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1. **Call to Order:** President Charles H. Gooding recognized guests and called the meeting to order at 2:32 p.m. A get well card was circulated for signatures for our friend, colleague and former senator, Chuck Linnell.

2. **Approval of Minutes:** The Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting dated December 11, 2007 were approved as distributed.

3. **“Free Speech”:** None

4. **Special Orders of the Day:** Angie Leidinger, Governmental Affairs, informed the Senate of overall legislative/governmental relations and provided information regarding two separate budgets (PSA and E&G) (Attachment A); Clemson’s advocacy groups; implementation of state-wide and federal lobbying efforts and the strategic plan.

Tracy Arwood, Director of Research Compliance, noted that the Office of Research has prepared a revised Research Ethics Policy, which will come to the Faculty Senate Policy Committee and, eventually, to the full Senate for approval. The revised policy reflects regulations for misconduct for investigation and inquiry aspects and will bring Clemson into federal compliance. Input has been provided by the NSF inspector and general counsel.

Lucy Rollin, Chair of the Emeritus College Advisory Committee, presented information regarding the Emeritus College which included goals, beginning efforts, organization, general operations, teaching/scholarship/research efforts, University and community service, communications and the future of the College.

5. a. **Senate Committees:**

1) **Welfare Committee** - Chair Bill Bowerman submitted and explained Report dated December 13, 2007 (Attachment B).

2) **Scholastic Policies Committee** - Chair Antonis Katsiyannis submitted and explained the Committee Report dated December 4, 2007 (Attachment C) and stated that there would be an item under New Business.
10. **Adjournment**: 4:18 p.m.

Deborah Thomason, Secretary

Cathy Toth Sturkie, Program Assistant

South Carolina’s agricultural producers are facing many difficulties from the pressures of production, market forces and climate conditions. Clemson Public Service scientists provide the research and technology transfer needed to help producers and policy decision-makers face these challenges and prepare for the future.

Our five-year plan calls for building clusters of expertise in research and technology transfer to enhance the state’s agribusiness sector, support the rural economy, and protect natural resources, particularly water quality and quantity.

**To better serve South Carolina, Clemson PSA is asking for continued state support in 2008-2009:**

- **$2.5 million Agriculture & Natural Resources**
  - Continue to build expertise in production agriculture and natural resources

- **$2.0 million Biofuels Research**
  - Develop novel technology to support a biofuels industry cluster in South Carolina

- **$2.0 million Animal Health /Biomedical Research**
  - Support the state’s animal agriculture industry and the developing biomedical industry

- **$1.2 million Remote Environmental Sensing**
  - Collect real-time data for more informed environmental policy decision-making

**Recurring Budget Requests**

**Agriculture & Natural Resources** $2.5 million

Agriculture and forestry represent the state’s second largest industry and the most critical components of the rural economy. Critical hires of research scientists and Extension agents throughout the state will enhance support for crop production, precision agriculture, forage-fed beef production, and natural resources conservation, particularly forest systems management and stormwater management.

**Biofuels Research** $2.0 million

Producing fuels from agricultural crops and timber provides an alternative to imported oil, a value-added crop for growers, and a growth industry for rural communities. A cluster of research scientists in bioprocess engineering, molecular biology, and materials handling will support development of new technologies to build a biofuels industry in the state.

**Animal Health & Biomedical Research** $2.0 million

Animal agriculture is a leading sector of South Carolina agriculture, producing almost $1 billion in cash receipts. Human biomedicine is closely linked with animal biology and represents a growing segment in the state. A cluster of research scientists in biomedicine, infectious disease pathology, genetics and reproduction, and metabolic biotechnology can provide the expertise needed to support these industries and to improve both animal and human health.

**Remote Environmental Sensing** $1.2 million

As the state faces increasing demands on natural resources due to a growing population and a prolonged drought, research is needed to provide the most current information possible to environmental policy decision-makers. A cluster of scientists in ecology, natural resources, Geographic Information Systems (GIS), and database analysis will collect, analyze and share environmental data that can be used to develop best management practices for watersheds, farms, forests and coastal areas to enhance economic growth.

**Capital Improvement Requests**

**Farm Animal Research Center** $13.0 million

Upgrade and centralize animal farms that are 30 years or older; ensure state-of-the-art facilities for teaching, research, and extension; and meet all accreditation standards.

**Cellulosic Bio-ethanol Pilot Plant** $12.0 million

Build a pilot-scale facility to support the development and rapid commercialization of new technology for producing biofuels from agricultural crops and timber.

**Bioprocessing Facility** $32.0 million

Build a pilot-scale bioprocessing facility to support new biotechnology industries and produce compounds for use in agriculture, chemicals, textiles, materials and pharmaceuticals.

**Biosafety Level III Diagnostic Laboratory** $5.0 million

Expand facilities at the veterinary diagnostic laboratory in Columbia to meet highest level biosafety certification requirements needed to isolate infectious diseases, such as avian influenza.

