

Cathy Toth Sturkie, Program Coordinator

April 14, 2009
The Clemson University Faculty Senate
Presented to
Webb Smathers Jr., Professor
Applied Economics and Statistics
Reference to Parking
On Transit Fees: Supply and Demand
"I find that the three major administrative problems on a campus are sex for the students, athletics for the alumni and parking for the faculty."

- Clark Kerr, Professor of Economics, First Chancellor University of California, Berkeley
Students will ask for transit fee elimination if changes are not made. That will happen at the upcoming April board meeting if there's not a plan presented for faculty and staff to share in a transit fee.

- Callie Boyd, Clemson University
2008-2009 Student Body President

Students implemented their fee in 2006 to pay for increased service and with the expectation that faculty and staff also would share in costs, Boyd said.

"It a plan isn't presented to the board in April that includes a way for faculty to contribute to transit expenses, students will pull their self-imposed fee, Boyd said.

No student transit or parking fee increase is planned for the 2009-10 academic year, Smith said. At this time there is no specific proposal in increase parking or transit rates for faculty or staff, Smith said.

- George Smith, Clemson University
Associate Vice President Student Affairs

*AII quotes from Greenvilleonline.com - March 29, 2009*
What use is knowledge if there is no understanding?

5th Century AD
Stobaeus, Greek Philosopher
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Proposed Faculty Manual Change – Part VII Section B, 1-e

Current Language:

e. **Calhoun Honors College Committee** formulates and recommends policies and procedures for Calhoun Honors College to the Council on Undergraduate Studies. The faculty members on the committee serve as the curriculum committee for the honors program. Membership consists of five faculty members, one from each college elected for a three-year term. Colleges shall elect from their ranks faculty with experience and interest in the Honors College as indicated by such activities as teaching honors courses, directing honors theses and research projects, and serving on honors committees at the department and college level. Other voting members are: one member of the Faculty Senate elected for a one-year term; two faculty members, each serving two-year terms and appointed by the director of the Honors College from the combined constituencies of the Dixon Senior Fellows, Calhoun Honors seminar instructors, and Bradbury Award recipients; one student member of the Dixon Fellows program elected by the other fellows; one student member of the Calhoun Society elected by the members of the Society; one honors student appointed by the director of the Honors College. All student members shall serve one-year terms. Non-voting members are the director, associate director, and assistant director of the Honors College, and one representative from the office of undergraduate admissions.

Proposed New Language:

e. **Calhoun Honors College Committee** formulates and recommends policies and procedures for Calhoun Honors College to the Council on Undergraduate Studies. The faculty members on the committee serve as the curriculum committee for the honors program. Membership consists of six faculty members, one from each college and one representative from the Library elected for a three-year term. Colleges shall elect from their ranks faculty with experience and interest in the Honors College as indicated by such activities as teaching honors courses, directing honors theses and research projects, and serving on honors committees at the department and college level. Other voting members are: one member of the Faculty Senate elected for a one-year term; two faculty members, each serving two-year terms and appointed by the director of the Honors College from the combined constituencies of the Dixon Senior Fellows, Calhoun Honors seminar instructors, and Bradbury Award recipients; one student member of the Dixon Fellows program elected by the other fellows; one student member of the Calhoun Society elected by the members of the Society; one honors student appointed by the director of the Honors College. All student members shall serve one-year terms. Non-voting members are the director, associate director, and assistant director of the Honors College, and one representative from the office of undergraduate admissions.

Rationale – A representative from the Library has been serving on the Committee for several years but position has never been added to the Manual.
Proposed *Faculty Manual* Change

Title Change – Classified Staff to Staff

The Policy Committee approved a request from the Staff Senate to change all references of "Classified Staff" to "Staff" in the *Faculty Manual*.

This is in accordance with the name change from the Classified Staff Senate to the Staff Senate.

This request will be presented under Old Business at the April Senate meeting.
Proposed Change to the Faculty Manual: Part II – Section A

Current Language:

A. The Nature and Function of this Manual

The Clemson University Faculty Manual is a compilation of information pertaining to faculty participation in the governance of the university. It includes summaries of those university policies and procedures that are of major concern to faculty. The need to have a Manual of manageable size dictates that this document, though comprehensive, be less than complete. Consequently, in certain places the reader is directed to other documents or sources to obtain more detailed information.

Since the first Manual for Clemson University faculty was distributed in 1960, it has undergone numerous revisions. The guiding principle behind recent editions (since 1995) was the desire to record and codify the changes made in the principal governing instrument following campus reorganization and internal policy changes. The most current version of the Manual is available on the Faculty Senate’s World Wide Web page (http://www.lib.clemson.edu/fs/), where cumulative revisions of the Faculty Manual of a substantive nature are posted each year no later than July 1st for use during the next academic year.

Proposed New Language:

A. The Nature and Function of this Manual

The Clemson University Faculty Manual is a compilation of information pertaining to faculty participation in the governance of the university. It includes summaries of those university policies and procedures that are of major concern to faculty. The need to have a Manual of manageable size dictates that this document, though comprehensive, be less than complete. Consequently, in certain places the reader is directed to other documents or sources to obtain more detailed information.

Since the first Manual for Clemson University faculty was distributed in 1960, it has undergone numerous revisions. The guiding principle behind recent editions (since 1995) was the desire to record and codify the changes made in the principal governing instrument following campus reorganization and internal policy changes. The most current version of the Manual is available on the Faculty Senate’s World Wide Web page (http://www.lib.clemson.edu/fs/), where cumulative revisions of the Faculty Manual of a substantive nature are posted each year no later than July 1st for use during the next academic year.

Policies set forth in the Faculty Manual identify the rights of faculty members at Clemson University. No, Department, School, College or University policies may abrogate the policies specified in this Manual without approval of the Faculty Senate.
Approval of change #2 (2008-2009), ILA The Nature and Function of the FM

[Box for Approval:

☐ yes  ☐ no

With wording changes

Doris R. Helms
Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost

Date 4-12-09

Need Board of Trustees Approval  ✓  yes  ☐ no
Change will go into effect July 1, 2009 unless otherwise noted below

* Information only
A Review of the GAD at Clemson University

Faculty Senate Research Committee

The Graduate Assistant Differential (GAD) at Clemson University (CU) is a confusing concept to many and as a result, it has become controversial. The Faculty Senate Research Committee has devoted several meetings to a review of what the GAD is and how the funds derived from GADs obtained from sponsored project activity are dispensed by the University. The participation of Dr. Bruce Rafert, Graduate Dean, in these discussions is very much appreciated. Dr. Rafert’s has written a white paper

http://www.grad.clemson.edu/Faculty/documents/The%20Graduate%20Assistantship%20Differential%20at%20Clemson%20University.pdf

which provides an exhaustive review of the GAD process and its history that is quite informative.

Three documents available on the CU web that provides further details regarding the GAD are:

www.clemson.edu/public/gss/grant_proposals/grad_rates.html

www.clemson.edu/public/gss/grant_proposals/grad_calc-by_tier.pdf

www.clemson.edu/caah/research/images/sponsored_programs_quick_reference_guide.pdf

Perhaps the first point to be emphasized in regard to the misunderstandings manifested in the recent Faculty Senate survey report is that the GAD is the portion of the graduate school tuition that is in excess of student fees.

Were a Clemson University graduate student not to receive any financial support via an assistantship or fellowship (self-paying student), that person would pay full tuition and fees composed of the GAD (typically $3,000 per semester) plus a fee ($954). If the student were to receive stipend support via a teaching assistantship (GTA) or a research assistantship (GRA), then the GTA’s GAD is covered either by the University (E&G funds) or the GRA’s GAD is covered by the Principal Investigator (PI) in the event that the sponsor allows graduate tuition support. In addition to the stipend, the graduate student receives a medical insurance coverage subsidy. In the cases where the research sponsor allows the expense (most agencies), the sponsor pays for the GAD via a budget category (‘other’ category). The GAD for a GRA can be waived as a cost-sharing contribution by the Graduate Dean for cases in which the funding agency does not allow such an expense in the budget. The amount of the GAD expense is determined by the tier classification that is dependent upon the particular PI’s department. The expense of the GAD ranges from $3,600 (tier 1) to $2,000 (tier 4). It is also true that the GAD expense can be pro-rated between a GRA and a GTA.

The second point to be noted is that the Clemson GAD has two unappreciated features.

Given that GRA students are supported by funding by research awards from agencies, the PI benefits from the GAD for two reasons. The first is that the GAD funding improves the chances
of recruiting good Clemson University graduate students because of increased stipends generated from the combination of GAD funds and E&G money that is provided solely for the purpose of increasing stipends (see http://www.grad.clemson.edu/Faculty/documents/The%20Graduate%20Assistantship%20Differential%20at%20Clemson%20University.pdf).

The second featurepositive aspect is that there is no overhead charge to the PI for any GAD funding received from the research sponsor.

An important third point is that the GAD is ranked very low in ‘importance’ by the same faculty who are dissatisfied with it—an importance rank of 46th among 50 items.

Concerns

- According to the Faculty Senate Survey (February 2009), the GAD appears to be overly complicated and confusing. Replies from faculty who are PIs indicate a perceived burden. Many who responded have never even heard of the GAD, or know what it is. Part of the problem is that the present GAD process at Clemson tries to take into account such variables as grant/contract size (which can vary from a few thousand dollars to several hundred thousand dollars), the diversity of the graduate student population (GRA, GTA, GAA, Master’s, PhD’s, distance-learning, etc), and the wide range of graduate student stipends (from $3,500/yr to $40,000/yr). The GAD revenue for FY08 amounted to $1.3 million total as compared with the total of $150 million for research awards received. The Research Committee views this amount to be limited compensation when compared with the magnitude of the administrative difficulties that the GAD represents to all parties.

- It is very difficult for small projects (in the tens of thousands of dollars) to support even one graduate student via stipend and GAD amounts, although multiple small projects can be bundled together for that purpose. Often waivers have to be granted from the Graduate Dean, which has the effect of providing a benefit (stipend supplement) to a student on a small grant from which no GAD is obtained; instead, the funds come from other grants as well as E&G. The feeling is that small projects are being unfairly burdened by the GAD expense, yet there are colleges that have difficulty funding large research grants that include graduate student support. Often the PIs in these colleges, who generally have full teaching loads, cannot even cover a course buyout and a graduate student with the award proceeds for such small projects. Thus, the question is whether it is even worth submitting such a small grant proposal.

- The accounting of the funds associated with the tuition for self-pay students, and fees collected from all graduate students ($12 million for FY 089), and how the stipend supplement is financed is not transparent with regard to how these funds are spent.
Recommendations

The Faculty Senate Research Committee has reviewed the details regarding the GAD process including the comments proffered by the CU Faculty Survey and Dr. Rafert's white paper and has arrived at the following recommendations:

1. Communications between the CU administration and CU PIs should be improved so that the purpose and utilization of the GAD are better understood. The Rafert Report represents an exhaustive overview that brings together all of the details regarding the GAD in regard to the history and evolution of graduate student tuition. We urge anyone who wishes to make suggestions pertaining to modification of the current process to carefully study the Rafert Report. The Research Committee recommends that information regarding the web posting of GAD documentation be more clearly circulated to prospective PIs via the Sponsored Programs Office and the Vice President Office of Research. Other means of fostering communications should be considered.

2. Communications between the CU administration and CU PIs should be improved so that the accounting of graduate tuition and fees collected from graduate students is better understood. Without transparency regarding how these funds are graduate tuition and fees revenue is spent, it is difficult to suggest ways of making improvements to the GAD and ensuring the money from that source is used to support its intended goal, namely, an increase in the graduate student stipend so that better quality graduate students may be recruited to CU.

3. When the GAD was originally established, there was no faculty input. The GAD process should be continuously reviewed and revised based on the consideration of several variables mentioned previously (grant/contract size, the diversity of the graduate student population, and the wide range of stipend amounts). The Faculty Senate research committee recommends accordingly that a taskforce be appointed with the charge of considering whether the GAD can be made less cumbersome and more equitable for all PIs and graduate students across all colleges. It is further recommended that this taskforce include faculty representatives from all colleges with experience on grants of various amounts, and also, that this task force include representatives from the Graduate School.
Graduate students are important to the teaching and research functions at Clemson University!
Graduate Assistant Differential - what is it?

- Message: The GAD is graduate tuition that is charged to graduate research assistants (GRA) in excess of fees (~$1000 a semester) in excess of fees.
- Charge runs from $2000 (tier 4) to $3600 (tier 1) per semester.
- Clemson is hiring GRA are required to pay this charge out of grant funds so the GAD is considered to be a onerous burden for small grants.
- Supposedly, PIs do not pay overhead on GAD charges.

Message: The GAD is Graduate tuition that is charged to Graduate Assistant. What is it?
To provide "supplements" to Graduate student stipends so that Clemson University can attract better quality students.

Provost E&G funds also used for this purpose.

(\$1.3 M in 2008-2009)

What is the GAD Revenue used for?
Problems and Concerns

For small awards (< 30 K), significant burden on resources - some professors waive summer salaries so to have funding for travel, etc. Others forgo small grant activity altogether. For small awards (< 30 K), significant burden on resources - some professors waive summer salaries so to have funding for travel, etc. Others forgo small grant activity altogether.

Accounting not transparent - what happens to graduate tuition paid by self-pay students? And Graduate Tuition paid by self-pay students.

Administration of GAD by SPA is separated from Graduate Dean’s office leading to some confusion re policy issues.

Statement of "no overhead charge on GAD not completely correct" - USDA awards requiring TDC rather than MTDC pay GAD overhead.

Problems and Concerns

Modified GADs, anyone? Should graduate students working on writing theses or doctorate after quals and coursework pay full GAD expenses? Issue of philosophy re research university diploma.
Research Committee Recommendations

More communication between administrators and faculty is essential - Faculty survey report indicates considerable confusion re GAD concept. Rafert Report does great job of responding to comments.

Task force should be formed to consider options re improvements and changes - should GAD be eliminated and stipend supplement funded out of E&G funds or Graduate Fees?

Transparent accounting of all funds spent re Graduate tuition funds received (fees + GAD).

Report does great job of responding to comments.

More communication between administrators and

Research Committee Recommendations
Following a review of the Salary Report presented at the March Meeting, the Finance Committee had the following recommendations.

1. The committee feels that the powerpoint presentation of the Finance Committee’s Salary Report should be made available to the Faculty via the Faculty Senate website. The committee recommends that the last slide (recommendations) be removed.

2. The committee would like to see additional explanation of salary increases in future salary reports. One recommendation is that Promotions should be divided into different columns or separate footnotes—Promotions that result in a change in title; and Promotions that do not result in a change in title (e.g. additional duties).

3. Performance raises should also be divided between Performance Equity Increases, and Merit raises (performance pay).

4. The finance committee discourages targeting certain groups for raises regardless of reason. The finance committee would like to see next year’s committee work with the administration to come up with a structured policy with regard to procedures for distributing raises especially with regard to targeting groups for raises as well as distributing raises outside of “guidelines.”

At the March 31st Executive/Advisory Committee: a motion to “accept” the Finance Committee Salary Report. The motion passed. The EAC recommends that the report be placed on the website after removing the last slide (recommendations). The other recommendations of the finance committee were not voted on.
2. The committee recommends that next year’s committee conducts a review of the next salary report. Further, the annual salary report lists only E&G funds. It might be helpful to determine how many employees get additional compensation from non-E&G funds (e.g., from the Foundation) and the policies governing the additional compensation.

3. The committee recommends that next year’s Finance Committee continue to study the relative contributions of the graduate and undergraduate programs to Clemson’s budget. It is not clear that the conventional wisdom about undergrad education subsidizing graduate education and research applies to Clemson.

4. Provost Helms made some comments at a Fall, 2008 Faculty Senate Meeting that indicated that the state contribution to tuition for the University of Virginia is less than half of what Clemson gets for South Carolina. A check of the fees from both institutions this past fall: UVA’s in state is $9490 and Clemson’s is $11108. The natural question is “why are fees higher even though we may receive a higher state contribution then some schools?”

5. There has been discussion that the lab fee policy has not been instituted uniformly across campus. Further, how lab fees are used is also subject to debate. Next year’s committee may consider taking a look at lab fees.
Clemson’s top peer rival is the University of South Carolina, see the tables below.

### Level of Interest in Peer Institutions by Residency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peer Institution</th>
<th>In-State (N=238)</th>
<th>Out-of-State (N=502)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Applied</td>
<td>Admitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of South Carolina</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
<td>39.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Charleston</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furman University</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Tech</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winthrop University</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn University</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Tech</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina State University</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Georgia</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Perception of Strength of Peer Institutions

Scale: 1 = Poor, 7 = Excellent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peer Institution</th>
<th>Academic Program</th>
<th>Career Prep.</th>
<th>Social Env.</th>
<th>Physical Env.</th>
<th>Affordability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>6.43</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Tech</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>5.76</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>4.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clemson University*</td>
<td>5.62</td>
<td>5.91</td>
<td>5.82</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>4.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Georgia</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>5.82</td>
<td>6.08</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>4.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furman University</td>
<td>5.87</td>
<td>6.14</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>6.03</td>
<td>4.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Tech</td>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>6.39</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>4.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn University</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>4.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of South Carolina</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>5.72</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>5.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Charleston</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>5.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina State University</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>4.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winthrop University</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>5.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes ratings by non-enrollees only
Distribution of Staff Receiving Performance Increases Over 1% Not Including Promotions
Salaries 2009
Salary Tables Analyzed

Over 50 K Report Column Table
1834 Records

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Bud Ctr Desc</th>
<th>Dept Desc</th>
<th>Factbook Category</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>State Title</th>
<th>Clemson Title</th>
<th>Pay Group</th>
<th>Pay Band</th>
<th>Listed Salary</th>
<th>Prev Perm Salary</th>
<th>%Chng</th>
<th>Monthly Salary</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Supplemental Table Column Headings
2154 Salary adjustments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bud Ctr Desc</th>
<th>Dept Desc</th>
<th>Factbook Category</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Effective Date</th>
<th>CUBS Reason</th>
<th>a-Perf</th>
<th>b-Prom</th>
<th>c-Cola</th>
<th>d-Cont</th>
<th>e-Misc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(Perf- performance, Prom-promotion, Cola-cost of living adjustment, Cont-change in contract (e.g. conversion from 9 to 12 mo)
The State reported salary increases to a number of individuals on July 28, 2008. Many administrators appeared to receive mid-year raises. One thing to note is that Employees with Salaries $\geq$ $150,000$ must go through Compensation Committee Review. Thus many of these salary increases that were given in 2007 actually didn’t get approved until after October 1, 2007 which gives the appearance of a mid-year raise.
For example: Administrator Clemson Tiger

CT Salary as of Oct. 1, 2007 according to OIR 2007 report: $165,000.
CT State July 28, 2008 salary: 173,316. (An increase of $8,316 or 5.04%)
CT Salary as of Oct. 1, 2008 according to OIR 2008 report: $173,316

From the supplemental data,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effective Date</th>
<th>CUBS Reason</th>
<th>a-Perf</th>
<th>b-Prom</th>
<th>c-Cola</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15-Jun-07</td>
<td>Cost-of Living Adjustment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-Jun-07</td>
<td>Performance Pay</td>
<td>$6,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-Jun-08</td>
<td>Cost-of Living Adjustment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison Group</td>
<td>Min Salary</td>
<td>Avg Salary</td>
<td>Max Salary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Targeted Institutions</td>
<td>$173,250</td>
<td>$210,985</td>
<td>$250,001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US News Top 20</td>
<td>$189,400</td>
<td>$220,553</td>
<td>$252,938</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Mascot          | $173,250   | $210,985   | $250,001   |
| Mascot          | $189,400   | $220,553   | $252,938   |

Board of Trustees Compensation Committee Review of Clemson Tiger
# Example 2: Provost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparison Group</th>
<th>Comparison Description</th>
<th>Min Salary</th>
<th>Avg Salary</th>
<th>Max Salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 Targeted Institutions</td>
<td>Chief Academic Affairs &amp; Provost</td>
<td>$192,390</td>
<td>$326,438</td>
<td>$706,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US News Top 20</td>
<td>Chief Academic Affairs &amp; Provost</td>
<td>$236,500</td>
<td>$342,375</td>
<td>$706,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Filter Athletics

- Sorted by Budget Center
  - Deleted Athletics leaves 1762 records (2073 salary adjustments)

Of the salary adjustments:
  1708 Cost of Living Adjustments
  32 Performance Equity Increases
  107 Performance Pay
  63 Promotion
  32 Additional Duties
  26 Job Reclassification
  105 Other
Who received raises?

- 10 received <0%
- 68 received 0%
- 0 received between 0 and <0.5%
- 36 received between 0.5% and <1%
- 1367 received 1%
- 2 received between 1 and 2%
- 4 received between 2 and 3%
- 4 received between 3 and 4%
- 18 received between 4 and 5%
- 27 received between 5 and 6%
- 31 received between 6 and 7%
- The rest received 6% or above (195)
Who received performance raises?