**Advanced Plant Technology Laboratory** $7.0 million

Install laboratory facilities at Pee Dee Research & Education Center to genetically modify agricultural plants to enhance crop production and to produce novel proteins for use by biotechnology industries.
Clemson University is undergoing a transformation into a nationally ranked research university by focusing on academic quality; research that drives economic development; recruiting outstanding faculty, staff and students; and providing students with an exceptional academic experience.

To continue its progress toward being one of the nation's top public universities Clemson must continue to partner with the State of South Carolina.

Our highest priority is financial stability; therefore, our first request is for increased base funding. The South Carolina General Assembly has shown a commitment to investing for the future and that investment has helped Clemson continue to make progress toward our goal of becoming one of the nation's top-ranked universities, reaching US News & World Report's Top 30 (#27) in 2007. Increased base funding is critical to making this goal a reality.

Our second request is for faculty and staff to be included in compensation increases for state employees since a university is only as good as its people. As Clemson maintains its commitment to excellence, our staff will continue to play a key role in reaching the University's goals. State funding for increases in cost-of-living and health care costs is essential for Clemson to fulfill its mission and commitment to South Carolina.

Our third request is for funding for the following specific initiatives to foster economic development and support Clemson's academic goals to continue our mission as a land-grant university.

Recurring Budget Requests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiative</th>
<th>Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Road Map</td>
<td>$4.8 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster Faculty Initiative</td>
<td>$4.2 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Academic Road Map

Investing in these categories – faculty, start-ups and operating support, and graduate assistantships – will help Clemson remain competitive and ultimately prepare graduates for success in the global economy.

Cluster Faculty Initiative

Strategic cluster hires within niche areas of Clemson’s eight emphasis areas will add to the brain trust driving economic development. Faculty members hired in clusters (e.g. Bioengineering, Advanced Materials) are more successful in obtaining federal grants, patents and developing start-up companies and are more likely to stay at their universities, enhancing the investments made at the time of hiring.

University System

Technology Infrastructure $4.0 million

Acquire and maintain a critical IT infrastructure capable of supporting everything from classroom instruction to student services (libraries, registration) to business and financial operations university-wide.

Clemson University International Center for Automotive Research (CU-ICAR) $1.5 million

Provide funding and support for the CU-ICAR Partnership Office, which serves as the business development and operational hub of that campus.

Clemson University Restoration Institute (CURI) $3.0 million

Create, develop and foster restoration industries and environmentally sustainable technologies while developing a knowledge-based export-oriented industry cluster in the Lowcountry, positioning South Carolina as the premier home of restoration knowledge and expertise.

SC Light Rail $1.5 million

The SC Light Rail will provide a premier network as a collaborative project to interconnect universities, research institutions, and research partners to enhance collaboration in support of instruction, research and public service.

Campus Safety $1.0 million

Clemson seeks to make strategic enhancements to augment its Fire, EMS and Police departments. The university also plans to implement E-911, Text-Messaging, and a Voice-Activated Siren System.

Capital Improvement Requests

Information Technology Center $25.0 million

Construct a new IT lab in order to allow faculty, students and researchers to take advantage of new information technology resources in a centralized campus location.

Hunter Chemistry Building $30.0 million

Construct a 90,000 square-foot research wing to support the Chemistry department's quest to offer nationally recognized research and teaching programs.

Air Quality & Deferred Maintenance $10.0 million

Upgrade air quality and exhaust systems and improve building safety and utility infrastructure across the Clemson campus.
Monthly Report

The Faculty Senate Welfare Committee held its monthly meeting on December 14, 2007 at the Esso Club. Senators Li-Bleuel, Futral, White, and Bowerman attended. Also in attendance was Dr. Smart. We only had 2 agenda items which are covered below. Our next meeting is scheduled for January 15th, 2-3:30 pm, 113 Lehotsky Hall.

Top 20 Goal-Top 20 Compensation

Bill Bowerman meet with Lawrence Nichols on the December 13th to discuss this priority. Mr. Nichols has also been assigned by the President to review and compare our benefits with the same 32 universities that our committee has been using. Mr. Nichols has a deadline of the end of December to report to the President with his initial assessment. He shared his preliminary work with our committee. We shared our preliminary work with him and our list of benefits that we had identified. Mr. Nichols will complete his assignment for the President, and then attend the next Welfare Committee meeting in January. We are going to combine our efforts, determine what we need to do to complete this report, and put together a joint report for the Senate, the President, and the Board of Trustees, with a delivery date of the March Faculty Senate meeting.