- Chief Administrative Officer 6/22
- CCIT 9/186
- CAFLS 6/253
- CAAH 2/159
- CBBS 1/177
- COES 12/340
- CHEHD 3/137
- Cooperative Extension Service 35/67
- Facilities 6/33
- Financial Affairs 3/28
- Library 3/21
- President 2/14
- Provost 7/61
- Public Service and Agriculture 13/117
- Research 2/27
- Student Affairs 8/54
- University Advancement 13/58

Notes: Some of these may include a promotion in addition to a performance raise. A raise due to a “change of duties” is a promotion.
Employee increases above guidelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College of Agriculture, Forestry &amp; Life Science</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of employees over $50,000</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of employees receiving increases above guidelines</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of above whose increase reflects a promotion/contract change</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0% to 6% in 2006, 2007; 1% in 2008
Employee increases above guidelines
0% to 6% in 2006, 2007; 1% in 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College of Engineering &amp; Science</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of employees over $50,000</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of employees receiving increases above guidelines</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of above whose increase reflects a promotion/contract change</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Employee increases above guidelines
0% to 6% in 2006, 2007; 1% in 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College of Architecture, Arts, &amp; Humanities</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of employees over $50,000</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of employees receiving increases above guidelines</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of above whose increase reflects a promotion/contract change</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Business &amp; Behavioral Science</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of employees over $50,000</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of employees receiving increases above guidelines</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of above whose increase reflects a promotion/contract change</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Employee increases above guidelines
0% to 6% in 2006, 2007; 1% in 2008
# Employee increases above guidelines

0% to 6% in 2006, 2007; 1% in 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College of Health, Education, &amp; Human Development</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of employees over $50,000</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of employees receiving increases above guidelines</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of above whose increase reflects a promotion/contract change</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The next slides do not include records that have promotions.
Top 50 Based on % Increase

- 10 Administrators
- 1 Research Associate
- 1 Human resources manager
- 4 Public information director
- 1 Director/ Computational Science
- 1 Global Bus Dev Director (ICAR)
- 1 Alumni Dev Manager
- 1 Research Prof
- 2 Asst. Profs
- 2 Prof
- 3 Assoc Prof
- 1 Lecturer non-teaching
- 7 extension or senior extension associate
- 11 senior extension agents
- 2 info research consult
- 1 Production Manager
- 1 Eng./Assoc. Eng
Notes: Top 50 Based on %

- Only 8 are 9 month employees
- 19 admin-managers-directors
- 2 of these individuals (1 Administrator) received some sort of salary increase before Oct. 1, 2007 that did not appear on that salary report—thus, the increase is reflected in the Oct. 1, 2008 salary report.
- 7 of 50 are instructional faculty
Top 50 Based on $ Increase

- 18 Administrators
- 2 Research Faculty
- 1 Research Associate
- 1 Human resources manager
- 1 Public relations director
- 1 Director/Computational Science
- 1 Global Bus Dev Director (ICAR)
- 1 Alumni Dev Manager
- 5 Asst Profs

- 3 Prof
- 3 Assoc Prof
- 1 Lecturer non-teaching
- 2 extension or senior extension associates
- 5 senior extension agents
- 2 info research consult including 1 from provost office
- 1 Program leader
- 1 Exec Dir of CURF
Notes: Top 50 Based on $

- Only 13 are 9 month employees
- 25 admin-managers-directors-leaders
- 12 of these individuals (10 Administrators) received some sort of salary increase before Oct. 1, 2007 that did not appear on that salary report—thus, the increase is reflected in the Oct. 1, 2008 salary report.
- 11 of 50 are instructional faculty
### Summary of Salary Increases
Stratified by Factbook Category
(Fall 2008 Data)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factbook Category</th>
<th>Average % Increase</th>
<th>Median % Increase</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Average Annual Increase</th>
<th>Median Annual Increase</th>
<th>Average Monthly Increase</th>
<th>Median Monthly Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1586</td>
<td>$1341</td>
<td>$1607</td>
<td>$125</td>
<td>$134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>$1,607</td>
<td>$2,746</td>
<td>$134</td>
<td>$240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Faculty</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>$2,746</td>
<td>$947</td>
<td>$240</td>
<td>$278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Faculty</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>$947</td>
<td>$2,954</td>
<td>$240</td>
<td>$278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Faculty</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>$2,954</td>
<td>$1,134</td>
<td>$240</td>
<td>$70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Service Faculty</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$2,954</td>
<td>$1,134</td>
<td>$240</td>
<td>$124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Professional Faculty</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>$824</td>
<td>$1,134</td>
<td>$240</td>
<td>$1493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>$1493</td>
<td>$1,134</td>
<td>$240</td>
<td>$1493</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notes: Top 50 Based on $

- Only 13 are 9 month employees
- 25 admin-managers-directors-leaders
- 12 of these individuals (10 Administrators) received some sort of salary increase before Oct. 1, 2007 that did not appear on that salary report—thus, the increase is reflected in the Oct. 1, 2008 salary report.
- 11 of 50 are instructional faculty
Who are Administrators?

- Associate Academic Program Director
- Associate Director of Residential Life
- Student Services Manager at the Health Center
- Extension Director, Colleton
- Building/Grounds Manager for the Pee Dee Research and Education Center
Who Are Administrators with Faculty Rank?

- Provost
- Associate Dean/Dean
- Visiting Professor/University Historian
- Lecturer
- 3 Administrators w/Faculty Rank of Associate Dean or above received Salary Increases > 1%
Staff Receiving Performance/Salary Increases
Over 1% Not Including Promotions

- 40%
- 19%
- 13%
- 10%
- 8%

- Manager I/II/III
- Extension/Associate/Extension Agent
- Information Resource Consultant II
- Director I/II
- Senior Extension Agent
- Other
RESOLUTION ON DISPROPORTIONATE ADMINISTRATIVE RAISES

FS-09-4-1 P

WHEREAS, The recently completed Faculty Senate Finance Committee 2009 Salary Report (hereafter referred to as the Salary Report) represents the most complete analysis of raises given over the past two years;

WHEREAS, The Salary Report clearly establishes that the number and magnitude of raises given to administrators at Clemson is disproportionate to the total numbers of raises given above established State guidelines;

WHEREAS, The administration has justified many administrative raises on the basis of changing job duties;

WHEREAS, The administration has hired many new administrators at very high starting salaries;

WHEREAS, The administration has justified this disproportionate allocation of resources based on comparison with our peer institutions and on Clemson’s quest for top-twenty status;

WHEREAS, The administration has nonetheless failed to adequately justify and explain these disproportionate starting salaries and raises especially at the highest levels of the Clemson administration; and

WHEREAS, Results of the Faculty Senate 2009 Faculty Survey indicate that faculty are extremely dissatisfied with the disproportionately higher administrative raises compared to faculty and staff salary raises and believe these raises impact University morale and harms the well-being of the institution;

RESOLVED, That the Faculty Senate strongly disapproves of the disproportionate raises provided to upper level administrators;

FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Clemson University Faculty Senate strongly disapproves of the lack of thought and consideration given by the Clemson University Administration regarding how these disproportionate raises would impact the Clemson faculty and staff; the State Legislature and the general public;

FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Faculty Senate reconstitute the Budget Accountability Committee (established in 1997) to review Clemson University’s financial situation to identify concerns and develop recommendations that can be addressed by the Faculty Senate, the Provost, and the Chief Financial Officer. The Committee will provide periodic reports of its work to the Faculty Senate; and
FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Clemson University Faculty Senate and the Clemson University Administration, in a spirit of shared governance, work to rebuild the trust that has been lost due to this inequity in resource allocation and work to insure that financial resources be allocated more equitably and with greater fiscal transparency in the future.

Passed unanimously by the
Faculty Senate on April 14, 2009.
2009 FACULTY SENATE SALARY REPORT

RECOMMENDATIONS

In the spirit of shared governance and to fulfill the intent of the Resolution on Disproportionate Administrative Raises, the Faculty Senate highly recommends:

1. That the Faculty Senate have representation on the:
   a. Administrative Council
   b. Provost’s Advisory Council
   c. Organization of Academic Department Chairs

2. That, as Special Order of the Day, the President of Clemson University meet with the Faculty Senate annually to present and discuss administrative and faculty raises including total compensation.

3. That the Faculty Senate have representation on the Board of Trustees Compensation Committee, as it does on the Budget & Finance Committee, the Educational Policy Committee, Agriculture & Natural Resources Committee, the Student Affairs Committee, the Research Committee and the Institutional Advancement Committee.

Unanimously passed by the Faculty Senate

on Tuesday, April 14, 2009
Minutes of last Thursday's (March 26) meeting:
Attendees: Shima Clarke, Mary Laforge, Danny Smith, Wayne Sarasua

1. Shima Clarke is currently researching Clemson’s fee structure. She identified a survey done by Eduventure that surveyed the perceptions of admitted students. She will be following up what the survey is being used for and how it’s influencing our fee structure (if at all). She will report her findings at the April Senate meeting.

2. Salaries: the committee had extended discussion of the report that Wayne presented at the March Faculty Senate Meeting. The committee has the following recommendations:

   With regard to Professor Bednar’s report, the committee has no official comment. However, the committee does feel that any response to Bednar’s report should come from the administration.

   The committee feels that the powerpoint presentation of the Finance Committee’s Salary Report should be made available to the Faculty via the Faculty Senate website. The committee recommends that the last slide (recommendations) be removed.

   The committee what like to see additional explanation of salary increases in future salary reports. One recommendation is that Promotions should be divided into different columns or separate footnotes—Promotions that result in a change in title; and Promotions that do not result in a change in title (e.g. additional duties)

   Performance raises should also be divided between Performance Equity Increases, and Merit raises (performance pay).

   The finance committee discourages targeting certain groups for raises regardless of reason. The finance committee would like to see next year’s committee work with the administration to come up with a structured policy with regard to procedures for distributing raises—especially with regard to targeting groups for raises as well as distributing raises outside of “guidelines.”

3. Steve Stuart and Wayne met informally on Friday, March 27 to discuss Thursday’s meeting as well as the status on Steve’s research on budget issues of Clemson’s graduate education. Steve will continue to compile information that he has received from the graduate school and prepare a summary that will be included in the Finance Committee’s year-end report.

FINANCE COMMITTEE Wayne Sarasua, Chair (E&S)
Yanming An (AFLS)
Shima Clarke (AAH)
Mary LaForge (BBS)
Daniel Smith (AAH)
Steve Stuart (E&S)
The 2008-2009 Finance Committee worked on several issues this year. The following are some highlights. Additional information can be found in the finance committee reports that are posted on the Faculty Senate website.

1. In the fall, Brent Emerson from the CFO's office spoke to the Finance Committee about a new "program" on campus that focuses on process improvement, improved resource utilization, and improved efficiency in operations and processes. The program at Clemson is new and includes a high level Discovery Council--currently made up of key administrators, faculty, and students and a support level that provides input to the Discovery Council. The goal of the Discover Council is to value add at the systems level including improving processes for Human Resources, Travel, Payroll, Facilities, etc. The faculty senate does not currently provide input at the support level, however, the staff senate does have some involvement.

2. Shima Clarke researched Clemson's fees in relation to other public universities. She also compiled summary information from a recent web survey that was conducted by EDUVENTURES, Inc. (Enrollment Management Learning Collaborative (EM-LC) Custom Research Report No. 101-EMCRR-82008) in August 2008 to understand why admitted students choose to attend or not attend Clemson University, and how Clemson is perceived by admitted students, as compared to its competitors. The information is attached.

3. Steve Stuart is continuing to compile data for a report on the relative contributions of the graduate and undergraduate programs to Clemson's budget. As of April 2009, the report is not complete. Data collection and analysis will continue, in connection with the graduate school. Input and participation from next year's finance committee would be welcomed.

4. The Finance Committee did a detailed study of faculty salaries. Wayne Sarasua presented this report at the March meeting. The results indicate that roughly 61% of performance raises greater than 1% went to administrators/administrators w/faculty rank/or staff with administrative type positions. As a comparison, 26% of all employees that earned > $50k are administrators/administrators w/faculty rank or staff with administrative type positions. This includes only employees that earned greater than $50k. Athletics and employees who received promotions are not included. The top 50 highest raises based on % increase and $ increase include a large number of administrators/administrators w/faculty rank or staff with administrative type positions (19 of 50 based on % increase; 25 of 50 based on $ increase). By comparison, 7 of the top 50 based on % increase and 11 of the top 50 based on $ increase are instructional faculty. The committee would like to thank OIR and the Provost's office for providing salary information.

The 2008-2009 Finance Committee recommends that next year's Finance Committee consider the following items.

1. The committee did begin to look into the 2008 budget last fall but more pressing university budget matters essentially tabled this review indefinitely. We think it is important for the next committee to work with Provost Helms in obtaining and reviewing yearly budgets summarizing the funding of the colleges. The committee should also work toward a better understanding on the policies regarding and the effect of performance credits.
2. The committee recommends that next year's committee conducts a review of the next salary report. Further, the annual salary report lists only E&G funds. It might be helpful to determine how many employees get additional compensation from non-E&G funds (e.g., from the Foundation) and the policies governing the additional compensation.

3. The committee recommends that next year's Finance Committee continue to study the relative contributions of the graduate and undergraduate programs to Clemson's budget. It is not clear that the conventional wisdom about undergrad education subsidizing graduate education and research applies to Clemson.

4. Provost Helms made some comments at a Fall, 2008 Faculty Senate Meeting that indicated that the state contribution to tuition for the University of Virginia is less than half of what Clemson gets for South Carolina. A check of the fees from both institutions this past fall: UVA's in state is $9490 and Clemson's is $11108. The natural question is "why are fees higher even though we may receive a higher state contribution then some schools?"

5. There has been discussion that the lab fee policy has not been instituted uniformly across campus. Further, how lab fees are used is also subject to debate. Next year's committee may consider taking a look at lab fees.
Perception of Admitted Students

A web survey was conducted by EDUVENTURES, Inc. (Enrollment Management Learning Collaborative (EM-LC) Custom Research Report No. 101-EMCRR-82008) in August 2008 to understand why admitted students choose to attend or not attend Clemson University, and how Clemson is perceived by admitted students, as compared to its competitors. This report was done as part of the assessment plan for the Office of Admissions, and was included in their most recent report. The report also served as a resource for the Task Force Committee on Tuition and Scholarships. The report was also shared with the University’s Office of Publications and Promotion to help better understand student applicant activity when developing various recruitment brochures and other materials. The findings shown below are excerpts from the EM-LC report.

Enrollees were asked to indicate the primary reasons they decided to attend Clemson, and non-enrollees were asked to identify the reasons why they decided not to attend Clemson. Their responses are presented below:

### Primary Reasons

**Enrollee N = 385, Non-Enrollee = 355**

- Non-enrollees cited overall academic reputation, academic program, and scholarships and grants as their top reasons for attending other institutions.
- Clemson enrollees cited academic program, sense of campus community, and overall reputation most frequently.
- One item that stood out for its dramatic difference between enrollees and non-enrollees was sense of campus community. More than 17% of enrollees attended Clemson primarily due to the campus community, and only 2% of non-enrollees attended another school because of its community.

Financial aid has a major impact on admission decisions. Three out of four non-enrollees said they would consider enrolling if awarded a grant or scholarship; close to 90% of those respondents said they require at least $6,000 to affect their decisions, see below.

### Influence of Grants and Scholarships on Non-Enrollees, N=355
Clemson’s top peer rival is the University of South Carolina, see the tables below.

### Level of Interest in Peer Institutions by Residency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peer Institution</th>
<th>In-State (N=238)</th>
<th>Out-of-State (N=502)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Applied</td>
<td>Admitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of South Carolina</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
<td>39.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Charleston</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furman University</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Tech</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winthrop University</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn University</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Tech</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina State University</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Georgia</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Perception of Strength of Peer Institutions

Scale: 1 = Poor, 7 = Excellent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peer Institution</th>
<th>Academic Program</th>
<th>Social Env.</th>
<th>Physical Env.</th>
<th>Affordability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Tech</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td>5.76</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>4.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clemson University*</td>
<td>5.62</td>
<td>5.82</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>4.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Georgia</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>5.82</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>4.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furman University</td>
<td>5.87</td>
<td>6.02</td>
<td>6.03</td>
<td>4.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Tech</td>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>6.08</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>4.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn University</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>4.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of South Carolina</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>5.72</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>5.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Charleston</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>5.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina State University</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>4.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winthrop University</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>5.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
*Includes ratings by non-enrollees only
Our main item of business in 2008-09 was the development and administration of the 2009 Faculty Survey, the first of its kind to be conducted since 1999. The survey was anonymous, requested basic demographic information, and solicited feedback on a variety of issues pertinent to faculty.

Six hundred forty-four faculty members responded, providing the Senate with detailed quantitative data and over 250 typed pages of comments. Their contributions are now helping the Senate to identify priority issues and represent the faculty in discussions with administration. This is particularly important now, as the University faces significant budgetary challenges.

Results of the survey were presented at the February 10 meeting of the Faculty Senate and are available to the University community at www.clemson.edu/faculty-staff/facultysenate/. Longitudinal analysis of survey data from 1999 and 2009 will be conducted in the following months to determine how faculty opinion has evolved over the past decade.
Faculty Scholarship Award (9-23-08): It was established by the faculty senate in 1959 to be given annually to the member of the graduating class with the highest academic achievement. Until 1975, only one student per year received the award...most recently, 49 students received in 2006 and 30 in 2008.

- Issue #1. Plaque has not been updated since 1998. The committee recommended a video display of recipients (original plaque to direct individuals to the new mode of display...) also names to appear on Clemson web site in a prominent manner.
- Issue #2. Observe criteria as written...highest GPA required for the award.
- Issue #3. Medals to be awarded similar to those awarded in 2008 (Gold electroplate); ribbon to match Clemson colors-orange, white, and purple
- Issue #4. Certificate to be updated (new format to be circulated through the committee)

Safe Teaching Committee (10-21-08)-In PROCESS. A new committee to review teaching activities involving safety hazards. Committee members suggest that departments in which such hazards are used or are present in the laboratory setting develop “Best Practices” to address this issue (CAFLS -biological sciences and Engineering-chemistry have expressed concern). At the college level, the expertise of Departmental safety coordinators should be utilized and these Best Practices should be written by the Faculty of each department. Committee members reiterated that department/college level mechanisms are best.

Online Exams (10-21-08). Committee members suggested that the current exam policy be revised by adding: “for online courses, the syllabus will designate when during the exam week, the final examination will be given (date/time) or due.

Summer Reading Committee (10-21-08)-Committee proposed to add the Chief Diversity Officer as an ex officio member.

Undergraduate Integrity Policy (9-23-08; 10-21-08)-Simplified procedure for first time offenders of plagiarism (Alternative procedure)
Committee members endorsed the proposed procedure for first time offenders for plagiarism; editorial suggestions regarding the circulated form were suggested Academic Integrity provisions on page 29 of the undergraduate Announcements need minor editing (see C1

Assignment and Sale of Textbooks and Other Course Materials to Students (12-9-08.) Under no circumstances should the faculty member engage in the direct sale of textbooks or other course materials to students. Faculty members who wish to assign textbooks or other course materials that they authored or edited as part of a Clemson University course must first complete a written disclosure form identifying the economic interest they may have in the textbook or materials. This disclosure form should be submitted to the faculty member’s Department Chair – or if the faculty member is the Department Chair, to their Dean – for final approval in
accordance with the SC Ethics Act. This restriction does not limit the freedom of faculty members to develop course materials that can be sold through the bookstore or other suppliers.

**Latin Honors (1-20-09)**
Effective with fall semester 2010, implement a grade point centered minimum threshold of 3.70 cum laude, 3.85 magna cum laude and 3.95 summa cum laude for Latin honors (current min GPAs 3.40 cum laude, 3.7 magna cum laude and 3.9 summa cum laude. In 2006, 45% received honors (from 1996-2005 it has been steadily rising)

**Evaluation of Academic Advising (1-20-09)-In PROCESS**
Possibility of a uniform system of evaluation for advising (department /college level); evaluation of current system in advising across the university; separation of “course scheduling” advising from career advising; Academic advising web site to provide useful tips to students on advising.

**Maymester scheduling change (2-17-09)**
Committee endorsed the proposal “Monday through Friday class meeting times for Clemson Maymester courses be changed from the present 5:30 – 8:30 PM time period to 3:30 – 6:30 PM beginning Maymester 2010. The time for the two Saturday classes would remain the same, 9 AM to 12 noon.”

**Academic Eligibility Re-enrollment Deadline Proposal (2-17-09)**
Committee endorsed proposal to “add a re-enrollment application deadline (two days before the first day of classes) to encourage re-enrolling students to be more prepared to begin classes and to provide an opportunity for students to meet with an advisor prior to registering for classes. This deadline would appear on the re-enrollment application and other re-enrollment materials (registrar’s web-site, withdrawal packet, etc.).”

**Issues related to international transfer credits (21-17-09)-IN PROCESS**
Issues associated with international transfer credit were identified. There is a proliferation of study abroad programs; faculty input in the process-course content/credit hours; SACS related requirements on policies regarding transfer credit; European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System (Bologna agreement); TCEL (Transfer Credit Equivalency List); World Education Services; Articulation agreements...

**Scholastic Policies Committee Contact Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Antonis Katsiyannis</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>407-C Tillman</td>
<td>656-5114</td>
<td><a href="mailto:antonis@clemson.edu">antonis@clemson.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Dawson</td>
<td>Food Science</td>
<td>204 Poole</td>
<td>656-1138</td>
<td><a href="mailto:pdawson@clemson.edu">pdawson@clemson.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne Goddard</td>
<td>Computer Sc</td>
<td>311 McAdams</td>
<td>656-0186</td>
<td><a href="mailto:goddard@clemson.edu">goddard@clemson.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vic Shelburne</td>
<td>Forestry</td>
<td>212 Lehotsky</td>
<td>656-4855</td>
<td><a href="mailto:vshlbrn@clemson.edu">vshlbrn@clemson.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Weisenmiller</td>
<td>Graphic Com</td>
<td>G-01 Tillman</td>
<td>656-3653</td>
<td><a href="mailto:emweise@clemson.edu">emweise@clemson.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deb Willoughby</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>409 Edwards</td>
<td>656-1437</td>
<td><a href="mailto:willoud@clemson.edu">willoud@clemson.edu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Final Report of the Faculty Research Committee

The Research Committee concentrated its efforts during the current Faculty Senate term upon the evaluation of the Graduate Assistant Differential (GAD) feature of graduate school education at Clemson University. This initiative was undertaken prior to the release of the findings from the Faculty Survey report which indicated that the GAD was relatively high on the list of topics that represented dissatisfaction within the Faculty (although it should be added that this topic ranked low on the list of important topics). As part of our discussions we met with Dean Bruce Rafert who over two sessions gave us a detailed briefing of how the GAD works at Clemson University. He also provided detailed comments in regard to several e-mail inquires that were put forward to him. We are grateful to him for his support of our discussions.

As a consequence of these discussions the Research Committee has prepared a report combined with several recommendations. From the various discussions that took place and examination of the comments in the recent Survey report it became clear that there was a great deal of confusion and misinformation about how the GAD works and what the GAD is meant to provide for. Thus, we recommended that a more extended effort be made by the Administration to inform Principal Investigators about the GAD and what its purpose is meant to do, i.e., improve graduate student stipends by helping to fund a supplement. We also felt that the accounting relating to the GAD was not sufficiently transparent, and we recommended that this should be changed so that the disbursement of the funds associated with the GAD and graduate student fees is more clearly evident. Finally, the Research Committee felt that there was a need for consideration of how the GAD process might be reformed and improved. The PIs involved in projects that represent relatively low funding (i.e., small awards) feel that the requirement for a GAD for any graduate student involved in such a small project (total funding less than 30 K) represents a significant burden in regard to competitiveness and ability for the award to cover project expenses. There is also the question of the philosophy involved with the GAD. Should a graduate student that has finished taking courses and is working on research for a master thesis or a doctorate be required to take the number of research credit hours corresponding to a normal course load? There is also the question of whether the GAD should be replaced by some other means of providing a supplement to a graduate assistant stipend. Leaving out the GAD would alleviate a great number of issues regarding how the GAD process is administered. Consequently, the Research Committee recommended that a task force be formed including faculty and graduate school representation to investigate these issues with an eye toward possible improvements that might emerge from such a study.

The Research Committee report was presented to the Executive Committee/Advisory Committee of the Faculty Senate on March 31, 2009. After discussion the report was endorsed by the Committee for submission to the Senate body for approval and endorsement.

The Research Committee met with Clemson University officials in the fall of 2008 and discussed several issues regarding the research compliance policy at Clemson University. The Research Committee was satisfied with the efforts of Ms. Tracey Arwood to educate Clemson PIs about the proper measures to follow to abide by federal guidelines in regard to animal research protocols.
The Policy Committee met on March 9. The following were discussed.

1. Continued our discussion regarding the length of service for Visiting Faculty. This matter will be referred to next year’s Policy Committee.

2. The committee voted unanimously not to recommend any change to the selection of a Departmental Advisory Committee. This was in response to a request from Graphic Communications.

3. The Committee discussed a request from Bonnie Holady to add a representative from three Interdisciplinary Programs to the Graduate Council. This request has been referred to next year’s Policy Committee.

4. The Committee approved a request to add a Library representative to the Calhoun Honor’s Committee. A representative has been serving on the committee for several years. The position has never been formally added to the Faculty Manual. This request will be presented under Old Business at the April Senate meeting.

5. The Committee approved a request from the Staff Senate to change all references to the Classified Staff to Staff in the Faculty Manual. This is in accordance with the name change of the Staff Senate from the Classified Staff Senate to Staff Senate. This request will be presented under Old Business at the April Senate meeting.

The next meeting of the Policy Committee will be scheduled by the new Chair.
This year has been a productive year for the Policy Committee. Following are the major accomplishments of this year's Committee.

1. Change to the Faculty Manual reaffirming the confidentiality of all meetings with the University Ombudsman. Also added was a nondisclosure agreement that further strengthens the confidentiality of the Ombudsman.

2. The Committee, with Senate approval, recommended that a Select Committee be appointed to recommend changes to Lecturers as proposed by the Administrative Council in 2006. In addition any new hires of Lecturer shall follow the guidelines of the Faculty Manual. Such title should only be granted for academic reasons.

3. The Policy Committee, with Senate approval, recommended that regular faculty as defined by the Faculty Manual be limited to that faculty with no administrative duties. Also, the Manual be edited to reflect this.

4. The Committee, with Senate approval, recommended that specific revisions of the Manual will take effect on July 1, subject to final approval by the Provost and those requiring additional approval by the Board of Trustees.

5. The Committee, with Senate approval, recommended changes to the selection procedures for the Faculty Representative to the Board of Trustees. These included changes to the selection committee, who may serve in that capacity, and procedures for replacement.

6. The Committee, with Senate approval, clarified the role of the Faculty Manual as the protector of Faculty rights and privileges. Also, no department, college, or university body may supersede the rights and privileges of the Manual.

The Committee also

1. investigated several possible violations of the Faculty Manual. These were resolved on an individual basis and resolved favorably.

2. The Committee, after lengthy discussions between the Chair and Parking Services, obtained free parking permits for Emeriti Faculty.
Minutes
Faculty Senate
June 9, 2009

1. Call to Order: The meeting was called to order at 2:30 p.m.

2. Free Speech: There was no Free Speech.

3. Committee Reports:
   a. Finance: No report.

   b. Welfare: Linda Li-Bleuel announced that Wayne Stewart will be vice-chair of the committee. Linda attended the Douthit Hills Planning Meeting; graduate student housing will be part of the development. The Parking Director search turned out a failed search.

   c. Research: The Committee has established a Blackboard mode of meetings. Grubb asked about the legal aspects of holding meetings in this manner as all committee meetings, like the Faculty Senate itself, are public meetings. Renee Roux (University Counsel’s Office) was asked her opinion of the matter. Roux said that if someone asked for the contents of the meetings they could because these are considered open meetings. The Committee discussed what’s happening with limited submission of proposals and queried as to the guidelines for limited submissions. The deans would like feedback from the faculty about this and their views.

      The committee is following up on last year’s white paper on GADs and seeking peer comparison with Clemson’s procedures. Dean Rafert is cooperating in this. Senator Figliola asked what the Committee was seeking about GADs; the Committee’s response was that it’s trying to determine whether GADs are fair and if/or there’s a better way.

   d. Policy: The Committee met in May. The main issue was the definition of the term “faculty” which turns out to be more difficult than it might seem.

      University Committees: President Bowerman announced that the Compensation Policy Committee is presently working on a compensation policy which will apply when the budget improves.
4. President's Report: President Bowerman stated that he had met repeatedly in the last month with President Barker and the Provost. We are still waiting for the outcome of the President's Task Forces' recommendations and still don't know when they will be announced. The Governance Task Force will be named this summer before the August meeting of the Faculty Senate.

5. Old Business: None

6. New Business: Proposed Change to the Faculty Manual - Part II—Section A. No vote was necessary as this was an informational item.

7. Provost's Announcements: The Provost indicated that the recommendations of the President's Task Forces will be taken to the Board of Trustees on June 18th; at that meeting the Board will also set tuition and fees for the coming year. The Board meeting in July will examine how we want Clemson to look in the future—five, ten, twenty years down the line. The Provost indicated that she is worried about what freshmen will do in spite of commitments. Right now we expect a large class, as we erred on the side of too many rather than too few in acceptances, but predictions are difficult. She also indicated that endowments are down and that 2-3 colleges haven't been able to make payroll; loans have been covering this. She predicted that we will probably make 2,800 freshmen and have to make decisions about how to deal with the possibility of a larger freshman class than usual. Finally, she announced that salary compensation will be better in the future, identifying why people got raises.

8. Announcements: President Bowerman reminded Senators of the Fall Convocation and the Senate meeting in August.

9. Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

Alan Grubb, Secretary

Cathy Toth Sturkie, Program Coordinator

Presentation by Catherine Watt: After adjournment senators, guests, and administrators were invited to remain for Catherine Watt's presentation of the talk she had given at the Annual Conference of the Association for Institutional Research. Watt's presentation on strategies employed by Clemson University to rise in U.S. News & World Report's rankings occasioned much comment.

Absent: H. Liu; H. Luo (D. Tonkyn for); Vic Shelburne (P. Gerard for); L. Temesvari (P. Rangaraju or D. Perajoa for); D. Smith; X. Hu; C. Marinescu; W. Sarasua;
MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
MAY 12, 2009

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

2. Approval of Minutes: The Faculty Senate Minutes dated April 14, 2009 were approved as written.

3. "Free Speech": None

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

5. Committee Reports:
   a. Senate Committees:
      Chairs of the five Faculty Senate Standing Committees shared the respective 2009-10 Committee Work Plans (Finance Committee, Chair Richard Figliola; Welfare Committee, Chair Linda Li-Bleuel; Scholastic Policies Committee, Chair Vic Shelburne; Research Committee, Chair Lesly Temesvari and Policy Committee, Chair Jeremy King). Senator Figliola also submitted The Finance Committee Report dated April 23, 2009.

   b. University Commissions and Committees: Former Faculty Senator and Welfare Committee Chair Christina Wells presented a PowerPoint Presentation on plans for a summer 2009 Faculty Survey Analysis, which entails expanding information received from this past year’s survey to assist the Faculty Senate and the administration in future efforts.

6. President’s Report: President Bowerman:
   a. thanked everyone for their assistance and participation in the morning’s Faculty Senate Orientation and afternoon’s Retreat and

   b. stated that Bill Surver (Vice President/President-Elect) and Alan Grubb (Secretary) are at the disposal of the standing committee chairs and that their input will be at the request of the chairs.

7. Old Business: None

8. New Business:
   a. Senators introduced themselves.
b. Faculty Senate Secretary and Former Faculty Senate President Alan Grubb informed the Senate of the passing last week of Horace Fleming, also a former Faculty Senate President and noted that he was an effective, inspiring Senate President, emphasizing civility even in the midst of the most contentious issues.

9. **Announcements:**
   a. President Bowerman reminded everyone of the invitation to the Graduate Student Picnic.
   
   b. The next Executive/Advisory Committee meeting will be held on May 26, 2009 in 205 Cooper Library.
   
   c. The June Faculty Senate may be canceled depending on current campus issues arising at that time.

10. **Adjournment:** President Bowerman adjourned the meeting at 3:20 p.m.

   [Signature]

   Alan Grubb, Secretary

   [Signature]

   Cathy Toth Sturkie, Program Coordinator

Absent: P. Dawson (P. Gerard for); G. Wang; Y. An; M. LaForge; P. Rangaraju; P. Srimani (T. Boland for); C. Marinescu
THERE WAS

NO FACULTY SENATE MEETING

IN JULY, 2009
MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
AUGUST 18, 2009

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

2. Approval of Minutes: The Faculty Senate Minutes dated May June 9, 2009 were approved as written.

3. “Free Speech”: John Leininger, Professor of Graphic Communications, provided his thoughts on dealing with lecturers rights on campus.

4. Committee Reports:
   a. Senate Committees:
      1) Finance Committee – No report.
      2) Welfare Committee – Linda Li-Bleuel, Chair of the Welfare Committee, noting the tremendous interest in child care, indicated that this would be one of the committee’s top priorities this year. Li-Bleuel reported that the Sullivan Center has a new website and that the committee will meet to discuss the results of the recent business travel survey.
      3) Scholastic Policies – In the discussion of Vic Shelburne’s report for the Scholastic Policies Committee, a lively discussion followed reports of access by department chairs to the comments on student evaluations without the instructors’ permission, which is a violation of previously-stated Faculty Senate policy; Shelburne indicated that his committee would look into this. Shelburne also indicated that the committee would be taking up the issues of international credits, lab fees, and academic forgiveness.
      4) Research Committee – Chair Lesley Temesvari stated that the Research Committee will be working with Graduate Dean Rafert on GAD policy. The committee will also be taking up the issue of the classification and hiring of postdocs.
      5) Policy Committee – Chair Jeremy King stated that the Policy Committee will be addressing problems relating to the definition of “faculty” in the Faculty Manual as well as time periods of visiting faculty.

   b. University Commissions and Committees: And finally President Bowerman reported that the Compensation Advisory Group formed by President Barker is trying to establish a compensation policy that is consistent and the committee will also be establishing a peer comparison group for faculty, staff, and administrators. The report, he indicated, will then go to the Budget Accountability Committee.
Parking Advisory Committee: Senator Sarasua noted that parking continues to be an issue and there will be announcements on policy matters forthcoming.

5. President's Report: President Bowerman shared his presentation to the Department Chair Retreat, “Faculty Senate Committees and Projects” with the Faculty Senate.

6. Old Business: None

7. New Business: None

8. Announcements:
   a. President Bowerman stated that the next Faculty Senate meeting will be on September 8, 2009.
   b. The next Executive/Advisory Committee meeting will be on September 29, 2009.

9. Adjournment: President Bowerman adjourned the meeting at 3:45 p.m.

C. Alan Grubb, Secretary

Cathy Toth Sturkie, Program Coordinator
Free Speech for Faculty Senate on August 18, 2009
Submitted by Dr. John Leininger, Professor of Graphic Communications

Topic: Dealing with Lectures rights on campus.

My name is John Leininger and I am a Professor in the Department of Graphic Communications. I appreciate the opportunity to speak to you today on the status of Lecturers and Senior Lecturers on campus.

In the 2009–2010 Faculty Manual made available over the summer the following statement was added.

"Unless indicated otherwise, when the term "regular faculty" is used throughout the Faculty Manual it is limited to faculty with the ranks described below who have no administrative appointment." (that is Section III, page 3)

I also had some concerns after reading comments from Faculty Senate President Bowerman's letter to faculty last spring; in his letter he stated:

"We have now refined the definition of 'regular faculty' to include the ranks of Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor, 'who do not hold any administrative appointment'. This change refers to all instances of 'regular faculty' in the Faculty Manual related to who can serve on or be elected to Department, College, and University committees, task forces, evaluation committees, search committees and all other appointments for 'faculty' positions."

As I was preparing to speak to this group, I found out how controversial this topic has become across campus and I realize what I say here today cannot solve the problem, but I hope it will add more depth in order to come to a practical solution. I am here today to speak on behalf of a group of faculty on campus that have a significant impact on the success of all of our students and programs, but potentially have no voice on campus. There are many Lecturers and Senior Lecturers currently serving on both departmental committees and college committees who are being told they have no right to vote or participate in university meetings, college meetings, and departmental meetings.

I would like to clearly point out some of the history of Lecturers on this campus that perhaps not all faculty are aware of. This also brings up the issue of whether these people should be considered as regular faculty members.

I am speaking today because the 5 lecturers in my department have been told that they have no rights because they never took the time to get a doctorate and have not gone through the tedious tenure process; yet, they are critical to our department. I have also had conversations around campus and there are many other departments with a similar situation. After hearing comments from certain Faculty Senate
representatives last spring I became concerned in the change in position many departments and colleges have been following for years, that lecturers have no vote or right to participate in faculty governance at any level. If this is so, these people have no direct representation at all. The way it is being interpreted means they have no vote as faculty and are not considered staff.

As I understand, from my 24 years of working at Clemson, there are four types of Lecturers on campus:
1. Lecturers hired through a "National Search" and voted on by departmental faculty.
2. Lecturers appointed by a chair to teach a class or work in a lab.
3. Lecturers hired by administrators and are working as part of an administrative staff.
4. A final category that may be unique to the College of Business and Behavior Science—

Approximately 8 years ago Dean Trapnell took all Instructors in the College (all of whom had been hired through a "National Search") and moved them to the Lecturer position when the budget got soft. He did this because he could terminate a Lecturer on June 30th with no prior notice, but he had to give an instructor a one-year notice. There are two lecturers in our department who were hired many years ago and could have remained instructors since they were grandfathered in and not limited to four years. They were advised not to be different than the other faculty. I am sure if they had understood that today, their right to vote and to be considered a regular part of the Clemson faculty would be in question as a Lecturer, they never would have accepted the change.

Personally, as a past member of the faculty senate, my question would be why can't Lecturers vote at all levels? If you have a Lecturer that has been here for 5, 10 or 20 years, they certainly have a vested interest in the university and if a department or college faculty believes that they would be the best person to represent them on a University Committee or even on the Faculty Senate, why should they not be able to represent the faculty? I know that people on the Faculty Senate do not measure the merit of a comment from a faculty senator as carrying more or less weight depending on whether they are an instructor, assistant professor, associate professor or professor. Why is a Lecturer singled out?

On the sheet I have passed out, I have outlined just 6 different options that could be considered to address this issue (I am sure there are more). For times sake I will let you read them as you debate the topic, I only offer them as discussion points.

This will be distributed on a Separate Handout and not read as part of the Free Speech:
I see many alternatives that can be addressed; I offer the following for discussion
1. Continue to let each department and college create their own rules for voting members in their by-laws.
2. Add lecturers to the list of regular faculty as long as they were hired through a “National Search,” were voted to be hired by the faculty in that department and are in a teaching position.

3. Recognize “Senior Lecturers” as a “Regular Faculty” rank—as a result I would suggest dropping the requirement to be considered from Senior Lecturer from six years to three or four year.

4. Allow Lecturers hired under a “National Search” to be converted to an instructor position, without limits—but none of their years can count towards tenure if they are ever promoted to assistant professor or higher.

5. Allow any Lecturer, hired through a “National Search”, who has served this University and its students for more than 3 full years to become a voting member of the university, college or department.

6. Create an instructor position, that is not limited to 4 years, for non-tenured track faculty that have served the University for a reasonable period of time.

In closing, I want to point out that a Lecturer who has served this university for 7 or more years may not have gotten a doctorate and gone through the 7 years of effort to get tenure—but they have lived with a yearly renewal process and every year they have to justify their worth. There are Lecturers who are pushing the envelop with new instructional technology, writing articles, presenting seminars at conferences and trade shows, working on significant research projects, running departmental curriculum committees, winning teaching awards, working extra hours with the students and helping to promote educational excellence. For tenured and tenure track faculty to imply they have no value in determining academic guidelines and are not vested in this university is arrogant. In my eyes they are REGULAR faculty and should be treated with the respect that all faculty deserve. If you ask students to tell you who are the best faculty, they do not look at their title, they look at what the person does for them and their commitment to their program.

Thank you.
MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
SEPTEMBER 8, 2009

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

2. Approval of Minutes: The Faculty Senate Minutes dated May August 18, 2009 and the Academic Convocation Minutes of August 18, 2009 were approved as corrected.

3. "Free Speech": None

4. Special Order of the Day: Scott Pigeon informed the Senate of results of a Travel Study and asked for support on the five measures contained therein. Following a question and answer exchange, it was decided that the Welfare Committee will address the measures and respond to him.

5. Committee Reports:
   a. Senate Committees:
      1) Finance Committee – Chair Rich Figliola submitted and explained the September 1, 2009 Finance Committee Report (Attachment).
      3) Scholastic Policies – Chair Vic Shelburne submitted Report dated August 11, 2009 (Attachment); stated that this Committee had not met since the last meeting and noted that the Committee will meet next week.
      4) Research Committee – Chair Lesley Temesvari stated that the Research Committee met and discussed work to undertake this year on the Gad, noting the concern of re-inventing the wheel of last year’s Research Committee. It was determined that there are some issues that remain and should be addressed.
      5) Policy Committee – Chair Jeremy King submitted and briefly explained the Report dated August 20, 2009 (Attachment).
   b. University Commissions and Committees:
      1) Faculty Survey Subcommittee – Christina Wells provided an update on the 2009 Faculty Survey dated September 8, 2009 (Attachment).
      2) Compensation Advisory Group – No report at this time. Committee meets every two to three weeks.
6. **President’s Report:** President Bowerman noted that:
   a. the Senate seems to be solving a lot of problems that were identified in the 2009 Faculty Survey;
   b. the Senate is working very well with the Administration on those problems, as are the Senate’s Standing and *ad hoc* Committees;
   c. changes to the *Faculty Manual* will soon come to the Senate regarding guidelines for and appointment of lecturers; promotion and tenure; Grievance II procedures and clarity on dean search committees;
   d. he would like suggestions of faculty to be considered as members to the *ad hoc* Academic Lecturers Committee (joint committee with Provost) within the next two weeks;
   e. the Budget Accountability Committee, chaired by Antonis Katsiyannis, will convene soon;
   
   f. efforts are continuing to define the term, “regular faculty.” Seven University committees have been identified that will certainly have voting regular faculty as members; and
   
   g. college bylaws will be reviewed by the end of October; departmental bylaws, by Christmas break.

7. **Old Business:** None

8. **New Business:**
   a. Proposed *Faculty Manual* Change regarding the Scholarships and Awards Committee was submitted for approval and explained by Senator King. Following two friendly amendments which were accepted, vote to accept amended change was taken and passed unanimously (attachment).

9. **Announcements:**
   a. President Bowerman stated that the next Faculty Senate meeting will be on October 6, 2009.
   b. The next Executive/Advisory Committee meeting will be on September 29, 2009.
   c. Board of Trustees Dinner hosted by the Faculty Senate will be held on October 15, 2009.
d. Class of ’39 Award for Excellence Nominations are due to the Faculty Senate Office by October 19, 2009.

e. Faculty Senate lapel pins will be distributed to Senators.

f. An informal forum with Provost Helms on faculty workload will be held immediately following today’s Senate meeting. All are welcome to stay for and participate in the forum.

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

   [Signature]
   C. Alan Grubb, Secretary

   [Signature]
   Cathy Toth Sturkie, Program Coordinator

Absent: X. Hu, W. Sarasua (J. Meriwether for)
Clemson University
Travel Management Initiative

Scott Pigeon
Faculty Senate – 8 September 2009
jpigeon@clemson.edu | 656-2090
Agenda

- State of Travel
- Survey
- Requirements
- Faculty and Staff Support

How Could We Accomplish Travel More Efficiently?
## By the Numbers...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>FY08</th>
<th>FY07</th>
<th>FY06</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lodging</td>
<td>4,159,835</td>
<td>3,782,356</td>
<td>3,133,814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Fare</td>
<td>3,278,942</td>
<td>3,101,190</td>
<td>2,818,890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mileage</td>
<td>2,118,605</td>
<td>2,093,600</td>
<td>1,558,403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meals</td>
<td>1,900,372</td>
<td>1,669,872</td>
<td>1,553,196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registrations</td>
<td>1,739,643</td>
<td>1,661,483</td>
<td>1,455,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto</td>
<td>473,930</td>
<td>564,915</td>
<td>581,191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>591,464</td>
<td>452,228</td>
<td>715,003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>14,262,792</td>
<td>13,325,644</td>
<td>11,815,526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Employee</td>
<td>1,328,897</td>
<td>833,080</td>
<td>881,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>15,591,689</td>
<td>14,158,724</td>
<td>12,696,756</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Survey Results

- 221 respondents – faculty, staff, on/off-campus
- Pre-Trip, Changes, & Post-Trip activities
- Findings/Requirements
  - Offer University Travel Credit Card
  - Departmental Travel Approval Levels Vary Greatly
  - **Quicker** Pre-Trip process (> 45 mins)
    - Arrangements via multiple Internet-capable sites
    - Restrictive tickets
    - Hard to make plans for multiple departmental travelers
  - Voucher to Traveler Payment = Less than 5 days
  - Limited to No employee and refresher training
  - Meal Per Diem is Antiquated

How Could We Accomplish Travel More Efficiently?
Faculty Support

— Offer a University Travel Credit Card
  • Allow for Hotel Charges and Out of Pocket expenses

— Explore an Internet-capable travel reservation system
  • For Travelers and Travel Planners

— Update and provide Web-based Training
  • New Travelers
  • New Employees
  • Refresher

— Seek a Meal Per Diem Increase with State
  • Out of State Travel —— A Priority
  • Match to approved-Federal Per Diem rates
Task 1: Compensation Report Study (Lead: Clarke)

The Committee has discussed ways to improve the transparency of annual compensation totals. Senator Clarke looks (1) for feedback from the special University Compensation Group, particularly on setting appropriate benchmarks and (2) will set up meeting with Dr Westcott on increasing the information on the current annual compensation report format.

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

Senator Figliola also sits on the University Budget Accountability Committee. The Finance Committee will report the budget flow information as a way to improve transparency. Included will be reporting of the funding of Institutes and Centers.

Task 3: Compensation Strategy (Lead: Simon)

This task force began outlining how to think about compensation. Three major questions were addressed: the purpose of raises, management of raises, and strategic difficulties faced by the University in managing raises. Issues discussed included (1) the role of outside market; (2) establishment of appropriate benchmarks, which may vary across departments and schools; (3) the importance of trust. The outcome from this Task is recognized to be a thought process that might become a guide to future strategies on Faculty compensation.
The Faculty Senate Welfare Committee took place on Tues., Sept. 1. Present at the meeting were Linda Li-Bleuel, Meredith Futral, Yanming An, Chris Piper, Wayne Sarasua, and Wayne Stuart. Scott Pigeon, Procurement Manager, summarized the business travel survey. He will present his results to the Faculty Senate meeting on Sept. 8.

Amid rumors and speculation, the Welfare Committee also wanted to find out the status of OTEI (Office of Teaching Effectiveness and Innovation). Provost Helms and Bruce Rafert came to the meeting to help clear up some misconceptions. The following are the highlights:

- Linda Nilson is not being taken out of OTEI; it was proposed that she offer fewer workshops of the same topic and expand her role by offering some workshops to graduate teaching assistants. She would still continue working with faculty; there was never any intention of moving her away from faculty or having her work exclusively with graduate assistants. Linda Nilson would remain Director of OTEI.

- To help develop workshops for the Graduate School, it was proposed that she move her office to the Graduate School in order for her to work more closely with Bruce Rafert; however, there was no room at the Graduate School. As a result, she currently will not be moving her office.

- The above were simply proposals and ideas that were discussed with Linda Nilson; nothing had been finalized.

- As of now, Linda Nilson’s role with OTEI is the same; nothing has changed at this point.

President Barker is forming a committee, the United Way Steering Committee, to promote interest and make recommendations on ways to enhance the University’s participation during the campaign this fall. Leon Wiles and Marvin Carmichael will co-chair. He would like a representative from the Faculty Senate. The 1st meeting took place around Sept. 1, and there will be a reception at the President Barker’s house on Oct. 21. If any members of the Faculty Senate are interested, please let Linda Li-Bleuel know as soon as possible!!
SCHOLASTIC POLICIES COMMITTEE – Vic Shelburne, Chair – (AFLS) present
Sean Brittain (E&S) present
Wayne Goddard (E&S) present
Bob Horton (HEHD) present
Haibo Lu (AFLS) not present
Daniel Smith (AAH) not present

Guests: None

Under each Topic, the last italicized and dated entry is the most recent action by the committee

**Topic 1-Grade Inflation**
Lead: [Goddard]

Check status of Scholastic Policies Committee/Faculty Senate recommendation from two years ago (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. There is also the issue of what the results would tell us anyway and what would we do that information (yes vs no with respect to grade inflation at Clemson).* 06/09

We unanimously concurred again on this and will drop this from the agenda. 08/09

**Topic 2-Winter Semester**
Lead: [Goddard]

When and IF a recommendation comes for a “Winter semester” (Scheduling Task Force?), be prepared to review and make recommendations as appropriate. *Goddard is also on the University Academic Calendar Planning Committee and will keep our committee (SP) apprised if any recommendations come from that committee.* 06/09

No progress. 08/09

**Topic 3-International Transfer Credits**
Lead: [Shelburne]

Review upcoming new policy for International Transfer Credits (especially the policy as it relates to the European Credit Transfer System) and make recommendations as appropriate. *We will await a proposal from the Register’s Office. Shelburne will apprise the Registrar’s office of our meeting schedule and perhaps there will be a proposal at the August meeting.* 06/09
Shelburne will contact Registrar’s office and invite someone to update the committee at the next meeting in September. 08/09

**Topic 4-Course drop/withdrawal date (2nd date) time change to later date**
Lead: [Goddard]

Review current dates and make recommendations which may be more equitable for students. Goddard will check with Student government and determine if there is any interest in pursuing this. 06/09

No progress. 08/09

**Topic 5-Make Fall Break a permanent date in October—not a November date in election years**
Lead: [Goddard]

The November Fall Break is generally too late and loses its effectiveness. With increasing flexibility for voting, the alignment of the Fall Break with November elections seems inappropriate and should be reviewed. Goddard is also on the University Academic Calendar Planning Committee and will keep our committee (SP) apprised if any recommendations come from that committee. 06/09

Still strong support for this idea in the committee and this is undoubtedly shared by most students and faculty. South Carolina is behind other states in flexible voting dates but we are not sure that should be a constraint in any case. We will continue to pursue this issue through the above committee. 08/09

**Topic 6-General Education**
Lead: All

React to Gen Ed proposals as needed. We discussed this potential issue (note for example the recent change in the writing requirement never went through Scholastic Policies) and decided that because of the usual bottom up approval curriculum flow, most changes were outside the purview of this committee. However, top down curriculum decisions might be issues we should address if they occur 06/09.

NO action on any topics during summer 08/09

**Topic 7- Lab Fees**

Lead: [Brittain]

Make proposal that 100% of lab fees be returned to Departments (and Students) for their use. Brittain will check out the current policy (how much goes to the Dept vs College vs University) and we will make recommendations as appropriate. 06/09

No action due to summer break but Brittain will poll five deans to discover differences among
colleges (if any) for lab fee returns. 08/09

Topic 8 – Course forgiveness policy (actually Course Redemption policy and Academic Renewal policy – two separate issues)

Lead: [Horton]

Review Course Redemption policy and make recommendation to allow a grade of C or lower to be redeemed (D and F only in present policy) and also review Academic renewal policy for exceptions, i.e. change of major or long-term return to Clemson. Horton will check with Student government and determine if they have any interest in pursuing these two topics. On the second topic, we noted that IF you transfer to or from Clemson, you can be selective about what courses will transfer BUT if you return to Clemson even after a very long time, you are stuck with your departing GPA. The committee felt that wiping the slate clean might be a better way of approaching this especially if the return is a time longer than 10 years. 0609

Horton checked with Abby Daniel (Student Govt. President) about Student interest in both these topics. She replied that she did have an interest in the course redemption policy for a grade of C since many students thought it was unfair that you could redeem a D or F but not a C especially with the Scholarship minimum GPA pressure. She did recommend that the number of redeemable hours NOT be changed (presently 10) so to prevent overuse or abuse of the policy. The committee concurs with Abby and will probably propose a change to that effect.

As for the Academic Renewal Policy (p. 29 Undergrad announcements), the committee was in error in bringing this up since the present policy DOES allow returning students who were NOT permanently dismissed and who have not been enrolled at Clemson for at least two years to void their previous GPA and ALL courses previously attempted (whether failed or passed) at Clemson and start again. This topic will be dropped from the committee’s agenda. 08/09

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

Shelburne reported that he has been asked by Faculty Senate President Bill Bowerman to represent Scholastic Policies at Dept Chair’s retreat tomorrow along with Bill Bowerman, Bill Surver and Fran McGuire to discuss the availability of the comments on Student Evaluation of Instructors for Chairs and PTR committees. Last year, this committee voted, it was ultimately approved by the Senate and is now in the Faculty Manual that chairs have access to the summary statistical data from the evaluations BUT not the comments. Faculty can of course opt to give the comments to the chair for annual evaluations and the PTR committees for promotion and tenure. This has come up because the Provost has released the comments anyway to chairs and/or some departments have voted to give the chairs the comments. Both actions are a potential Faculty Manual violation in that comments may only be released by the individual and not by the action of the provost or even a department faculty vote. Shelburne asked for feedback on this matter and the general consensus among the committee was that the comments belonged to the faculty as feedback to improve teaching and should not be available to chairs and PTR committees.
unless opted for on an individual basis. Shelburne will report back to the committee (via e-mail) issues noted at the meeting and we will discuss in September. 08/09

**Other minor (for now) Topics 08/09:**

Goddard wondered whether the change this committee had suggested last year for the color change on the ribbon (from red, white and blue to Clemson orange and purple) for the Faculty Award to students at Graduation (for a 4.0 GPA) had been instituted or whether they were just using up the old ribbons. Likewise, he will check to make sure that an electronic roster of recipients is being kept somewhere for public access (Library website?) as was also part of the approved change.

Shelburne reported that Jan Murdoch, Undergraduate Dean, had mentioned that there were a few issues that needed to come before Scholastic Policies and she would talk to him soon about those issues.

Horton noted that he has class at 3:30 on Tuesday (scheduled before he was elected Senator) and asked if we could move the meeting time up for this semester to 2 PM instead of 2:30. We likewise moved the meeting over to Tillman Hall (Rm 420 — where we held them last year — one of the best views of campus also) for the Sept 15, October 20 and November 17 meetings only so Bob would be closer to his class and could stay longer if needed. Bob has secured the room and times so that change is done.

Meeting adjourned at 3:45
Report of the Faculty Senate Policy Committee

The Policy Committee met on 20 August 2009 to consider several items of business:

- Senator Denise Anderson reported that Alan Grubb was willing to present the idea of representation on the Graduate Council for interdisciplinary graduate programs housed in the Graduate School to the Graduate Advisory Committee at their 18 September meeting. The preliminary proposal was that Graduate Council representation for such programs would be accomplished by representation on the Graduate Advisory Committee, whose members all sit on the Graduate Council.

**Disposition:** The Policy Committee offered its preliminary endorsement of representation on the Graduate Council for interdisciplinary programs. It recommended that Senator Anderson work with Alan Grubb, the Graduate Advisory Committee, and Bonnie Holaday (who proposed the Graduate Council representation idea in Spring 2009) to clarify whether representation on the Graduate Council would be best achieved in standalone fashion or via representation solely on the Graduate Advisory Committee, or whether representation would also be appropriate on additional relevant committees such as the University Graduate Curriculum Committee.

- Senator Meredith Futral asked the Policy Committee to consider a change to the Faculty Manual allowing the use of a customized versions of the Form for the Evaluation of Academic Administrators (Appendix D of the Faculty Manual) for the evaluation of the Library Chair and Dean of Libraries.

The Policy Committee expressed reservations about this proposal on 3 counts: a) it was unclear to the Committee that the standard form was inadequate for the evaluation of Libraries administrators b) it was unclear to the Committee that the proposed forms captured unique information that could not be included in the standard form c) the Committee worried that such a precedent could lead to the creation of customized evaluation forms by numerous administrators. The Committee believed that standardization of administrator evaluation should be retained if at all reasonably possible. The Committee also concluded that the best way to ensure this in light of perceived inadequacies of the standard form is to revise the standard form in a manner that can be used for all academic administrators.

**Disposition:** The Policy Committee asked Senator Dutkiewicz to work with Senator Futral and their Libraries colleagues in recommending changes or additions to the standard form that would fulfill the perceived need for a crisper evaluation of Libraries administrators in the larger context of a uniform evaluation of all academic administrators on campus.
The Policy Committee considered a proposed change to the Faculty Manual concerning definitions of “faculty”, “regular faculty”, and “constitutional faculty”.

Disposition: The Committee approved the proposed changes, which were to then be presented to the E/AC on 25 August 2009.

The Policy Committee considered changes to the Faculty Manual concerning the constitution of the Scholarship and Awards Committee. Some administrative units with non-voting membership on this committee would prefer to send a designated representative instead of the unit head to the Committee.

Disposition: The Policy Committee had no objections to the desire by some administrative units to simultaneously maintain unit head efficiency and non-voting membership on the Committee and approved the changes, which were to then be presented to the E/AC on 25 August 2009.

The Policy Committee initiated a discussion on visiting faculty positions at Clemson. Senator Claudio Cantalupo briefed the Committee on his discussions of visiting positions in Mathematical Sciences with their Chair, Robert Taylor. The Committee recognized that there exist visiting faculty on campus whose times in such positions are clearly inconsistent with the “brief and temporary” appointments mandated by the Faculty Manual. Concern was expressed over the apparent use of a Visiting Lecturer position that is not defined in the Faculty Manual. Some members of the Committee suggested that the visiting titles are used to promote professional development in hopes that such titles will assist in the securing tenure-track faculty positions (here or elsewhere) in the future. While sympathetic to this situation, some members of the Committee nevertheless expressed the opinion that most/many of the visiting faculty could/should be reclassified as non-visiting faculty (e.g., lecturers). Some members of the committee noted that visiting faculty positions at other domestic and international institutions are typically a semester or a year—rarely even as long as 2 years. Some members of the committee noted that visiting faculty positions at other institutions are rarely funded or prohibited from being funded by institutional operating funds.

Disposition: The Committee decided to launch an online discussion board thread to consider the matter further and consider whether a hard time limit should be placed on visiting positions.
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- Research analyses
- 1999-2008 comparisons
Defining the "research faculty"

- No non-tenure track faculty, instructors or lecturers
- >25% research appointment
- <50% admin appointment
- 313 tenure-track and tenured faculty with mean research appointment of 46%

What is your current faculty rank?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Number of Respondants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All Research Faculty: Issues Ranked by (Importance-Satisfaction)

- Financial support for graduate students
- Support for research activities
- Support for graduate instruction
- The GAD process
- Internal funding for research activities
- Trust in VP for Research and Economic Development
- Effectiveness of OSP
- Adequacy of library resources
- Financial support for research technicians
- Availability of laboratory equipment
- Availability of research laboratory space
- Support for research activities
- Financial support for graduate students
All Research Faculty: Financial Support for Graduate Students

Letters are significantly different at P < 0.05 (Fisher's LSD).

For bars of the same color within a panel, means followed by different satisfaction letters are significantly different at P < 0.05 (Fisher's LSD).
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Overview
### University Issue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Senate Questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Senate is frequent to me as a faculty member</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>79.0</td>
<td>83.0</td>
<td>85.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Senate is effective in addressing concerns</td>
<td>82.0</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>83.0</td>
<td>84.0</td>
<td>85.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Faculty Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relationships between faculty and administration</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>-0.63</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University-provided dependent care</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td>-0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of parking</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>-0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking fees</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>-0.48</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty evaluation procedures</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>-0.48</td>
<td>-0.55</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistency between evaluation by administrators and faculty peer evaluations</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures for evaluation of administrators</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>-0.69</td>
<td>-0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequacy of salary increases for faculty</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>-1.20</td>
<td>-1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary increases of administrators</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>-0.95</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>-0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequacy of support for undergraduate instruction</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>-0.46</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequacy of support for graduate instruction</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.47</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of adequate classroom space</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate availability of classroom technology</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequacy of support for research activities</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>-0.60</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate availability of research laboratory space</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequacy of laboratory equipment</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequacy of support for service/outreach/Extension activities</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion of faculty input in decision-making processes</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.72</td>
<td>-0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University's commitment to diversity of faculty/staff</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University's commitment to diversity of students</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuition reduction/waiver for spouses or dependents</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.84</td>
<td>-0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency of University administrative structure</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>-0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust in University administration</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.92</td>
<td>-0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency of department chair administrative structure</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency of College/Dean administrative structure</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>-0.42</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency of administrative activities in the Provost's office</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>-0.35</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust in Department chair</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust in Dean</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.31</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust in Provost</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.37</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequacy of funding for your college</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-1.09</td>
<td>-0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequacy of funding for your department</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>-1.06</td>
<td>-1.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Faculty Senate Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am aware of the activities of the Faculty Senate</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Faculty Senate is an effective organization</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Faculty Senate is relevant to me as a faculty member</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Current Language:

Scholarships and Awards Committee formulates and recommends policies and procedures relating to scholarships and awards to the Council on Undergraduate Studies. It reviews the selection of recipients for university and collegiate undergraduate scholarships and grants-in-aid. Membership consists of six elected faculty members, one from each college and the library, serving three-year terms, the chair of the Faculty Senate scholastic policies committee or designee, and one undergraduate student, appointed by the student body president. Non-voting members are the director of financial aid (chair), the director of Calhoun Honors College, the dean of student life, the director of admissions, and the registrar.

Proposed Changes:

Scholarships and Awards Committee formulates and recommends policies and procedures relating to scholarships and awards to the Council on Undergraduate Studies. It reviews the selection of recipients for university and collegiate undergraduate scholarships and grants-in-aid. Membership consists of six elected regular faculty members, one from each college and the library, serving three-year terms, the chair of the Faculty Senate scholastic policies committee or designee, and one undergraduate student, appointed by the undergraduate student body president. Non-voting members are the director of financial aid (chair), the director of Calhoun Honors College, the Dean of Students, the Director of Admissions, and the Registrar or their designees.

Proposed Language:

Scholarships and Awards Committee formulates and recommends policies and procedures relating to scholarships and awards to the Council on Undergraduate Studies. It reviews the selection of recipients for university and collegiate undergraduate scholarships and grants-in-aid. Membership consists of six elected regular faculty members, one from each college and the library, serving three-year terms, the chair of the Faculty Senate scholastic policies committee or designee, and one undergraduate student, appointed by the undergraduate student body president. Non-voting members are the director of financial aid (chair), the director of Calhoun Honors College, the Dean of Students, the Director of Admissions, and the Registrar or their designees.

Rationale: The changes: a) clarify that the “faculty” membership on the Committee should consist of “regular faculty” as defined in the Faculty Manual; b) updates the intended administrative titles; and c) allows the non-voting Committee members to appoint designees to serve in their stead.
FACULTY SENATE AGENDA

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
   Faculty Senate – September 8, 2009

3. “FREE SPEECH” PERIOD

4. SPECIAL ORDER OF THE DAY – Becky Bowman, Associate Athletic Director
   Vickery Hall Overview

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
      1) Faculty Survey Subcommittee – Christina Wells
      2) Compensation Policy Group – President Bill Bowerman

6. PRESIDENT’S REPORT

7. OLD BUSINESS

8. NEW BUSINESS
   b. Proposed Faculty Manual Change – IV. H. 4 - Post-Tenure Review Committee – Senator King
   d. Proposed Faculty Manual Change – VII.B.2a – Graduate Curriculum Committee – Senator King
   e. Proposed Faculty Manual Change – VII.B.1b - Undergraduate Curriculum Committee – Senator King
   f. Proposed Faculty Manual Change – VII. I and J – Faculty Participation in Governance – Senator King
   g. Proposed Faculty Manual Change – VII.A General Framework – Senator King

9. ANNOUNCEMENTS
   a. Board of Trustees Dinner – October 15, 2009 - RSVP
   b. Class of ’39 Award for Excellence Nominations due October 19, 2009
   c. Executive/Advisory Committee – October 27, 2009 – 2:30 p.m. – F149 P&A Building
   d. Next Faculty Senate Meeting – November 10, 2009 – 2:30 p.m. – Madren Center

10. ADJOURNMENT
1. Call to Order: The meeting was called to order at 2:33 p.m. by President Bill Bowerman and guests were recognized.

2. Approval of Minutes: The Minutes from the Faculty Senate Meeting dated September 8, 2009 were approved as written.

3. "Free Speech": None

4. Committee Reports:
   
   
   
   

5. President’s Report: President Bowerman
   a. thanked the Standing Committee Chairs and Committee members for their hard work during the first six months of this Senate Session and for taking on new issues as they arise.
   
   b. informed the Senate about the question regarding 403B Retirement System and the ability to borrow against it. The University is working on this issue. There is evidently, a new requirement that went into effect this year that must be looked at in our plan.
   
   c. asked for two volunteers (in addition to himself) to join a small committee to determine guidelines for those who may be invited to fill up seats in the University plane when
University officers fly to Columbia and Washington, DC. Senators were asked to contact President Bowerman if they would be interested in serving in this capacity.

d. announced that Bill Pennington will chair the Faculty Senate Select Committee on Lecturers which will work with the Provost to define the role of teaching and non-teaching lecturers.

e. thanked Mary LaForge and Eric Skaar for volunteering to immediately become interim Grievance Board members until January, 2010 when new elections will be held.

f. thanked the Faculty Senate Executive/Advisory Committee which approved the concept of computers for needy students at Clemson University. “Tech for Tigers” will begin in November and the Faculty Senate will be one of many sponsors of the program.

g. asked Senators to forward to him any issues that they would like for him to discuss with the Board of Trustees next week.

6. Old Business: None

7. New Business:

a. Senator King submitted and explained the proposed Faculty Manual Change, IV.6.J Review of Academic Administrators. There was no discussion. Vote to accept proposed change was taken and passed unanimously (Attached).

b. Senator King submitted and explained the proposed Faculty Manual Change, IV.H.4 Post-Tenure Review Committee. There was no discussion. Vote to accept proposed change was taken and passed unanimously (Attached).

c. Senator King submitted and explained the proposed Faculty Manual Change, IV.D Procedures for Renewal of Appointment, Tenure, and Promotion. Following discussion, vote to accept proposed change was taken and passed (Attached).

d. Senator King submitted and explained the proposed Faculty Manual Change, VII.B.2a Graduate Curriculum Committee. There was no discussion. Vote to accept proposed change was taken and passed unanimously (Attached).

e. Senator King submitted and explained the proposed Faculty Manual Change, VII.B.1b Undergraduate Curriculum Committee. There was much discussion during which a call to question was asked and the vote on the call passed unanimously. Vote to accept proposed change was taken and passed (Attached).

f. Senator King submitted and explained the proposed Faculty Manual Change, VII.I and J Faculty Participation in Governance. There was much discussion. Motion was made to amend change to remove references to departmental committees which was seconded. Discussion on amendment followed. Call to question was asked and seconded. Vote to accept
call was taken and passed. Vote to accept amendment was taken and failed. Motion was made to table this proposed changed which was seconded. Vote to table and refer back to Policy Committee was taken and failed. Call to question was asked and seconded. Vote to accept call was taken and passed. Vote to accept proposed change, Faculty Participation in Governance, was taken and passed (Attached).

g. Senator King submitted and explained the proposed Faculty Manual Change, VII.A General Framework. There was no discussion. Vote to accept proposed change was taken and passed (Attached).

8. Announcements:
a. Board of Trustees Dinner – October 15, 2009 – RSVP to Cathy Sturkie as soon as possible.

b. Class of ’39 Award for Excellence nominations are due to the Faculty Senate Office on October 19, 2009. Call Cathy Sturkie with any questions regarding nomination form and encourage nominations.

c. The next Executive/Advisory Committee will meet on October 27, 2009 at 2:30 p.m. in F149 P&A Building (room change for this meeting only).

d. Tigerama will be held on October 30, 2009.

e. The next Faculty Senate meeting will be held on November 10, 2009 at 2:30 p.m. at the Madren Center.

9. Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 4:12 p.m.
Faculty Senate Finance Committee Report

Meeting: 9/15/2009    Rm 215 Fluor Daniel EIB    2:30PM – 3:15PM

Attending Senators: Figliola, Simon, Warner, LaForge

Submitted by: Senator Figliola

Task 1: Compensation Report Study (Lead: Clarke)

University Compensation Task Force still has not released any information. No other report this period.

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

The University Budget Accountability Committee has still not met as a full committee. No other report this period.

Task 3: Compensation Strategy (Lead: Simon)

This task force continued its discussions about compensation, including: (1) the role and monetary compensation of “clinical” (i.e., non-tenure track) faculty in helping the University achieve its broader goals; (2) the subtle issues that can arise in making meaningful salary comparisons across faculty within a Department and across Departments within a given field (e.g., discerning whether and the extent to which salary inversion exists); (3) the importance of establishing appropriate benchmarks across University Departments with differing goals and expectations; (4) the necessity of measuring actual performance against those benchmarks; and (5) what sorts of benchmarks might be appropriate for Administrators.
Work Plan Topics and Leads

Child Care
Lead: Linda Li-Bleuel and Michelle Martin
Pat Smart advised Linda Li-Bleuel to schedule an appointment with Provost Helms to discuss child care. Linda Li-Bleuel emailed the provost’s office on 9/14 but has not heard back as of now. She has already sent a follow-up email to see if she can schedule an appointment.

Work Loads
Lead: Chris Piper
Chris is checking the following and will have a report by Oct 20 meeting:
1) Is the 4-block workload written out in the faculty manual (or is it just a generic compilation of research, teaching, service) - the exercise being a check in total change of workload policy.
2) Who are the responsible administrators for workload? The exercise being a check on duties of deans and dept. chairs.

Salaries/Salary Compression
Lead: Wayne Sarasua
Nothing to report at this time.

Parking
Lead: Meredith Futral
There was a Parking Advisory Committee meeting on Sept. 10th. It was the first of the new academic year.

It seems that parking services will give parking decals to emeriti with permission from the Provost.

The west parking lot between the library and the new Rhodes annex is now only for carpool, motorcycle, handicapped, and delivery vehicles. It is not officially open for carpool, motorcycles, or handicapped vehicles. They are still working on repainting the spaces. This was formerly a primarily faculty/staff lot. With the Rhodes annex and a narrow road leading to the lot, these changes are being made.

There will be two sessions of the Parking Visioning Committee on 9/24 9am-12pm and 9/25 1:30pm-4:30pm.

Healthy Communities
Lead: Linda Howe
Nothing to report at this time.

**Professional Travel**

**Lead:** Wayne Stewart

Scott Pigeon and Linda Li-Bleuel had a follow-up meeting concerning the results of the business travel survey. Scott gave more specifics on the breakdown of travel funds—approximately 50% of the travel money is not tax money, but generated by grants and athletics. Scott and Linda also went over the pros and cons of having a credit card for hotels. Such a card would be optional and not forced upon anyone.

**Spousal Hire**

**Lead:** Yanming An

Nothing to report at this time.
FACULTY SENATE SCHOLASTIC POLICIES COMMITTEE
MONTHLY MEETING MINUTES
September 15, 2009 2:00 PM (420 Tillman Hall)

SCHOLASTIC POLICIES COMMITTEE – Vic Shelburne, Chair – (AFLS) present
Sean Brittain (E&S) not present
Wayne Goddard (E&S) present
Bob Horton (HEHD) present
Haibo Lu (AFLS) not present
Daniel Smith (AAH) not present

Guests: Julie Pennebaker, Asst Registrar

Topic 1 - Winter Semester
Lead: [Goddard]

When and IF a recommendation comes for a “Winter semester” (Scheduling Task Force?), be prepared to review and make recommendations as appropriate. Goddard is also on the University Academic Calendar Planning Committee and will keep our committee (Scholastic Policies) apprised if any recommendations come from that committee. 06/09

No progress. 09/09

Topic 2 - International Transfer Credits
Lead: [Shelburne]

Review upcoming new policy for International Transfer Credits (especially the policy as it relates to the European Credit Transfer System) and make recommendations as appropriate. Shelburne contacted Stan Smith, Registrar, who reported that his office believes that the matter is settled and that the new on-line form “Request for Approval of Work to be Taken Abroad” ([http://www.clemson.edu/ia/forms/coursework_approval_form.pdf](http://www.clemson.edu/ia/forms/coursework_approval_form.pdf)) outlines the basic credit conversion. The committee reviewed a copy of this form and concurred that no further action was necessary.

Topic 3 - Course drop/withdrawal date (2nd date) time change to later date
Lead: [Goddard]

Review current dates and make recommendations which may be more equitable for students. Shelburne reported that this issue in the form of a proposal came before the Undergraduate Council at its last meeting on Sept 11. Specifically, the proposal is to move the date back two weeks or 10 Class days—it is October 9th this semester. The major reason for the later date is that students need more time to make a decision to drop a class and that there are cases where the faculty have not provided adequate feedback by the existing date. Although the mood of the Council was to approve this proposal, there was some concern about how it would affect
advising. A subcommittee of advising staff and faculty was created (Shelburne or his designee will attend to represent Scholastic Policies) and will meet on Sept 22 to review the issue.

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

The November Fall Break is generally too late and loses its effectiveness. With increasing flexibility for voting, the alignment of the Fall Break with November elections seems inappropriate and should be reviewed. Shelburne had discussed this issue earlier in the day with Dr. Murdoch, Dean of Undergraduate Studies, and she suggested we get someone from Human Resources to provide input on whether an October fall break date during Congressional election years (in lieu of a holiday on election day) would be a problem for faculty, staff and students and whether any State requirements might be violated. Otherwise, the general consensus is that a stable date around mid-October would be better for everyone. Shelburne will contact Human Resources and get feedback for the next meeting.

Topic 5 - General Education
Lead: All

React to Gen Ed proposals as needed. Shelburne reported from a meeting earlier in the day with Dr. Murdoch that there was a possible move forthcoming to reduce the number of competencies (from 19 to 7) but this was the purview of the various curriculum committees and not Scholastic Policies; however, we will stay informed.

Topic 6 - Lab Fees
Lead: [Brittain]

Make proposal that 100% of lab fees be returned to Departments (and Students) for their use. Brittain will check out the current policy (how much goes to the Dept vs College vs University) and we will make recommendations as appropriate. 06/09

NO report 09/09

Topic 7 - Course Redemption Policy
Lead: [Horton]

Review Course Redemption policy and make recommendation to allow a grade of C or lower to be redeemed (D and F only in present policy).

Horton checked over the summer with Abby Daniel (Student Govt. President) about Student interest in this topic. She replied that she did have an interest in the course redemption policy for a grade of C since many students thought it was unfair that you could redeem a D or F but not a C especially with the Scholarship minimum GPA pressure. She did recommend that the
number of redeemable hours NOT be changed (presently 10) so to prevent overuse or abuse of the policy. The committee concurs with Abby and will probably propose a change to that effect.

Shelburne asked Horton to edit the language in the Undergraduate Announcements. His edit merely adds the grade of 'C' in the language as follows (note we will need to deliberate further on the last sentence below before we make a proposal to the EAC and on up):

Academic Redemption Policy
The Academic Redemption Policy (ARP) allows a student enrolled before August 2007 to repeat up to nine hours of coursework in which a C, D or F was earned if he/she has sufficient W hours remaining. Students whose initial enrollment occurs August 2007 or later may redeem up to ten credit hours. In all cases, the grade earned in the course used to redeem the earlier course will be used in computing the grade-point ratio and satisfying degree requirements. When the earlier grade is D and the second grade is F, the student cannot use the D grade to satisfy any degree requirement.

The committee’s logic for allowing a C to be redeemed is that many students are under a lot of pressure to maintain State Scholarship support by maintaining a B average. Although there are only 10 credit hours available, used judiciously, the ability to redeem a C may make a difference to a few students. Also, there is the undocumented but suspected situation whereby student may knowingly perform poorly at the end of the semester because by scoring a D or F, these grades allow them to redeem the grade whereas a C will not.

Topic 8 - Availability of Comments on Student Evaluation of Instructors for Chairs

Shelburne reported that he had been asked by Faculty Senate President Bill Bowerman to represent Scholastic Policies at Dept Chair’s retreat on Aug 18th along with Bill Bowerman, Bill Surver and Fran McGuire to discuss the availability of the comments on Student Evaluation of Instructors for Chairs and PTR committees. Last year, Scholastic Policies voted, it was ultimately approved by the Senate and is now in the Faculty Manual that chairs have access to the summary statistical data from the evaluations BUT not the comments. Faculty can of course opt to give the comments to the chair for annual evaluations and the PTR committees for promotion and tenure. This has come up because the Provost has released the comments anyway to chairs and/or some departments have voted to give the chairs the comments. Both actions are a potential Faculty Manual violation in that comments may only be released by the individual and not by the action of the provost or even a department faculty vote. Shelburne asked for feedback on this matter and the general consensus among the committee was that the comments belonged to the faculty as feedback to improve teaching and should not be available to chairs and PTR committees unless opted for on an individual basis. Shelburne rewrote the section in the Faculty Manual (Section IX – 6 2009 ). The committee deliberated over these changes and edited the wording as follows:

11. Student Evaluation of Teaching. (Section IX-6 2009 Faculty Manual)

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 may develop and employ supplemental questions, but the standard questions are required.

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

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. Recent summaries will be available to department chairs through the data warehouse, but the actual responses from students (including comments) will not be available unless an instructor opts to submit them. The university may retain electronic copies of summaries of statistical ratings for the purpose of verification that the evaluations have been carried out. However, it is the responsibility of the instructor to retain copies of the evaluations and their summaries.

The process of evaluating teaching should also involve other evaluation results, not just the summary of statistical ratings from the evaluations. These evaluation results may include 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, and
- any other method to which the faculty member and chair both agree

Meeting adjourned at 3:30
GAD
Lead: Lesly Temesvari
We are still collecting information on the peer-institutions (few more schools are required).

Post-doctoral hiring
Lead: Dvora Perahia

Dvora met with S. Craeger who initiated the request. The main issue is unreasonable time delay from the point where a candidate is identified to the generation of the offer letter. This results in losing some of the best candidates.

She found that:
a) The process is lengthy; however, it is not clear why. She is continuing to conduct research.
b) There are no clear guidelines
c) Since postdocs are on faculty ranks it requires Deans signatures (contributes to the delay)
She has received the official document that outlines the hiring procedure and is arranging a meeting for clarification.

Internal Competitions
Lead: Dvora Perahia
Nothing to report at this time.

Other Activities

2. Reviewing proposed faculty manual changes for the policy committee regarding IBC.
Faculty Senate Policy Committee Report

15 September 2009 Meeting

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

Special guests: Jens Holley, Fran Mcguire, Pat Smart

Respectfully submitted by: Jeremy King

1. The committee discussed a proposed change to IV-H-4 of the Faculty Manual regarding post tenure review—specifically, criteria for membership on a post-tenure-review committee in the context of the functions of Faculty in the Constitution and the idea of peer review.

Disposition: The Policy Committee approved a change to the Faculty Manual that restricted membership on post-tenure-review committees to regular faculty, cleaned up some grammar in this section of the Faculty Manual, and eliminated the “PTR” abbreviation. The change has been forwarded to the Executive Advisory Committee for consideration.

2. The committee discussed changes to the IV-D, Paragraphs 1 and 2 of the Faculty Manual concerning tenure, promotion and (re)appointment (TPR). The contexts of the discussion included the functions of Faculty in the Constitution, the idea and meaning of peer review, troubling reports that some departments may be using committees with secret membership in the TPR process, transparency of the TPR process (especially to junior Faculty members), and the silence of the Faculty Manual on minimum sizes of TPR committees (which are prescribed for post-tenure-review committees by the Faculty Manual).

Disposition: The policy committee approved changes to the Faculty Manual that limited voting membership on TPR committees to regular faculty, restricted voting privileges on TPR to regular faculty of tenure status and/or rank equivalent or higher than that sought by a candidate, prohibited use of TPR committees having secret membership, requires departments/units to have TPR guidelines in a document that is separate from bylaws and approved by the Provost, and established a minimum TPR committee size and methods of ensuring this. The changes have been forwarded to the Executive Advisory Committee for consideration.

3. The committee heard from and discussed with Jens Holley (Libraries Chair) the Library administrator evaluation forms contained in the Libraries bylaws. Discussion focused on the special nature of Library administrators in the Faculty Manual, the benefits and drawbacks of the use of the current administrator evaluation form in evaluating Libraries administrators, and the possible unintended consequences (e.g., other administrators on campus desiring customized evaluation forms) of using a separate evaluation form for Libraries administrators.

Disposition: The Policy Committee approved the inclusion of the Libraries administrators evaluation forms in Appendix D of the Faculty Manual for use in the evaluation process as described in IV-6, J of the Faculty Manual, and forwarded the recommended change to the Executive Advisory Committee.
4. The committee initiated a discussion on the timeline guidelines in the Faculty Manual for dismissal of lecturers. Several possible ambiguities were believed to exist that may be (now or in the future) the source of grievances or legal actions, and the need for clarifying language was embraced by the committee. At the same time, a number of issues with which such language must deal were noted to exist and be non-trivial.

Disposition: Kelly Smith was charged with drafting improved language with clear guidelines concerning lecturer appointments and dismissal for the Faculty Manual. The draft, and the issues it addresses and no doubt will raise, will be discussed at the Policy Committee’s October meeting.

5. The committee resumed a very brief discussion of the status and use of visiting faculty titles and classifications, and issue being spearheaded by Senator Cantalupo.

Disposition: Given reports of both flagging use of visiting classifications and the purported use of a “visiting lecturer” title (not defined in the Faculty Manual), the committee believed it should seek the most up-to-date statistics on visiting titles. The Committee asked Pat Smart to work with Wickes Wescott in providing the committee with current numbers (absent any personally identifying information) of visiting faculty, specific classifications in use, and years of service in these classifications.

6. The committee received informational updates from Senators Anderson and King regarding, respectively, the issue of representation of interdisciplinary graduate programs on the Graduate Council and the role of external supporters/sponsors of Center of Excellence (CoE) Endowed Chairs in the proposal and hiring process. The committee was informed that the Graduate Advisory Committee would consider the interdisciplinary program representation issue at its September meeting via the kind efforts of Senate Secretary Alan Grubb, who sits on the GAC. The committee was informed that General Counsel and the Provost have established a draft policy concerning CoE chairs that has reached the Policy Committee chair, and that (in response) the Policy Committee chair has asked both General Counsel and the Provost for a response to several questions concerning the draft for the benefit of the Committee prior to its consideration of the draft.
Proposed Change to the Faculty Manual
VI-6, section J (Review of Academic Administrators) 2nd paragraph and
Appendix D

Current Wording:
In the normal performance of their duties, administrators are subject to evaluations. Such evaluations shall employ the standard Clemson University form for the evaluation of administrators (see Appendix D), which shall be submitted to the chair of the evaluation committee. The evaluation committee will involve the faculty most affected by a particular administrator as well as that administrator’s supervisor. In all instances of an administrator’s review, a comment period of 15 days shall be provided. The affected faculty or constituent group is defined as follows: (a) all tenured and tenure-track members of a department, (b) all regular faculty of the appropriate college for academic deans and (c) all staff affected by that administrator.

Proposed Changes:
In the normal performance of their duties, administrators are subject to evaluations. Such evaluations shall employ the appropriate standard Clemson University form for the evaluation of administrators (see Appendix D), which shall be submitted to the chair of the evaluation committee. The evaluation committee will involve the faculty most affected by a particular administrator as well as that administrator’s supervisor. In all instances of an administrator’s review, a comment period of 15 days shall be provided. The affected faculty or constituent group is defined as follows: (a) all tenured and tenure-track members of a department, (b) all regular faculty of the appropriate college for academic deans and (c) all staff affected by that administrator.

Proposed Wording:
In the normal performance of their duties, administrators are subject to evaluations. Such evaluations shall employ the appropriate standard Clemson University form for the evaluation of administrators (see Appendix D), which shall be submitted to the chair of the evaluation committee. The evaluation committee will involve the faculty most affected by a particular administrator as well as that administrator’s supervisor. In all instances of an administrator’s review, a comment period of 15 days shall be provided. The affected faculty or constituent group is defined as follows: (a) all tenured and tenure-track members of a department, (b) all regular faculty of the appropriate college for academic deans and (c) all staff affected by that administrator.

Rationale: The intent of the change is to clarify that evaluation of the Dean of Libraries and the Library Chair should utilize forms contained in the Libraries’ approved bylaws and newly provided in Appendix D of the Faculty Manual. The Libraries evaluation forms are similar in design, spirit, and content to the current standard form in Appendix D, but contain evaluation criteria of greater relevance for the reviews of Libraries administrators. The Libraries bylaws containing the revised evaluation forms were approved by the Provost on February 15, 2009.
Proposed Faculty Manual Change
Section IV, Part H, Number 4

Current Wording:
4. Post-tenure review Committee. Whenever any faculty member is scheduled for regular review or in a period of PTR remediation, a PTR committee will be constituted in accordance with departmental bylaws that is separate from the regular personnel committee(s). Faculty members subject to Part II of PTR will be recused from participating in this second stage process. Only tenured faculty members are eligible for election to the PTR committee. The size of the committee may vary from one academic unit to another; however, the committee must have a minimum of three members. In cases in which the department does not have enough tenured faculty members to constitute a PTR committee, the departmental peer review committee will elect outside faculty members from other departments who are qualified to serve on the PTR committee. The PTR committee will elect its own chair.

Proposed Wording:
4. Post-tenure review Committee. Whenever any faculty member is scheduled for regular review or in a period of PTR post-tenure review remediation, a PTR post-tenure review committee, separate from the regular tenure, promotion, and reappointment committee, will be constituted in accordance with departmental bylaws that is separate from the regular personnel committee. Faculty members subject to Part II of PTR post-tenure review will be recused from participating in this second stage process. Only tenured regular faculty members are eligible for election to the PTR post-tenure review committee. The size of the committee may vary from one academic unit to another; however, the committee must have a minimum of three members. In cases in which the department does not have enough tenured regular faculty members to constitute a PTR post-tenure review committee, the departmental peer review committee will elect outside regular faculty members from other departments who are qualified to serve on the PTR post-tenure review committee. The PTR post-tenure review committee will elect its own chair.

Final Wording:
4. Post-tenure review Committee. Whenever any faculty member is scheduled for regular review or in a period of post-tenure review remediation, a post-tenure review committee, separate from the regular tenure, promotion, and reappointment committee, will be constituted in accordance with departmental bylaws. Faculty members subject to Part II of post-tenure review will be recused from participating in this second stage process. Only tenured regular faculty members are eligible for election to the post-tenure review committee. The size of the committee may vary from one academic unit to another; however, the committee must have a minimum of three members. In cases in which the department does not have enough tenured
regular faculty members to constitute a post-tenure review committee, the full departmental
tenure, promotion, and reappointment committee will elect regular faculty members from
other departments who are qualified to serve on the post-tenure review committee. The post-
tenure review committee will elect its own chair.

**Rationale:** The changes restrict membership on post-tenure review committees to tenured
regular faculty, uses “post-tenure review” instead of “PTR” in order to avoid confusion with
promotion-tenure-reappointment, cleans up confusing grammar in the first sentence, and clarifies
that the “personnel committee” referred to in the first sentence is the Departmental tenure,
promotion, and reappointment committee.
Proposed Change in Part VII Section B 2a Graduate Curriculum Committee

Current Language

a. Graduate Curriculum Committee is composed of the ViceProvost and Dean of the Graduate School as non-voting chair, plus two representatives of the graduate curriculum committees of the several colleges, one of whom will be the chair of the college graduate committee and the other elected by the college graduate committee. Should a college have a single curriculum committee, the college committee will elect two representatives to this committee.

Proposed Changes

a. Graduate Curriculum Committee is composed of the ViceProvost and Dean of the Graduate School as non-voting chair, plus two regular faculty representatives of the graduate curriculum committees of the several colleges, one of whom will be the chair of the college graduate committee and the other elected by the college graduate committee. Should a college have a single curriculum committee, the college committee will elect two regular faculty representatives to this committee.

New Language with the Changes

a. Graduate Curriculum Committee is composed of the ViceProvost and Dean of the Graduate School as non-voting chair, plus two regular faculty representatives of the graduate curriculum committees of the several colleges, one of whom will be the chair of the college graduate committee and the other elected by the college graduate committee. Should a college have a single curriculum committee, the college committee will elect two regular faculty representatives to this committee.
Suggested Changes in Part VII B1b –UG Curriculum Committee (page VII-2)

Current Wording

b. Undergraduate Curriculum Committee is comprised of the Vice-Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Studies or some other member of the Provost’s staff who serves as non-voting chairperson. Each college has two voting members, one of whom is chair of the collegiate curriculum committee, and the collegiate committee elects the second. The term of office is for three years in rotation. Non-voting members in addition to the chair include one elected library faculty, one undergraduate student appointed by the student body president, the registrar, the Calhoun honors college director, and other members of the Dean of Undergraduate Studies as needed. The committee’s jurisdiction is set forth in the Faculty Constitution, Article 4.

Interdisciplinary curricular proposals may be brought to the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee from oversight committees in the particular interdisciplinary area that are created by the college or colleges participating in the creation and staffing of these courses or curricula. If the participating departments or academic units are within a single college, a committee to oversee the interdisciplinary curriculum shall be established in the college bylaws providing for representation by affected departments or academic units. If the participating departments or academic units come from more than one college, a joint committee shall be established and be reflected in the bylaws of each participating college. The Honors College is also authorized to initiate interdisciplinary honors courses. Interdisciplinary proposals must be sent to college curriculum committees for review and comment before being considered by the university curriculum committees. The curriculum committees shall maintain a list of such committees to be published annually as an appendix to the Faculty Manual.

Proposed Changes

b. Undergraduate Curriculum Committee is comprised of the Vice-Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Studies or some other member of the Provost’s staff who serves as non-voting chairperson. Each college has two voting members selected from the regular faculty, one of whom is chair of the collegiate curriculum committee, and the collegiate committee elects the second. The term of office is for three years in rotation. Non-voting members in addition to the chair include one elected library faculty, one undergraduate student appointed by the student body president, the registrar, the Calhoun honors college director, and other members of the Dean of Undergraduate Studies as needed. The committee’s jurisdiction is set forth in the Faculty Constitution, Article 4.

Interdisciplinary curricular proposals may be brought to the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee from oversight committees in the particular interdisciplinary
area that are created by the college or colleges participating in the creation and staffing of these courses or curricula. If the participating departments or academic units are within a single college, a committee to oversee the interdisciplinary curriculum shall be established in the college bylaws providing for representation by affected departments or academic units. If the participating departments or academic units come from more than one college, a joint committee shall be established and be reflected in the bylaws of each participating college. The Honors College is also authorized to initiate interdisciplinary honors courses. Interdisciplinary proposals must be sent to college curriculum committees for review and comment before being considered by the university curriculum committees. The curriculum committees shall maintain a list of such committees to be published annually as an appendix to the Faculty Manual.

New Wording with Proposed Changes

b. Undergraduate Curriculum Committee is comprised of the Vice-Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Studies or some other member of the Provost’s staff who serves as non-voting chairperson. Each college has two voting members selected from the regular faculty, one of whom is chair of the collegiate curriculum committee, and the collegiate committee elects the second. The term of office is for three years in rotation. Non-voting members in addition to the chair include one elected library faculty, one undergraduate student appointed by the student body president, the registrar, the Calhoun honors college director, and other members of the Dean of Undergraduate Studies as needed. The committee’s jurisdiction is set forth in the Faculty Constitution, Article 4.

Interdisciplinary curricular proposals may be brought to the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee from oversight committees in the particular interdisciplinary area that are created by the college or colleges participating in the creation and staffing of these courses or curricula. If the participating departments or academic units are within a single college, a committee to oversee the interdisciplinary curriculum shall be established in the college bylaws providing for representation by affected departments or academic units. If the participating departments or academic units come from more than one college, a joint committee shall be established and be reflected in the bylaws of each participating college. The Honors College is also authorized to initiate interdisciplinary honors courses. Interdisciplinary proposals must be sent to college curriculum committees for review and comment before being considered by the university curriculum committees. The curriculum committees shall maintain a list of such committees to be published annually as an appendix to the Faculty Manual.
Suggested Changes in Part VII Sections I and J Faculty Participation in Governance

Current Language

I. Faculty Participation in College Governance

In conformity with policy adopted by the Board of Trustees in January, 1981, the faculty of each college or equivalent unit is organized in accordance with bylaws developed by its faculty under guidelines for the governance of academic units. Copies of college bylaws are available from the dean’s office or the Provost’s office. Although college bylaws vary, certain policies and procedures for faculty participation in college governance must be followed by all Collegiate Faculties.

Formal meetings of the faculty of college shall be held at least once during each of the long semesters. At such meetings standing and other committees of the college report to the faculty and make recommendations. However, any member of a Collegiate Faculty may raise a question concerning the academic affairs of the college before the faculty. Where immediate action on such questions is deemed inadvisable, the presiding officer, with the concurrence of the faculty, may refer them to appropriate college committees.

Recommendations from the college faculty are to be forwarded to the appropriate University council, committee, or administrative officer. Minutes of Collegiate Faculty meetings are to be forwarded to the Provost and Vice-President for Academic Affairs and to the President of the University for their information.

Each college with degree program responsibilities shall have as a standing committee a Curriculum Committee. At the discretion of the faculty and in accordance with college bylaws, a college may establish separate Undergraduate and Graduate Curriculum Committees. Each college’s Undergraduate Curriculum Committee elects its own chair, who also serves on the University Undergraduate Curriculum Committee. A second representative shall be elected by the committee. Likewise, the elected chair of the College’s Graduate Curriculum Committee represents the college on the University Graduate Curriculum Committee. A college that chooses to maintain a single curriculum committee delegates to that committee the authority to name the college representative to the University Graduate Curriculum Committee.

Each department or equivalent unit of the college shall elect its representative(s) to the college curriculum committee in accordance with procedures established in the college bylaws. In colleges in which the number of departments is small, college bylaws may specify alternate procedures for establishing the membership of college curriculum committees. Terms of service on college curriculum committees are to be determined by the faculty of each college and specified in its bylaws.

Curricular recommendations emanating from the departments or equivalent units of each college are acted upon by the Collegiate Faculty and/or by the appropriate college curriculum committee. Upon approval such curricular items are to be forwarded to the appropriate University Curriculum Committee for action.
A Collegiate Faculty may also establish other standing committees whose composition and membership are determined by the faculty in accordance with the college bylaws. Said committees shall report to the Collegiate Faculty at regular intervals. Ad Hoc committees may be established at the discretion of the dean of the college.

Membership on college committees need not be confined to Collegiate Faculty only: college bylaws shall provide for student and staff on representation wherever appropriate.

J. Faculty Participation in Departmental Governance

In conformity with policy adopted by the Board of Trustees in January, 1981, the faculty of each department or equivalent unit is organized in accordance with bylaws developed by its faculty under guidelines for the governance of academic units. Copies of departmental bylaws are available from the department office, the dean’s office or the Provost’s office. Although, departmental bylaws vary, certain policies and procedures for faculty participation in departmental governance must be followed by all departmental faculties.

The faculty who comprise an academic department or equivalent unit constitute the primary authority on academic matters such as the department’s curriculum and its major and minor programs. In such matters the influence of the department chair and of the dean (if the latter happens to be a member of the department) extends only so far as their status as departmental faculty. The faculty of a department or equivalent unit also constitutes the primary judge of the qualifications of its members; thus peer evaluation is an essential element in the appointment, reappointment, promotion, and tenure of department members (see Part IV.).

Since the will of the department with regard to academic matters is most properly established in formal assemblages, the department chair shall conduct a regular meeting of the departmental faculty at least once in each of the long semesters. Minutes of these meetings shall be forwarded to the dean of the college or the equivalent administrator for his/her information.

Each department or equivalent unit shall have a standing Advisory Committee of faculty members, chaired by the department chair, the composition and membership of which shall be approved by the regular faculty of the department. In small departments the faculty may elect to have the entire regular faculty serve as the Advisory committee. This committee shall advise the chair on matters which he/she brings to it.

If approved by the department chair and the departmental faculty, other standing committees may be established. These committees shall forward recommendations to the chair and report to the departmental faculty at regular intervals. Ad Hoc committees may be established at the department chair’s discretion. All departmental committees, however, must be established in ways consistent with college bylaws and with the Faculty Manual. Membership on departmental committees need not be confined to faculty: student and/or staff representation shall be provided.
for wherever appropriate. Each department shall also elect representatives to the college curriculum and other committees in accordance with procedures established in the college bylaws.

Suggested Changes

I. Faculty Participation in College Governance

In conformity with policy adopted by the Board of Trustees in January, 1981, the faculty of each college or equivalent unit is organized in accordance with bylaws developed by its Faculty under guidelines for the governance of academic units. Copies of college bylaws are available from the dean’s office or the Provost’s office. Although college bylaws vary, certain policies and procedures for faculty participation in college governance must be followed by all Collegiate Faculties.

Formal meetings of the faculty of college shall be held at least once during each of the long semesters. At such meetings standing and other committees of the college report to the faculty and make recommendations. However, any member of a Collegiate Faculty may raise a question concerning the academic affairs of the college before the faculty. Where immediate action on such questions is deemed advisable, the presiding officer, with the concurrence of the faculty, may refer them to appropriate college committees.

Recommendations from the college faculty are to be forwarded to the appropriate University council, committee, or administrative officer. Minutes of Collegiate Faculty meetings are to be forwarded to the Provost and Vice-President for Academic Affairs and to the President of the University for their information.

Each college with degree program responsibilities shall have as a standing committee a Curriculum Committee. At the discretion of the faculty and in accordance with college bylaws, a college may establish separate Undergraduate and Graduate Curriculum Committees. Each college’s Undergraduate Curriculum Committee elects its own chair, who also serves on the University Undergraduate Curriculum Committee. A second representative shall be elected by the committee. Likewise, the elected chair of the College’s Graduate Curriculum Committee represents the college on the University Graduate Curriculum Committee. A college that chooses to maintain a single curriculum committee delegates to that committee the authority to name the college representative to the University Graduate Curriculum Committee. Voting membership of College Curriculum Committees is limited to regular faculty.

Each department or equivalent unit of the college shall elect its representative(s) to the college curriculum committee in accordance with procedures established in the college bylaws. In colleges in which the number of departments is small, college bylaws may specify alternate procedures for establishing the membership of college curriculum committees. Terms of service on college curriculum
committees are to be determined by the faculty Faculty of each college and specified in its bylaws.

Curricular recommendations emanating from the departments or equivalent units of each college are acted upon by the Collegiate Faculty and/or by the appropriate college curriculum committee. Upon approval such curricular items are to be forwarded to the appropriate University Curriculum Committee for action.

A Collegiate Faculty may also establish other standing committees whose composition and membership are determined by the faculty in accordance with the college bylaws. Said committees shall report to the Collegiate Faculty at regular intervals. Ad Hoc committees may be established at the discretion of the dean of the college.

Membership on college committees need not be confined to regular Collegiate Faculty only except as noted in Section K: college bylaws shall provide for Faculty, special faculty, student and staff on representation wherever appropriate.

J. Faculty Participation in Departmental Governance

In conformity with policy adopted by the Board of Trustees in January, 1981, the faculty Faculty of each department or equivalent unit is organized in accordance with bylaws developed by its faculty Faculty under guidelines for the governance of academic units. Copies of departmental bylaws are available from the department office, the dean’s office or the Provost’s office. Although, departmental bylaws vary, certain policies and procedures for faculty participation in departmental governance must be followed by all departmental faculties.

The Faculty Faculty who comprise an academic department or equivalent unit constitute the primary authority on academic matters such as the department’s curriculum and its major and minor programs. In such matters the influence of the department chair and of the dean (if the latter happens to be a member of the department) extends only so far as their status as departmental faculty Faculty. The faculty Faculty of a department or equivalent unit also constitutes the primary judge of the qualifications of its members; thus peer evaluation is an essential element in the appointment, reappointment, promotion, and tenure of department members (see Part IV.).

Since the will of the department with regard to academic matters is most properly established in formal assemblages, the department chair shall conduct a regular meeting of the departmental faculty at least once in each of the long semesters. Minutes of these meetings shall be forwarded to the dean of the college or the equivalent administrator for his/her information.

Each academic department, or school if appropriate, shall have a standing committee as a curriculum committee. At the discretion of the Faculty and in accordance with departmental bylaws, a department or school may establish separate Undergraduate and Graduate Curriculum
Committees. Each department's Undergraduate Curriculum Committee elects its own chair, who also serves on the College Undergraduate Curriculum Committee. A second representative shall be elected by the Department Committee. Likewise, the elected chair of the department's Graduate Curriculum Committee represents the department on the College Graduate Curriculum Committee. A department that chooses to maintain a single curriculum committee delegates to that committee the authority to name the department's representative to the College Graduate Curriculum Committee. Voting membership on department Curriculum Committees is limited to regular faculty.

Each department or equivalent unit shall have a standing Advisory Committee of regular faculty members, chaired by the department chair, the composition and membership of which shall be approved by the regular faculty of the department. In small departments the faculty may elect to have the entire regular faculty serve as the Advisory committee. This committee shall advise the chair on matters which he/she brings to it.

If approved by the department chair and the departmental Faculty, other standing committees may be established. These committees shall forward recommendations to the chair and report to the departmental faculty at regular intervals. Ad Hoc committees may be established at the department chair's discretion. All departmental committees, however, must be established in ways consistent with college bylaws and with the Faculty Manual. Membership on departmental committees need not be confined to regular faculty except as noted in Section K: Faculty, special faculty, student and/or staff representation shall be provided for wherever appropriate. Each department shall also elect representatives to the college curriculum and other committees in accordance with procedures established in the college bylaws.

K. Committees Restricted to Regular Faculty as Voting Members

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

New Language

I. Faculty Participation in College Governance

In conformity with policy adopted by the Board of Trustees in January, 1981, the Faculty of each college or equivalent unit is organized in accordance with bylaws developed by its Faculty under guidelines for the governance of academic units. Copies of college bylaws are available from the dean's office or the Provost's office. Although college bylaws vary, certain policies
and procedures for faculty participation in college governance must be followed by all Collegiate Faculties.

Formal meetings of the faculty of college shall be held at least once during each of the long semesters. At such meetings standing and other committees of the college report to the faculty and make recommendations. However, any member of a Collegiate Faculty may raise a question concerning the academic affairs of the college before the faculty. Where immediate action on such questions is deemed inadvisable, the presiding officer, with the concurrence of the Faculty, may refer them to appropriate college committees.

Recommendations from the college Faculty are to be forwarded to the appropriate University council, committee, or administrative officer. Minutes of Collegiate Faculty meetings are to be forwarded to the Provost and Vice-President for Academic Affairs and to the President of the University for their information.

Each college with degree program responsibilities shall have as a standing committee a Curriculum Committee. At the discretion of the Faculty and in accordance with college bylaws, a college may establish separate Undergraduate and Graduate Curriculum Committees. Each college’s Undergraduate Curriculum Committee elects its own chair, who also serves on the University Undergraduate Curriculum Committee. A second representative shall be elected by the committee. Likewise, the elected chair of the College’s Graduate Curriculum Committee represents the college on the University Graduate Curriculum Committee. A college that chooses to maintain a single curriculum committee delegates to that committee the authority to name the college representative to the University Graduate Curriculum Committee. Voting membership of College Curriculum Committees is limited to regular faculty.

Each department or equivalent unit of the college shall elect its representative(s) to the college curriculum committee in accordance with procedures established in the college bylaws. In colleges in which the number of departments is small, college bylaws may specify alternate procedures for establishing the membership of college curriculum committees. Terms of service on college curriculum committees are to be determined by the Faculty of each college and specified in its bylaws.

Curricular recommendations emanating from the departments or equivalent units of each college are acted upon by the Collegiate Faculty and/or by the appropriate college curriculum committee. Upon approval such curricular items are to be forwarded to the appropriate University Curriculum Committee for action.

A Collegiate Faculty may also establish other standing committees whose composition and membership are determined by the faculty in accordance with the college bylaws. Said committees shall report to the Collegiate Faculty at regular intervals. Ad Hoc committees may be established at the discretion of the dean of the college.
Membership on college committees need not be confined to regular faculty only except as noted in Section K: college bylaws shall provide for Faculty, special faculty, student and staff on representation wherever appropriate.

J. Faculty Participation in Departmental Governance

In conformity with policy adopted by the Board of Trustees in January, 1981, the Faculty of each department or equivalent unit is organized in accordance with bylaws developed by its Faculty under guidelines for the governance of academic units. Copies of departmental bylaws are available from the department office, the dean’s office or the Provost’s office. Although, departmental bylaws vary, certain policies and procedures for faculty participation in departmental governance must be followed by all departmental faculties.

The Faculty who comprise an academic department or equivalent unit constitute the primary authority on academic matters such as the department’s curriculum and its major and minor programs. In such matters the influence of the department chair and of the dean (if the latter happens to be a member of the department) extends only so far as their status as departmental Faculty. The Faculty of a department or equivalent unit also constitutes the primary judge of the qualifications of its members; thus peer evaluation is an essential element in the appointment, reappointment, promotion, and tenure of department members (see Part IV.).

Since the will of the department with regard to academic matters is most properly established in formal assemblages, the department chair shall conduct a regular meeting of the departmental faculty at least once in each of the long semesters. Minutes of these meetings shall be forwarded to the dean of the college or the equivalent administrator for his/her information.

Each academic department, or school if appropriate, shall have a standing committee as a curriculum committee. At the discretion of the Faculty and in accordance with departmental bylaws, a department or school may establish separate Undergraduate and Graduate Curriculum Committees. Each department’s Undergraduate Curriculum Committee elects its own chair, who also serves on the College Undergraduate Curriculum Committee. A second representative shall be elected by the Department committee. Likewise, the elected chair of the department’s Graduate Curriculum Committee represents the department on the College Graduate Curriculum Committee. A department that chooses to maintain a single curriculum committee delegates to that committee the authority to name the department’s representative to the College Graduate Curriculum Committee. Voting membership on department Curriculum Committees is limited to regular faculty.

Each department or equivalent unit shall have a standing Advisory Committee of regular faculty members, chaired by the department chair, the composition and membership of which shall be approved by the regular faculty of the department. In small departments the faculty may elect to have the entire regular faculty serve as the Advisory committee. This committee shall advise the chair on matters which he/she brings to it.
If approved by the department chair and the departmental Faculty, other standing committees may be established. These committees shall forward recommendations to the chair and report to the departmental faculty at regular intervals. Ad Hoc committees may be established at the department chair’s discretion. All departmental committees, however, must be established in ways consistent with college bylaws and with the Faculty Manual. Membership on departmental committees need not be confined to regular faculty except as noted in Section K: Faculty, special faculty, student and/or staff representation shall be provided for wherever appropriate. Each department shall also elect representatives to the college curriculum and other committees in accordance with procedures established in the college bylaws.

K. Committees Restricted to Regular Faculty as Voting Members

Based on the description of the responsibilities shared by Faculty at Clemson University, voting members on the following committees are limited to regular faculty: Departmental Promotion, Tenure and Reappointment Committee; Departmental Post-Tenure Review Committee; Departmental, College and University Curriculum Committees; Departmental and College Advisory Committees; Faculty Senate; and Grievance Board.
Proposed Change to the Faculty Manual
Section IV, Part D, Paragraphs 1 and 2

Current wording:

D. Procedures for Renewal of Appointment, Tenure, and Promotion

Because the faculty of a department or equivalent academic unit is the primary judge of the qualifications of its members, peer evaluation is essential in recommendations for appointment, renewal of appointment, tenure, and promotion. All peer recommendations regarding any individual holding faculty rank in a department shall, therefore, originate within the faculty of that department. Individual departments at Clemson University establish written procedures and committee structures in order to facilitate peer evaluation. These written procedures must incorporate attention to “Best Practices for a Performance Review System for Faculty” (Appendix E).

All personnel matters are confidential and a matter of trust. The departmental committee(s) reviewing appointment, promotion, and tenure matters shall be composed of full-time faculty members excluding individuals who, as administrators, have input into personnel decisions such as appointment, tenure, and promotion. Initial recommendations on personnel decisions are made by the faculty peer review committee and the department chair. In cases where there is no department chair, the administrative recommendation is made by the school director. From the remainder of this section (D) through Section J, references to chair should be understood to refer to the school director if and only if there is no departmental chair.

Proposed Wording:

D. Procedures for Renewal of Appointment, Tenure, and Promotion

Because the regular faculty of a department or equivalent academic unit is the primary judge of the qualifications of its members, peer evaluation is essential in recommendations for appointment, renewal of appointment, tenure, and promotion. All peer recommendations regarding any individual holding faculty rank in a department shall, therefore, originate within the regular faculty of that department. Individual departments at Clemson University must establish and utilize written procedures and committee structures with defined membership in order to facilitate peer evaluation. These written procedures must incorporate attention to “Best Practices for a Performance Review System for Faculty” (Appendix E). Departmental regular faculty determine the tenure, promotion and reappointment standards, as well as procedures for electing the tenure, promotion and reappointment committee and the procedures the committee must follow. These will be stipulated in a Department’s Tenure, Promotion and Reappointment document that is distinct from Department or unit bylaws. Departmental policies must include the following: voting rights on a committee making recommendations concerning tenure are limited to tenured regular faculty; voting rights on a committee making a recommendation concerning promotion to rank or appointment at a rank are limited to regular faculty with equivalent or higher rank. The Tenure, Promotion, and Reappointment document containing written policies, procedures, and committee structures must be approved by the regular faculty;
D. Procedures for Renewal of Appointment, Tenure, and Promotion

Because the regular faculty of a department or equivalent academic unit is the primary judge of the qualifications of its members, peer evaluation is essential in recommendations for appointment, renewal of appointment, tenure, and promotion. All peer recommendations regarding any individual holding Faculty rank in a department shall, therefore, originate within the regular faculty of that department. Individual departments at Clemson University must establish and utilize written procedures and committee structures with defined membership in order to facilitate peer evaluation. These written procedures must incorporate attention to “Best Practices for a Performance Review System for Faculty” (Appendix E). Departmental regular faculty determine the tenure, promotion and reappointment standards, as well as procedures for electing the tenure, promotion and reappointment committee and the procedures the committee must follow. These will be stipulated in a Department’s Tenure, Promotion and Reappointment document that is distinct from Department or unit bylaws. Departmental policies must include the following: voting rights on a committee making recommendations concerning tenure are limited to tenured regular faculty; voting rights on a committee making a recommendation concerning promotion to rank or appointment at a rank are limited to regular faculty with equivalent or higher rank. The Tenure, Promotion, and Reappointment document containing written policies, procedures, and committee structures must be approved by the regular faculty; department chair, school director or unit head; and Provost. The Tenure, Promotion, and Reappointment document as well as the identities of those members comprised by the committee reviewing tenure, promotion, and reappointment must promptly be made available to the candidate upon request to the department chair, school director, or unit head.
All personnel matters are confidential and a matter of trust. The departmental committee(s) reviewing appointment, promotion, and tenure matters shall be composed of full-time regular faculty members excluding individuals who, as administrators, have input into personnel decisions such as appointment, tenure, and promotion. The size of the tenure, promotion and reappointment committee may vary from one academic unit to another; however, the committee must have a minimum of three members. In cases in which the department does not have enough regular faculty members to constitute a tenure, promotion and reappointment committee, the full departmental regular faculty will elect regular faculty members from other departments who are qualified to serve on the tenure, promotion and reappointment committee. Initial recommendations on personnel decisions are made by the tenure, promotion and reappointment committee and the department chair. In cases where there is no department chair, the administrative recommendation is made by the school director. From the remainder of this section (D) through Section J, references to chair should be understood to refer to the school director if and only if there is no departmental chair.

**Rationale:** The proposed changes: A) Ensure that the process of evaluation for tenure, promotion, and reappointment is consistent with the Constitution by limiting membership on tenure, promotion and reappointment (TPR) committees to regular faculty; B) Achieve a perceived improvement in fundamental fairness to candidates by limiting voting privileges on TPR committees to those members of equivalent or higher rank and tenure status than that sought by the candidate; C) Provide needed improved transparency in the TPR process by prohibiting the use of TPR committees with secretive membership; D) Promote needed improved transparency of and clarity about the TPR process, especially to new Faculty members, by mandating that departments/units have a separate TPR document describing the TPR process, procedures, and committee membership; in some cases, this information is currently threaded throughout department bylaws; E) Establish missing guidelines concerning a minimum TPR committee size and procedures to ensure a minimum size in a fashion identical to post tenure review guidelines, which mandate a minimum three-person committee size and election of external regular faculty members to ensure this minimum if sufficient personnel are not available within the Department.
Changes in Part VII section A - General Framework (page VII-1)

Current Language

In accordance with the Will of Thomas Green Clemson and the Act of Acceptance by the General Assembly of South Carolina, ultimate responsibility for the governance of Clemson University is vested in the Board of Trustees. The Board is charged with setting university policies so as to achieve the goals established by Mr. Clemson in his will and to serve the needs of the State of South Carolina. Thus, final authority and responsibility for all policy decisions rest with the Board.

In order to operate the university effectively, the Board delegates responsibility in various areas to the President of the University, to certain administrative officials, and to the faculty. The President is the executive officer charged with administering the university in accordance with the policies adopted by the Board and with primary responsibility for leadership and planning for the institution. The President is charged with responsibility for academic, personnel, development, and fiscal and budgetary matters; with providing for and maintaining the physical facilities of the university; with representing the institution to its several publics; with the administrative implementation of the various policies of the university.

The faculty, as the repository of learning in the various academic fields of study, is charged with creating the curriculum; setting requirements for degrees; determining when requirements have been met; approving candidates for degrees. The faculty also has primary responsibility for such academic matters as evaluating the qualifications of current or prospective faculty members; initiating recommendations for faculty and academic administrative appointments; faculty reappointment, tenure, and promotion recommendations.

To carry out its role in the governance of the university, the faculty is formally organized through a Faculty Constitution, which can be found in Section VIII of this Manual. The Faculty Senate, various university committees, and the several college, school, and departmental faculties and their committees facilitate the execution of the business of the faculty.

The Faculty Senate is the elected body that represents the faculty in its relationship with the administration, especially in regard to policy matters involving the academic prerogatives of the faculty and faculty welfare. To fulfill their academic governance responsibilities levels, the faculties of the several colleges, schools, and departments are formally organized according to bylaws. Indeed, the primary exercise of the academic prerogatives of the faculty takes place at the department level, where the specific professional expertise of a particular discipline can be brought to focus on academic matters, including questions regarding curriculum, appointment, tenure, and promotion.

Since the effective functioning of the university requires communication and cooperation between the faculty and the administration, a university council, commission, and committee structure has been established. This structure provides for faculty participation in planning, policy formulation, and decision-making in all areas that bear upon faculty concerns. The most
comprehensive body within this structure is the Academic Council, with its subsidiary commissions and committees. As outlined below, the Academic Council includes representatives from various constituencies of the university (students, nonacademic administrators, as well as faculty and academic administrators). Additional committees exist outside the Academic Council structure and are organized here by administrative area.

Suggested Changes

In accordance with the Will of Thomas Green Clemson and the Act of Acceptance by the General Assembly of South Carolina, ultimate responsibility for the governance of Clemson University is vested in the Board of Trustees. The Board is charged with setting university policies so as to achieve the goals established by Mr. Clemson in his will and to serve the needs of the State of South Carolina. Thus, final authority and responsibility for all policy decisions rest with the Board.

In order to operate the university effectively, the Board delegates responsibility in various areas to the President of the University, to certain administrative officials, and to the faculty. The President is the executive officer charged with administering the university in accordance with the policies adopted by the Board and with primary responsibility for leadership and planning for the institution. The President is charged with responsibility for academic, personnel, development, and fiscal and budgetary matters; with providing for and maintaining the physical facilities of the university; with representing the institution to its several publics; with the administrative implementation of the various policies of the university.

The faculty, as the repository of learning in the various academic fields of study, is charged with creating the curriculum; setting requirements for degrees; determining when requirements have been met; approving candidates for degrees. The faculty also has primary responsibility for such academic matters as evaluating the qualifications of current or prospective faculty members; initiating recommendations for faculty and academic administrative appointments; faculty reappointment, tenure, and promotion recommendations.

To carry out its role in the governance of the university, the faculty is formally organized through a Faculty Constitution, which can be found in Section VIII of this Manual. The Faculty Senate, various university committees, and the several college, school, and departmental faculties and their committees facilitate the execution of the business of the faculty.

The Faculty Senate is the elected body that represents the faculty in its relationship with the administration, especially in regard to policy matters involving the academic prerogatives of the faculty and faculty welfare. To fulfill their academic governance responsibilities levels, the faculties of the several colleges, schools, and departments are formally organized according to bylaws. Indeed, the primary exercise of the academic prerogatives of the faculty takes place at the department level, where the specific professional expertise of a particular discipline can be brought to focus on academic matters, including questions regarding curriculum, appointment, tenure, and promotion.
Since the effective functioning of the university requires communication and cooperation between the faculty and the administration, a university council, commission, and committee structure has been established. This structure provides for faculty participation in planning, policy formulation, and decision-making in all areas that bear upon faculty concerns.

Based on the description of the responsibilities shared by Faculty at Clemson University, representation on the following committees is limited to individuals meeting the definition of regular faculty: Departmental Promotion, Tenure And Reappointment Committee; Departmental Post-Tenure Review Committee; Departmental, College and University Curriculum Committees; Departmental and College Advisory Committees; Faculty Senate; Grievance Board.

The most comprehensive body within this structure is the Academic Council, with its subsidiary commissions and committees. As outlined below, the Academic Council includes representatives from various constituencies of the university (students, nonacademic administrators, as well as faculty and academic administrators). Additional committees exist outside the Academic Council structure and are organized here by administrative area.

New Language with Changes

In accordance with the Will of Thomas Green Clemson and the Act of Acceptance by the General Assembly of South Carolina, ultimate responsibility for the governance of Clemson University is vested in the Board of Trustees. The Board is charged with setting university policies so as to achieve the goals established by Mr. Clemson in his will and to serve the needs of the State of South Carolina. Thus, final authority and responsibility for all policy decisions rest with the Board.

In order to operate the university effectively, the Board delegates responsibility in various areas to the President of the University, to certain administrative officials, and to the Faculty. The President is the executive officer charged with administering the university in accordance with the policies adopted by the Board and with primary responsibility for leadership and planning for the institution. The President is charged with responsibility for academic, personnel, development, and fiscal and budgetary matters; with providing for and maintaining the physical facilities of the university; with representing the institution to its several publics; with the administrative implementation of the various policies of the university.

The Faculty, as the repository of learning in the various academic fields of study, is charged with creating the curriculum; setting requirements for degrees; determining when requirements have been met; approving candidates for degrees. The Faculty also has primary responsibility for such academic matters as evaluating the qualifications of current or prospective faculty members; initiating recommendations for faculty and academic administrative appointments; faculty reappointment, tenure, and promotion recommendations.

To carry out its role in the governance of the university, the Faculty is formally organized.
through a Faculty Constitution, which can be found in Section VIII of this Manual. The Faculty Senate, various university committees, and the several college, school, and departmental faculties and their committees facilitate the execution of the business of the faculty.

The Faculty Senate is the elected body that represents the faculty in its relationship with the administration, especially in regard to policy matters involving the academic prerogatives of the faculty and faculty welfare. To fulfill their academic governance responsibilities levels, the faculties of the several colleges, schools, and departments are formally organized according to bylaws. Indeed, the primary exercise of the academic prerogatives of the faculty takes place at the department level, where the specific professional expertise of a particular discipline can be brought to focus on academic matters, including questions regarding curriculum, appointment, tenure, and promotion.

Since the effective functioning of the university requires communication and cooperation between the faculty and the administration, a university council, commission, and committee structure has been established. This structure provides for faculty participation in planning, policy formulation, and decision-making in all areas that bear upon faculty concerns.

Based on the description of the responsibilities shared by Faculty at Clemson University, representation on the following committees is limited to individuals meeting the definition of regular faculty: Departmental Promotion, Tenure And Reappointment Committee; Departmental Post-Tenure Review Committee; Departmental, College and University Curriculum Committees; Departmental and College Advisory Committees; Faculty Senate: Grievance Board

The most comprehensive body within this structure is the Academic Council, with its subsidiary commissions and committees. As outlined below, the Academic Council includes representatives from various constituencies of the university (students, nonacademic administrators, as well as faculty and academic administrators). Additional committees exist outside the Academic Council structure and are organized here by administrative area.
NOVEMBER 10, 2009          MADREN CENTER          2:30 P.M.

FACULTY SENATE AGENDA

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. ELECTION OF CLASS OF '39 AWARD FOR EXCELLENCE:
   a. Election of Class of '39 Award (secret ballot); Pat Smart, Provost's Designee, and Bill Pennington – 2008 Award winner will conduct the election and count the ballots

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
   Faculty Senate – October 6, 2009

4. “FREE SPEECH” PERIOD

5. SPECIAL ORDERS OF THE DAY
   George Smith, Associate Vice President of Student Affairs – Parking Visioning Update
   Gail Ring, Director of ePortfolio Program

6. COMMITTEE REPORTS
   a. Faculty Senate Standing Committees
      Finance Committee – Senator Richard Figliola
      Welfare Committee – Senator Linda Li-Bluel
      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

7. PRESIDENT’S REPORT

8. OLD BUSINESS

9. NEW BUSINESS
   a. Selection of Two Representatives – Search Committee for Vice President for Research (one, from the three regulatory committees; one, from the Faculty Senate Research Committee)
   b. Approval of Process for Election of Additional Regular Faculty Members to the VP for Research Search Committee to ensure compliance with Faculty Manual - Alan Grubb

10. ANNOUNCEMENTS
    a. Executive/Advisory Committee – November 24, 2009 – 2:30 p.m. – 205 Cooper Library
    b. Next Faculty Senate Meeting – December 8, 2009 – 2:30 p.m. – Madren Center

11. ADJOURNMENT

(After Adjournment, (approximately 3:45 pm) the Senate has invited Undergraduate Studies representatives to provide a forum to discuss the ePortfolio requirement for General Education. All Senate meetings and discussions are open to the University community)
MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
NOVEMBER 10, 2009

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

2. Election of Class of ’39 Award for Excellence:
   a. Pat Smart, Provost’s Designee, and Bill Pennington were appointed to count the election ballots.
   b. Election of Class of ’39 Award was held by secret ballot.

3. Approval of Minutes: The Faculty Senate Minutes dated May October 6, 2009 were approved as distributed.

4. “Free Speech”: None

5. Special Order of the Day: George Smith, Associate Vice President of Student Affairs, provided the Senate with an update on parking visioning; and Gail Ring, Director of ePortfolio Program, provided information on the ePortfolio issue and shared portfolio successes.

6. Committee Reports:
   a. Senate Committees:
      2) Welfare Committee – Linda Li-Bleuel, Chair of the Welfare Committee, submitted and explained the October 20 and 27, 2009 Welfare Committee Report (Attachment).
      3) Scholastic Policies – Chair Vic Shelburne submitted Report dated October 20, 2009 (Attachment).
      4) Research Committee – Chair Lesley Temesvari submitted Report dated November 10, 2009 (Attachment). Senator Devora Perahia provided draft information regarding the hiring of post docs and the length of time it does to do so (Attachment).
      5) Policy Committee – Chair Jeremy King submitted and briefly explained the Report dated October 20, 2009 (Attachment).
b. Faculty Senate Select Committees –
   1) Compensation Advisory Group – President Bowerman stated that the Committee met on November 10, 2009 and shared information from that meeting with the Senate (Attachment). Cit – get hard copy of report

   2) Academic Lecturers Committee - Chair Bill Pennington stated that the Committee has met; shared the names of Committee members of the charge to it by Provost Dori Helms and Faculty Senate President Bowerman.

   3) Budget Accountability Committee – Chair Antonis Katsiyannis, Chair, submitted and explained the Report dated November 3, 2009 (Attachment).

c. University Commissions and Committees:

   7. President’s Report: President Bowerman noted that two important committees had been established and that Senate will receive reports from respective chairs and that the third, a committee on shared governance to be chaired by Immediate Past Faculty Senate President Bryan Simmons, will meet soon for the first time.

   He also noted that he continues to regularly meet with President Barker, the Student Body President, the Graduate Student Government President and the Staff Senate President.

   8. Old Business: None

   9. New Business:

   a. Selection of Two Representatives – Search Committee for Vice President for Research – President Bowerman noted explained the process to elect faculty to the Search Committee for the Vice President for Research to ensure compliance with the Faculty Manual (one from the three regulatory committees; one, from the Faculty Senate Research Committee). Senator Grubb moved that the Faculty Senate provide authority to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee to elect “regular faculty” members to maintain the faculty majority on this Search Committee and to further authorize the Executive Committee to vote electronically for this purpose, unless any member of the Executive Committee requests a meeting for this purpose. Motion was seconded and discussion was held. Nominees had been received from the regulatory committees, the Research Committee and from individual colleges except from the College of Engineering and Sciences (in which elections had been held). It was determined during discussion that the Senate would go ahead and vote on the individual college representatives and that the E&S vote would be taken as soon as the nomination period was terminated within that college. Vote to accept motion was held and was unanimously passed. (Nominations had been received prior to this Faculty Senate meeting from the regulatory committees and from the Chair of the Research Committee.)
10. **Announcements:**
   a. The next Executive/Advisory Committee meeting will be on November 24, 2009.

   b. President Bowerman stated that the next Faculty Senate meeting will be on December 8, 2009.

   c. An informal forum with Jan Murdoch on the ePortfolio will be held immediately following today’s Senate meeting. All are welcome to stay for and participate in the forum.

11. **Adjournment:** President Bowerman adjourned the meeting at 3:58 p.m.

   C. Alan Grubb, Secretary

   Cathy Tom Sturkie, Program Coordinator

Absent: G. Wang, C. Starkey (G. Tissera for), Y. An, S. Clarke (M. Martin for), X. Hu, R. Figliola (J. Meriwether for) P. Rangaraju, M. Futral (S. Dutkiewicz for)
FW: Proposed 2009 Principles of Parking

Senators – please see meredith’s message below - cts

From: Meredith Futral
Sent: Monday, November 02, 2009 4:45 PM
To: Cathy Sturkie; William Bowerman Iv
Subject: Proposed 2009 Principles of Parking

I am attaching the proposed 2009 Principles of Parking. These were discussed and voted on by the Parking Visioning Committee. George Smith will present these principles and answer questions at the November Senate meeting. I would like these to be sent out to the Faculty Senators. Comments and suggestions regarding these principles can be sent to Meredith Futral (mfutral@clemson.edu) or Wayne Sarasua (sarasua@clemson.edu).
I am attaching the proposed 2009 Principles of Parking. These were discussed and voted on by the Parking Visioning Committee. George Smith will present these principles and answer questions at the November Senate meeting. I would like these to be sent out to the Faculty Senators. Comments and suggestions regarding these principles can be sent to Meredith Futral (mfutral@clemson.edu) or Wayne Sarasua (sarasua@clemson.edu).

Meredith

Meredith Futral
Business Reference Librarian
Clemson University Libraries
R.M. Cooper Library
phone 864-656-6373
fax 864-656-7608
2009 Principles of Parking
S OF PARKING

Transportation system includes all mobility elements related to travel, including parking, transit, pedestrian movement and various travel modes.
Principle 2: The transportation system should be planned and managed to support broader University goals expressed in the campus master plan, goals for achieving a pedestrian friendly campus, campus housing objectives, promotion of healthy lifestyles and environmental sustainability.
PRINCIPLES OF PARKING

Principle 3:

The University should plan for a progressively lower parking ratio that is accomplished through parking demand reduction measures, but the University should provide sufficient parking capacity to meet the remaining demand if it is financially feasible.
PRINCIPLES OF PARKING

Principle 3, cont.

- Anticipating that campus land use priorities will result in the conversion of some existing surface parking areas to other uses over time, the University should take measures to progressively reduce the need to create new parking capacity through positive Transportation Demand Management (TDM) initiatives.

- Structured parking facilities can be considered as a way to increase parking capacity while minimizing land consumption, but should be considered as a last resort unless it is fully funded by the actual users through a combination of revenue streams generated by the specific facility such as permit fees, “pay per use” fees, or special events fees.
PRINCIPLES OF PARKING

Principle 4:

Walking, biking, riding transit, carpooling and other alternatives to single occupancy vehicle use should be encouraged.
Transportation Demand Management (TDM) should be developed as a key element of the University's transportation program as a way to reduce parking demand and support sustainability initiatives.

- The TDM program should focus on positive incentives, match - up, promotion of carpooling, vanpooling programs, facilitation of bicycle use and efficient transit service, that make alternatives to single occupancy vehicle use attractive, efficient and convenient.

- The TDM program should avoid the use of financial disincentives as a negative means to modify behavior.

The TDM program should be provided sufficient staffing and funding support to be effective.
PRINCIPLES OF PARKING

Principle 4, cont.

- The University should work with surrounding communities to develop safe walking and biking routes to the campus.
- Campus planning should include enhanced support for the safe use of alternative transportation modes on campus, engaging user groups as part of the planning process.
- Parking Services should educate students, staff, faculty, and visitors about campus transportation alternatives and safe intracampus travel.
- The University should seek to reduce unnecessary intracampus vehicular travel in order to provide a safer environment for cyclists and pedestrians.
PRINCIPLES OF PARKING

Principle 5:

The campus master planning process should anticipate, assess and plan for any impacts on parking sufficiency.

- Development plans that would increase parking demand or reduce net parking capacity should include a formal parking impact analysis.
PRINCIPLES OF PARKING

Principle 6:

Clemson should be guided by a parking philosophy that utilizes both “district” and “perimeter” strategies for the placement of parking.

- Priority should be given to faculty and staff in the allocation of core area parking but limited provisions may be made for teaching assistants and students with special service obligations.
University should take advantage of "shared parking" by increasing utilization of campus parking facilities and the level of demand after daytime class hours for general use. Areas can effectively serve multiple user groups.
PRINCIPLES OF PARKING

Principle 6, cont.

An assigned zone parking system can be considered as a way to:
increase the predictability of parking availability

- reduce interior traffic movement
- reduce pedestrian-vehicle conflicts
- reduce congestion
- minimize work schedule advantages

Management of an assigned zone system should ensure that parking is always available to assigned users, but take advantage of shared parking opportunities to achieve a high level of utilization.
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Introduction
In September, Provost Dori Helms issued workload guidelines and spreadsheet to all Clemson University department chairs for them to complete a workload analysis for each of their faculty. A copy of the workload guidelines and spreadsheet is attached. In summary, based on the provost’s guidelines, a full workload is expected to be composed of one research/scholarship block, three instructional blocks and one service block per semester.

The research/scholarship block consists of one of (or combination of) the following:
- Research grant(s) of significance resulting in peer-reviewed publications
- Scholarly output: at least two peer-reviewed publications or creative works of significance per year or demonstrable progress toward a major publication or creative work (i.e., juried performance or exhibit) that requires multiple semesters of work.

Each instructional block consists of a 3-4 credit course that supports an audience of at least 15 students requiring significant reading/grading or student written work or at least 30 students in didactic/lecture mode courses. Certain courses such as studio or seminar courses may merit a lower enrollment. A large total number of students taught (100+) may reduce the number of required instructional blocks unless 2 or more preparations are for the same course (i.e., sections of the same course).

The 5th block, or service block, signifies that all tenured faculty members are expected to serve the department, college or university. Examples include student advising, committee or commission member, faculty advisor to a student organization, or other such function. Service to the profession may substitute for university service.

Questions Raised by Faculty
After this went out, the Faculty Senate and subsequently, the Welfare Committee, received several emails from department chairs and faculty concerned about how and why the 4-blocks were being changed and the impact on “academic freedom”. Questions in these emails were raised concerning: how much latitude the provost has in setting workloads; whether or not the provost was in violation of the faculty manual; whether or not the current 4-block system in FAS would be replaced with this new 5-block system; the concern that the research block requires salary and fringe buyouts; the concern that the research loads would become part of a faculty’s regular salary and there would be little incentive to acquire more research contracts because faculty would be limited in what they could earn above their regular salary; faculty’s perception of an 25% workload increase; and having the administration determine the level of “significance” for research/scholarly activities being an infringement on academic freedom.
Research by Faculty Senate’s Welfare Committee

Based on the flood of emails received by Faculty Senate Bill Bowerman and forwarded to the Welfare Committee, the Welfare Committee was charged with looking for both a good understanding from Welfare Committee on what the implications of a change would be, if it would violate the manual, and who are the responsible administrators for workload. In other words, the Welfare Committee would study what the implications might be if the provost changes her policies based on the outcomes of her workload study, if those changed policies would affect the faculty manual, and who are the responsible administrators of workload. Therefore, the faculty manual was consulted and the findings are presented below as excerpts from the faculty manual.

Part VI – The University Administrative Structure

C. The Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost

“...the Provost has administrative jurisdiction over teaching and computing services. The Provost recommends to the President short- and long-range plans for academic development and formulates policies to implement approved plans; gives direction and guidance to the deans in the development and operation of academic programs, and to the directors of Admissions, Financial Aid, and Professional Development; coordinates the activities of the deans and those directors; counsels with college deans concerning faculty evaluation and reappointment of department chairs and school directors. As directed by the President, the Provost represents the university on matters relating to academic programs before the State’s Commission on Higher Education and its committees and before other state governmental bodies.”

E. The Deans of the College

“Among other duties, the deans represent the college in relations with other colleges of the university; ensure that faculty enjoy academic freedom and exercise academic responsibility; ensure that faculty peer evaluation, where appropriate, is part of the policies and procedures of all academic departments; review departmental recommendations for appointment, renewal, promotion, tenure, termination, and dismissal, and forward recommendations to the Provost; review the annual evaluation of each faculty member of the college; periodically review and evaluate the performances of the department chairs and school directors; monitor faculty workloads and schedules; etc...”

G. The Department Chairs

“Department Chairs are generally responsible for the activities of their departments, for which they are accountable to the school director and/or to the dean of the college. A department chair’s specific functions include: ensuring implementation of departmental policies and procedures involving peer evaluations; recommending faculty appointment, reappointment, tenure, promotion, termination, and dismissal; negotiating with prospective faculty; and supervising the department’s program of instruction, including curriculum, scheduling, faculty workload, and departmental research and public service; etc.”

Part IX – Professional Practice

B. Workload

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

In response to rumors and faculty concerns, Provost Helms released by email a short video communiqué to all faculty regarding the purpose of the workload study and how it was to be used to determine resource allocation within the university. The link to the video is http://www.clemson.edu/administration/provost/workload-video.html

Conclusion
Based on what is written in the faculty manual, the provost is within bounds to conduct any type of study she desires because she has to recommend to the President short- and long-range plans for academic development and formulate policies to implement approved plans. She also has to present matters relating to academic programs to the Board of Trustees, the State’s Commission on Higher Education and other state governmental bodies.

Furthermore, her video message clearly communicated how the work study would be used, which was clearly within the stated guidelines of the faculty manual of her role and responsibility as Provost. In the video, she clearly stated that she was not changing the structure of the Faculty Activity System; that the workload study would not be used as a performance measure; and that the faculty workload was not being increased by 25%. What she said was that the 5-block format enabled faculty to more clearly report their research and service activities.

If the provost wants to make the 5-block study an assessment of faculty’s performance and basis for tenure and promotion, then the Faculty Senate will have to intervene as the provost cannot set workload policies. According to the faculty manual, only the department chair can supervise the department’s program of instruction, including curriculum, scheduling, faculty workload, and departmental research and public service. Also, with so many different departments engaged at different levels in teaching, research and service, how can the provost expect everyone to fit one model? For example, there are departments that are more heavily engaged in teaching and service-learning projects than research because of very little research money in their particular industry. Likewise, some departments are heavily engaged in research and struggle to meet their teaching commitments. However, in actuality, there are many faculty struggling to do all three areas equally and becoming overloaded in the process, resulting in a poor work-life balance. The purpose of the workload study should be to make the provost aware of this; not to be an unfair performance measurement stick.
Workload Guidelines for Faculty

Workload guidelines have been developed to help Clemson University achieve its strategic objectives and maintain a level of national competitiveness that allows us to attract and retain the best faculty and students. Workload guidelines are also needed to assure work-life balance for Clemson faculty, to provide accountability to the State of South Carolina, to ensure the proper balance of activities leading to tenure and promotion, and to eliminate ambiguity about job requirements.

**Tenured Faculty**

All tenured faculty members are expected to follow a *four-block* workload model. Each block is equivalent to the amount of work required to teach a standard class (the time it takes to prepare, present, grade, advise/mentor). In addition, all tenured faculty members, as citizens of the University, are expected to engage in service functions that support the work of the institution at the department, college or university level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block 1</th>
<th>Block 2</th>
<th>Block 3</th>
<th>Block 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research/Scholarship</td>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>Instruction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Block 5
Service

A full workload is expected to be composed of one research/scholarship block per semester and three instructional blocks, or their equivalent, per semester.

A research/scholarship block consists of one of (or an appropriate combination of) the following:

- Research grant(s) of significance* for the discipline: grant work should result in peer-reviewed publications
- Scholarly output: at least two peer reviewed publications or creative works of significance* per year or demonstrable progress toward a major publication or creative work (e.g. juried performance or exhibit) that requires multiple semesters of work.

*The level of significance for research/scholarly output is defined by the Department Chair and Dean for each discipline.

All tenured faculty members are expected to engage in research and scholarship. If this expectation is not met, the research/scholarship block becomes a fourth instructional/equivalent block. A faculty
member cannot be promoted to the rank of professor without an acceptable level (as judged by his/her peers) of research/scholarship.

An instructional block consists of the following:

- A 3 or 4 credit course that supports an audience of at least 15 students for courses requiring significant reading/grading or student written work or at least 30 students in didactic/lecture mode courses. Certain courses such as studio or seminar courses may merit a lower enrollment. A large total number of students taught (eg: 100 or more) may reduce the number of required instructional blocks unless two or more preparations are for the same course (eg: sections of the same course).

If fewer than three instructional blocks are requested during goal setting as part of the four-block model, then “equivalents” for the instructional blocks must be approved by the Department Chair.

Equivalents for an instructional block may consist of one or more of the following:

- **Additional research:** If additional blocks are assigned for research, at least 15% of the investigator’s academic year salary/fringe per semester OR a year’s graduate stipend + tuition or post doctoral fellowship should be paid by external funds for the first additional block. The investigator should also be working with a minimum of 2 MS/PhD students (in departments with graduate programs.) For the second additional block, 30% of the investigator’s academic year salary/fringe per semester or 15% salary/fringe per semester AND a year’s graduate stipend + tuition or post doctoral fellowship should be paid by external funds. The investigator should be working with a minimum of 2 additional MS/PhD students. For all four blocks to be assigned to research will require 100% of the investigator’s academic year salary/fringe to be paid by external sources. If additional blocks are assigned to research without the required funding, the Department Chair may approve the assignment of the block if specific outcomes are identified and evaluated. Peer reviewed publications and graduate student mentoring/graduation are an expected component of this activity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block 1</th>
<th>Block 2</th>
<th>Block 3</th>
<th>Block 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;G Funded Research/Scholarship</td>
<td>Externally Funded (per semester) 15% salary/fringe OR graduate student stipend + tuition or post doctoral fellowship</td>
<td>Externally Funded (per semester) 30% salary/fringe OR 15% salary/fringe AND graduate student stipend + tuition or post doctoral fellowship</td>
<td>Externally Funded 100% salary/fringe AND graduate student stipend + tuition or post doctoral fellowship</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block 5</th>
<th>Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
• **Additional scholarship**: Scholarly output, judged as significant and in excess of that defined by the research/scholarship block may substitute for an instructional block. This may also include significant collaboration and teamwork that results in a major interdisciplinary proposal or project. Extensive proposal writing by a single investigator may be assigned to a block. If proposal writing does not result in funding within a reasonable time, or major projects are not completed, the Department Chair will not continue to assign the additional block.

• **Graduate student mentoring**: Major professor for at least 4 PhD or 6 MS (or combination) graduate students actively engaged in research and thesis/dissertation writing. This number may vary depending on the mixture of pre and post-qualifying students and should be monitored by the Department Chair. This number would be in addition to the baseline of 2 MS/PhD graduate students for a research block.

• **Alternative teaching**: Undergraduate research (3-5 students, 3-4 cr. per student) working on individual honors or research investigations; significant activity in leading multiple creative inquiry teams of 5-8 undergraduate students; study abroad course/program leader; extension assignments that involve significant presentation activities; significant course development activities. These activities, based on fewer numbers of students or less activity, may also serve as a partial block to balance instructional blocks that have inadequate numbers of students or activity levels to qualify as a complete block.

• **Service/Administration**: Significant service to the profession (eg: elected official of a major national organization or editor of a leading journal) or a significant administrative role (eg: graduate coordinator for >50 students, Associate Dean/Department Chair,) or significant University-level service role (eg: President of Faculty Senate, IRB chair, IACUC chair, Grievance Board chair) may substitute for an instructional block if approved by the Department Chair and Dean. Activities should be for no more than three years unless approved by the Dean.

**University/College/Department Service (the “fifth block”)**

All tenured faculty members are expected to serve the department, college or university. Examples include student advising, committee or commission member, faculty advisor to a student organization, or other such function. Service to the profession may substitute for university service.

**Tenure-track Faculty**

All tenure-track faculty members are expected to follow a **four-block** workload model. Each block is equivalent to the amount of work required to teach a standard class (the time it takes to prepare, present, grade, advise/mentor.) Significant department, college or university service is not required during the first two years of employment unless requested and approved by the Department Chair.

During years one through three, two blocks of the workload model are usually assigned to instruction, and two blocks are be assigned to research/scholarship unless otherwise directed by the Department Chair. If approved by the Department Chair and Dean, instructional expectations may be reduced to one course per semester by the following preparation equivalents:
**Research activity:** Submission of multiple grant proposals (number expected will vary by discipline); laboratory set-up and graduate student recruitment; establishing collaborations that result in proposal or publication submission or creative works.

**Scholarly output:** At least four publication submissions per year of significance (peer reviewed) or demonstrable progress toward a major publication or creative work that requires multiple semesters of work.

For a reduced instructional load to extend beyond the first two years of employment, specific outcomes should be identified and evaluated each semester.

A thorough pre-tenure review should be conducted before the beginning of year 4 (based on performance from years 1-3). During years 4-6, the guidelines for tenured faculty apply (see above). Reductions in teaching load may be negotiated, with approval of the Department Chair and Dean, during years 4-6 based on research, extension or scholarly activity required for a positive tenure review.

**Lecturers**

All lecturers are expected to teach (or perform work equivalent to) four courses per semester with a total audience of approximately 80-120 students for courses requiring significant reading/grading or student written work or a total of approximately 120-200 students in didactic/lecture mode courses. Significant increases in the total number of students taught may reduce the number of courses required unless two or more preparations are for the same course (i.e., sections of the same course). A significant service or administrative assignment may substitute for an instructional block if approved by the Department Chair. A fifth block may be filled with an instructional overload if approved by the Department Chair and Dean. If a fifth block is to be filled with a significant service or administrative assignment, the Department Chair and Dean must approve.

**Library Faculty**

The Library Faculty workload is broadly defined in the *Professional Effectiveness* category of the **Guidelines for Appointment, Tenure and Promotion General Criteria**, rather than by the teaching of formal courses.

More specifically, the position description outlines the expectations in the faculty member's area of library specialization. The position description delineates 75% of the workload as the equivalent to a 3-3 course load. The remaining 25% (or 1 block) of the appointment will be accomplished through a combination of research and scholarship, as delineated in the **Guidelines, General Criteria**. Expected levels of activity are further delineated in the document, **Statement of Understanding about the Annual Review Process** approved by the Library Faculty, Fall 2008.
PSA Faculty

Block assignments for PSA faculty are based on % research or extension appointments. Each block of the workload model is equivalent to 25% research or extension with an expectation that all E&G/PSA faculty members will teach at least one course per semester. If an appointment is 100% PSA research, then release from teaching must be approved by the VP for PSA. In addition, all PSA faculty members, as citizens of the University, are expected to engage in at least one service function that supports the work of the institution at the department, college or university level.

Salary is linked to the E&G and PSA blocks. For example, if a tenured faculty member is 50% PSA and 50% E&G, then when research on a specific PSA project is no longer being pursued, the faculty member will receive only the E&G component of the total salary unless transferred to another priority PSA project. Additional instructional blocks, or E&G research/scholarship blocks can be substituted for the PSA blocks if approved by the Department Chair and Dean of the college. Criteria for research/scholarship blocks are the same as those described above.

PSA Statement on Teaching

"PSA recognizes the value of the diverse expertise held by faculty funded for Experiment Station research or Extension specialist work and believes that is is a resource that should be available for undergraduate and graduate teaching. PSA faculty teaching assignments can provide the academic units with a valuable resource without full-FTE commitments and provide the faculty members with an opportunity to share their expertise and application-based knowledge with the students.

PSA-funded faculty are expected to teach at the graduate and undergraduate level within their areas of expertise. Teaching can be in the form of guest lectures, Maymesters, members of teaching teams, or as a traditional structured course instructors. Release time from PSA-funded program work to accommodate teaching time should be requested from PSA administration by the department chair. Guest lectures and teaching activities that require small percentages of a faculty member’s time will be considered as components of professional development and will not require adjustments of funding sources. Teaching assignments that require significant and regular release time, such as teaching a 3-credit course every year, represent changes in appointment and require appropriate adjustments in funding source."

For extension specialist positions, workloads should be developed around topic(s) focused into blocks. For example, a 50% extension appointment will be responsible for multiple blocks of extension program delivery. Each block will be defined by:

- Topic name
- Educational goal
- Audience
- Educational delivery method
- Scholarly communication output
- Fund development
- Performance measures

Examples:
An administrative appointment such as program leader with programmatic responsibility for county agents distributed across South Carolina will constitute one block.

A specialist responsible for conducting row crop variety trials and delivering the results and planting recommendations to various across the state would receive credit in one or more blocks.

A specialist responsible for developing a comprehensive technical guide and revising it each year, such as the *Agriculture Chemical Handbook*, would receive credit for one or more blocks.
Task 1: Compensation Report Study (Lead: Clarke)

Senator Clarke will meet with Institutional Assessment to discuss changes to the Annual Compensation Report.

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

The University Budget Accountability Committee has a meeting scheduled for 11/03/2009. Report will be provided.

Task 3: Compensation Strategy (Lead: Simon)

This task force continued its discussions about compensation.

Discussion on compensation strategy is focusing on three issues: (1) quantitative assessment; (2) institutional structure; and (3) the role of high achievers.

1. Quantitative Assessment
   “Anyone can count, but not everyone can read.” More precisely, it is easy to devise numerical benchmarks in terms of any output measure, be it teaching, research, or grants. More difficult is the problem of making useful comparisons based on quality and then applying this across disciplines (although difficulties are also present even within a field). One key is to develop valid and realistic benchmarks of comparison, likely at the Department or first-line level. Assessment should be applied with academic, administrative, service, and center focuses.

2. Institutional Structure
   Aloysius Siow has written on the impact that institutional structure can have on University performance. Flattening of the performance-pay relationship, by reducing the rewards to scholarship, leads to reduced University performance.

3. Superstars
   Sherwin Rosen considered the problem of setting optimum compensation in markets in which there is a winner-take-all aspect to performance (e.g., best musician, best athletes, and so on). The result is that the differences in rewards to individuals may appear to be larger than their actual differences in productivity.

New Business

A faculty representative on the Athletics Council has asked the Committee to consider making inquiries related to the royalty revenue relationship for University trademarks. The Committee is reviewing this information.

Currently, all royalty and athletic event income bookkeeping is handled by Athletic Department with revenues split based on an apparently verbal 1981 agreement between Athletic Department (McClellan) and University (Atchley) whereby the University general account receives only $0.07/$1, regardless of which trademarks are involved or how the athletic revenue was generated. Many of the 17 University trademarks do not bear relation to athletics. In comparison he observes two metrics, the University percentage taken from intellectual property sales and the University indirect cost percentage taken on awarded contracts, are substantially larger than the 7% fee charged on Athletic Department income or generated from royalties. The representative will meet with the Committee at its next meeting to discuss. Clay Steadman, University General Counsel, has also been contacted.
Recent Issues

- Subbing
  Cindy Pury has brought attention to some subbing issues in her department which probably affect the entire faculty. She will come to the next Welfare Committee Meeting on Nov. 17. We also plan to invite someone yet to be determined from HR to help us understand the leave policies. In a phone call on Oct. 19, Cindy and I touched on the following matters:
  - Possible flexible subbing policy in the Faculty Manual?
  - Maternity leave issues with new faculty member—she was given the choice of teaching or taking leave w/o pay
    - New faculty member had a 2/2 load, chair combined 2 sections into 1, counted that as 2; Cindy taught this class for her
    - Do chairs have to be able to work the system in order to let faculty take paid maternity leave?
    - Is it fair that faculty who have built up enough sick leave are able to pay for maternity leave, but faculty who have not (e.g. Elizabeth Rivlin, Heidi Zinzow) have to take unpaid leave?
    - Are we punishing faculty for choosing to have children early in their career?
  - Taking turns as sub during the course of a semester—is that fair to students?
    - If several instructors are needed to complete a term, how do evaluations work?
  - Pervasive culture to NOT take leave when needed—faculty afraid to take needed leave because of lack of procedure
  - If faculty agree to sub, should they be compensated by load reduction in the future? Or monetarily? Should we set a policy on that?
  - Some kind of policy/procedure? one for planned leave, such as maternity, one for sudden leave—accident or sickness?

- Phase-out Retirement
I spoke with Erik Flemming from HR. He will also discuss the details of the 3-year-Phase-Out-Retirement plan with the Welfare Committee on Nov. 17. The following matters, amongst others, will hopefully be discussed:

- Pros and cons of the 3-year-phase out
- Impact of retirement benefit and retiree insurance as well as eligibility

- **Child Care**
  
  **Lead:** Linda Li-Bleuel and Michelle Martin
  
  I have been trying to schedule an appointment with Provost Helms since Sept. 14 but have not been able to secure a meeting. The last email correspondence with Brenda Smith was on Oct. 14, and I was told again that Provost Helms would not be able to see me in the near future because she is inundated with many other pressing meetings. I am in the process of trying to see someone in the development office, but I still need Provost Helms’ approval. I emailed Provost Helms asking for permission on Oct. 20 and awaiting a response.

- **Work Loads**
  
  **Lead:** Chris Piper
  
  Please see handout on work block issue.

- **Professional Travel**
  
  **Lead:** Wayne Stewart
  
  Scott Pigeon is planning to move on with the idea of an optional travel credit card, and a website to make the procedure or systems easier, or more user-friendly to arrange travel.
At the recent meeting of the Council of Undergraduate Studies, Jeff Appling proposed a revision to the Undergraduate Academic Integrity Policy. The most controversial revision was the addition of the statement which makes submitting work from a previous or concurrent course an academic integrity violation unless the instructor consents to allow a student to do this. Actual statement in question is Number 2 below.

B. Academic dishonesty is further defined as:

1. Giving, receiving, or using unauthorized aid on any academic work;

2. Submitting work that has been turned in for credit for a previous or concurrent course without consent of the instructor.

3. Plagiarism, which includes the intentional or unintentional copying of language, structure, or ideas of another and attributing the work to one’s own efforts;

4. Attempts to copy, edit, or delete computer files that belong to another person or use of computer accounts that belong to another person without the permission of the file owner or account owner;

At the Undergraduate Council meeting, it was noted that any changes would have to go to the Scholastic Policies Committee anyway and since there was not a consensus at the Undergraduate Council, that body voted to send it to Scholastic Policies for a recommendation. This committee debated the issue and decided that the members would not support this addition to the Academic Integrity Policy for now. The committee recommends that this issue should be addressed at the
level of the syllabus and not the Undergraduate Catalogue. Specifically, every course syllabus should state whether or not it is allowable for a student to turn an assignment for the course if it has been used in a previous or concurrent course. If not allowable, then the penalty for that violation should be spelled out. Jeff Appling said he would make sure that this change in course syllabus content is highlighted in upcoming semesters. The committee’s basic logic in setting the policy at the syllabus level is that there is a lot of controversy on the ethics of “self-plagiarizing” and to automatically raise this to the level of an Academic Integrity violation may create more problems. Other minor edits in the revised Academic Integrity Policy were suggested to and accepted by Dr. Appling. At the next Undergraduate Council meeting, Shelburne will report the committee’s recommendation.

**Topic 2 - Winter Semester**  
Lead: [Goddard]

Goddard who is also on the University Academic Calendar Planning Committee asked the committee members’ overall opinion on whether they would support the concept of a Winter semester even if it meant delaying the beginning of the Spring semester up to two weeks and thereby delaying the end of the semester and graduation likewise. The committee approved the concept but would like to know more details (faculty required to teach? Extra pay? Etc.) before it approved any final plan. Basically the committee thought the concept of a “winter-mester” might be worthy of exploration.

**Topic 3 - International Transfer Credits**  
Lead: [Shelburne]

Shelburne reported that he had received some negative feedback from one faculty member in the College of AAH about the new Study Abroad Form (“Request for Approval of Work to be taken Abroad” (http://www.clemson.edu/ia/forms/coursework_approval_form.pdf)) specifically because it states that the European Credit Transfer System conversion will be used. Shelburne noted that Clemson must accept that conversion if that European University has agreed to that conversion already—it is not an option for Clemson whether or not to use the conversion. The only other issue is whether the form is to be used for grad students for grad courses. This came up at the Faculty Senate meeting on Oct 6. We assume so but we will get clarification and report back.

**Topic 4 - Course drop/withdrawal date (2nd date) time change to later date**  
Lead: [Goddard]

Goddard sits on the sub-committee to make a recommendation for this issue and our committee had no problem with a recommendation to move the withdrawal date back by up to two weeks even if it impinged on next semester’s registration. Degree Progress Reports may not show these late withdrawals but we did not believe that that would be a problem since the student could just report to the advisor that he/she dropped the course.
**Topic 5 - Make Fall Break a permanent date in October—not a November date in election years**

Lead: [Goddard]

This is being reviewed by the University Calendar committee and this committee strongly favors this idea.

**Topic 6 - General Education**

Lead: All

React to Gen Ed proposals as needed.

*None—no progress since no proposals received*

**Topic 7 - Lab Fees—concern on how they are distributed within and among colleges and within the University as a whole.**

Lead: [Brittain]

Brittain shared three documents as follows:

1. Lab fee allocation (http://www.clemson.edu/cfo/budgets/policy_manual/policies/lab_fee.html) and attached at the end of these minutes;

2. Student Fees Procedure—how lab and any student fees are actually determined;

3. A letter to the deans and the Provost with these questions:

   How the lab fees are allocated (at the college level) and what rules govern how the money is spent. Are there written policies guiding the distribution of lab fees and their use? What fraction of the lab fees are returned to the departments?

The main issue is the retention of 50% of the lab fees by the Provost office and its reallocation. Most faculty believe that the lab fees should go back only to those departments which generate them and on a dollar-for-dollar basis. Holding the fees for large equipment needs over many years would make sense if it went to those departments that generated them but allocation seems to be on an annual basis anyway. The committee agreed to send the letter to the Deans and Provost and based on those responses, make recommendations.

**Topic 8 - Course Redemption Policy**

Lead: [Horton]

Review Course Redemption policy and make recommendation to allow a grade of C or lower to be redeemed (D and F only in present policy).
Horton checked over the summer with Abby Daniel (Student Govt. President) about Student interest in this topic. She replied that she did have an interest in the course redemption policy for a grade of C since many students thought it was unfair that you could redeem a D or F but not a C especially with the Scholarship minimum GPA pressure. She did recommend that the number of redeemable hours NOT be changed (presently 10) so to prevent overuse or abuse of the policy. The committee concurs with Abby and proposes a change to that effect.

Shelburne asked Horton to edit the language in the Undergraduate Announcements. His edit adds the grade of 'C' in the language as follows. The committee members also reviewed the last sentence and decided it was not needed so we recommended its deletion.

Academic Redemption Policy original wording:

The Academic Redemption Policy (ARP) allows a student enrolled before August 2007 to repeat up to nine hours of coursework in which a D or F was earned if he/she has sufficient W hours remaining. Students whose initial enrollment occurs August 2007 or later may redeem up to ten credit hours. In all cases, the grade earned in the course used to redeem the earlier course will be used in computing the grade-point ratio and satisfying degree requirements. When the earlier grade is D and the second grade is F, the student cannot use the D grade to satisfy any degree requirement.

Academic Redemption Policy proposed wording:

The Academic Redemption Policy (ARP) allows a student enrolled before August 2007 to repeat up to nine hours of coursework in which a C, D or F was earned if he/she has sufficient W hours remaining. Students whose initial enrollment occurs August 2007 or later may redeem up to ten credit hours. In all cases, the grade earned in the course used to redeem the earlier course will be used in computing the grade-point ratio and satisfying degree requirements.

The committee’s rationale for allowing a C to be redeemed is that many students are under a lot of pressure to maintain State scholarship support by maintaining a B average. Although there are only 10 credit hours available, used judiciously, the ability to redeem a C may make a difference to a few students. Also, there is the undocumented but suspected situation whereby students may knowingly perform poorly at the end of the semester because by scoring a D or F, these grades allow them to redeem the grade whereas a C will not.

**Topic 9 - Availability of Comments on Student Evaluation of Instructors for Chairs**

The original wording and revision of this Faculty Manual change (see Sept. Minutes) were sent to the Policy Committee but a discussion (via e-mail) with Debbie Jackson on the Freedom of Information Act indicated that we needed to talk to others in the administration (either Clay Steadman or Renee Roux) about this issue. Also, Wickes Westcott indicated to Shelburne by e-mail that there have been a few changes in the Evaluation on-line application and we probably ought to discuss those changes first before we come up with the final rewording. Shelburne
therefore rescinded the revision from the Policy and we will invite some of the aforementioned people to our next meeting in November.

*Topic 10 – Request from Student Affairs (from Gail DiSabatino to Jan Murdock and Bill Bowerman) to have a representative on the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee, the Academic Integrity Committee, Calhoun Honors Committee and the Academic Eligibility Committee.*

We discussed this briefly but did not have a hard copy for everyone. The general consensus was not to add member from Student Affairs but perhaps allow as *ex-officio* members. We will discuss again in November when everyone can read the official request.

Meeting adjourned at 3:20.

Appendix:

Lab Fee Allocation:
http://www.clemson.edu/cfo/budgets/policy_manual/policies/lab_fee.html

Lab fees increased from $25 to $50 in the prior fiscal year, 2001-02. Lab fees were allocated on a lag basis, i.e. assigned to July 1, 2002 budget for the prior summer, fall and spring at the $25 rate.

There are two issues to address in the 2002-03 allocations:

1. The Provost requested and the administration approved retention of one-half the lab fees collected to centrally address laboratory upfit across the colleges and
2. Expeditiously provide funds to both the Provost and the colleges from the new lab fee structure effective with the fall 2002 semester. This new structure establishes a minimum lab fee of $75 with other, more costly lab sections at $100, $150, and $200.

The proposal to address these issues involves switching to a “real time” allocation of lab fees, i.e. provide funds to the Provost and colleges in the same year as these fees are collected. This brings the benefit of the new fee structure into the current year rather than on a lag basis. There will be three allocations during the year to accomplish this:

1. **Fall Allocation:** Gather data on fees collected in the second summer session and the fall semester by the end of October. One-half this amount will be set-aside for the Provost. The remaining half will constitute the college funds. When the distribution is made, one-half of the amount in each college’s base (from the old $25 rate) will be deducted and the remainder allocated.
2. **Spring Allocation:** Around the end of February, lab fee data will be collected for the spring semester and allocated in the same manner as the fall, giving half to the Provost and the remainder to the college less the remaining half in your base from the old rate.
3. Final Allocation: In mid-June, a final allocation will be made using data from Maymester and first session to the Provost for one-half and the colleges one-half. The Budget Office will make these allocations to the holding accounts of the Budget Centers. Budget Center Representatives are responsible for any distribution of lab fee revenues to individual departments.
Faculty Senate Research Committee
Lesly Temesvari, Chair
Dvora Perahia, Vice-Chair
November 10, 2009

GAD
Lead: Lesly Temesvari
Nothing to report at this time.

Policy on Consulting
Lead: Paul Dawson
Nothing to report at this time

Post-doctoral hiring and Internal Competitions
Lead: Dvora Perahia

Dvora Perahia will describe these activities.
Temp/Temp Grant
Unclassified Flowchart

Legend
CUHR = Clemson University Human Resources
Class & Comp = Classification and Compensation

COES HR Budget Center receives request and commitment form from Department to set up Temp/Temp Grant position

Budget Center sends JEF and commitment form to Provost for approval
Temporary without benefits

Budget Center creates job evaluation form (JEF)
Temp Grant with Benefits

Budget Center forwards JEF to HR for position to be set up

CUHR e-mails position number to Budget Center

If Dept is advertising position
Dept sends Background Consent form to CUHR. Budget Center submits requisition and creates Waiver to be forwarded to Access & Equity. Budget Center starts offer package.

When Waiver and Background check are approved, Budget Center will send offer package
NOTE: Salary form not needed because Provost does not need to approve and because name and salary amount are included on the JEF.

If Dept has candidate for position
Dept sends Background Consent form to CUHR. Budget Center submits requisition and creates Waiver to be forwarded to Access & Equity and starts offer package.

When Waiver and Background check is approved, Budget Center will send offer package
NOTE: Salary form not needed because Provost does not need to approve and because name and salary amount are included on the JEF.

Budget Center sends Request to Hire to Access & Equity, Request to Recruit with salary portion completed, along with copy of commitment form to Provost for approval. Offer package started by Budget Center.

When Request to Hire and Background check is approved, Budget Center will send offer package.
Facility Senate Policy Committee Report

20 October 2009 Meeting

Committee members present: Denise Anderson, Scott Dutkiewicz, Jeremy King, Jane Lindle, Hong Luo

Special guests: Fran Mcguire, Pat Smart, Cathy Sturkie

Respectfully submitted by: Jeremy King

1. The committee heard an update from Senator Anderson concerning representation on the Graduate Council for those interdisciplinary programs housed within the Graduate School. The update precipitated a wide-ranging discussion on the need for such representation, how such a representative would be selected, on what graduate committee(s) such a representative would serve, the wisdom of the current state of affairs where such ID program curriculum matters go directly to the University Graduate Curriculum Committee, and even promotion and tenure for faculty in such ID programs.

Disposition: Given the diversity of issues raised in these discussions, the committee decided to proceed as follows: a) to seek input on the representation, selection, committee affiliation, and curriculum committee issues from the Graduate Advisory Committee, and b) to refocus and first answer the basic question that brought this issue before the policy committee—is there a genuine need for ID program representation on the Graduate Council, or does some form of (possibly indirect) de facto representation already exist? The Policy Committee will issue an invitation to Bonnie Holaday to attend our November meeting to provide input and answer questions concerning (b).

2. In response to a query made by a Department Chair to Faculty Manual Editor Fran McGuire, the committee discussed a possible change to Part IV, Section E-3 of the Faculty Manual concerning annual faculty evaluation. The proposed change would have added language in the manual recognizing: (a) the right of a faculty member to file a second response to a Chair's response to that faculty member's initial response to the Chair's annual evaluation; and (b) the right of a faculty member to file a second response to a Dean's response to that faculty member's initial response to the Dean's evaluation. Both of these secondary responses are indicated in the flowchart of the annual evaluation process shown in Appendix F of the Faculty Manual. The committee also discussed time periods for faculty and Dean responses that are not present in the Faculty Manual text and/or Appendix F.

Disposition: The policy committee recognized the need for the proposed changes to the Faculty Manual text. However, there appear to be difficult timing issues if the rejoinder/response process runs its full length (2-3 months). If the Provost's canonical mid-to-late September deadline for annual evaluations is to be maintained, evaluations would have to be initially received and reviewed in the summer; this may present difficulties for 9-month faculty. If the Provost's canonical deadline is pushed back to allow for a 2-3 month response/rejoinder process after a faculty member receives a Chair evaluation around August 15, then merit-based salary increases would be delayed. Senators Lindle and Dutkiewicz will consider possible resolutions to these issues and the production of a clearer and more informative flow chart for Appendix F.
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(Select One):
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The December 2009 Faculty Senate Meeting was canceled