University Ombudsman

A policy from the Office of Access and Equity relating to a university policy of reporting of discrimination and harassment, and the role of the Ombudsman’s Office was discussed. We will invite Dr. Halfacre, one of the university attorneys, and someone from the Office of Access and Equity to our January meeting to discuss this issue.
FACULTY SENATE SCHOLASTIC POLICIES COMMITTEE
MONTHLY MEETING MINUTES

VIC SHELBURNE, ACTING CHAIR (A. KATSIYANNIS away on trip)

December 4, 2007 (420 Tillman Hall)

Senators Girgis, Willoughby, Winchell and Shelbume were in attendance.

Guests: Ronnie Chrestman (Institutional Research), Jeff Appling (Associate Dean Undergraduate Studies) and Stan Smith (Registrar)

1. Attendance Policy: Dr. Shelburne noted the latest version of the Attendance Policy that Dr. Appling had reviewed with General Counsel, Dean of Students and Redfern (pending). He also noted that at the last Faculty Senate Advisory/Exec Committee meeting there was some concern about a policy that might reduce a faculty member’s discretion in attendance. Specifically, Senator Willoughby still had reservations about only allowing participatory classes (labs, field experiences, etc.) to have a failing grade based on attendance but not lecture courses. After discussion, it was decided to leave the following sentences:

   Absence from class is detrimental to the learning process, so instructors may use reasonable academic penalties which reflect the importance of work missed because of unexcused absences. Instructors that penalize students for unexcused absences must specify attendance requirements as related to grading in the course syllabus and must keep accurate attendance records.

And delete the following sentence:

   Penalties resulting in a failing grade for a course based on “absences alone” may be used for “participatory” courses such as labs, field experiences, and leisure classes.

The effect of this change is to allow the faculty member reasonable discretion in using attendance as a sole criteria regardless of the course’s venue (lecture or otherwise).

Also, Senator Winchell took exception to the following sentence:

   Make-up examinations will be scheduled at a time and place mutually agreeable to both instructor and student.

Her thought was that while make-up work was certainly an agreeable method, it need not necessarily be an exam and likewise not always mutually agreeable. She suggested just removing the sentence and the committee likewise agreed.

Dr. Appling noted that even with these changes, the new proposed policy was much improved over the current policy and he appreciated the Senate’s review and input.
Senator Shelburne also suggested that the generic term instructor (although correct) could be misinterpreted since it is a rank and suggested that the term Faculty or Faculty member be used instead depending on the context.

The Attendance Policy with changes is attached to these minutes.

2. Grade Inflation-Since the last Committee meeting, Mr. Smith had provided copies of the 1996 Master’s Thesis which attempted to determine whether grade inflation had occurred at Clemson between 1974 and 1994. The committee was interested in reviewing this study and making a decision whether another 10 year study (1996-2006) might be in order since the cumulative GPA has risen from 2.73 to 2.99. Shelburne noted that the earlier study concluded that there was no grade inflation at Clemson between 1974 and 1994 because of rising SATs and other factors. Since 1996, SAT scores have continued to rise, there is more pressure on students for better grades due to the State scholarship program, the redemption policy has gone into effect, and some math and chemistry courses have become more restrictive for entering freshman (not allowed to enroll unless they meet more demanding criteria—these last two influences were suggested by Mr. Smith). Other factors were discussed also. Mr. Smith also noted however, that more students were graduating with honors (over half) indicating again that we either have grade inflation or other factors at work.

Mr. Chrestman noted that for the most part the data are available and the Office of Institutional Research would work with anyone who would want to look into the issue. Senator Shelburne noted that the Master's thesis approach seemed to work well in 1996 and that same methodology might be explored for the last 10 years. The committee concurred and recommends to the Senate that a new study be carried out employing Masters students in math. If approved by the Senate, we encourage the Faculty Senate President to work with the Provost and Undergraduate Dean to find a source of funds to support this project in the Math department.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Charles H. Gooding  
   Faculty Senate President  
FROM: James F. Barker, FAIA  
       President  
SUBJECT: Memorandum dated December 4, 2007  
DATE: January 2, 2008

In response to your memorandum of December 4, 2007, Provost Helms and I are in agreement with the following actions.

1. Clemson's 2007-2008 Guidelines and Procedures for Admission of Athletes will be submitted for review prior to the next scheduled NCAA inspection of our athletic procedures, policies and practices.

2. It is always in Clemson's best interest to have a wide range of participation in complex matters such as the admission of student athletes. Representatives of the Faculty Senate, the Athletic Council and the Faculty Athletic Representative will be asked to participate in this discussion.

Thank you for your recommendations on this important subject.

cc: Dori Helms, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs  
Jan Murdoch, Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Studies  
Larry LaForge, Faculty Athletic Representative  
Janie Hodge, President of the Athletic Council  
Terry Don Phillips, Athletic Director

JFB/stm
Faculty Senate President's Report
C. H. Gooding
January 8, 2008

We are in the final 100 days of the 51st Faculty Senate of Clemson University. We have started a lot of things, and now it is time to bring some of them to completion. I want to thank each of you for your efforts last semester, and ask that you be diligent and efficient in your committee work this semester as we try to bring about positive changes.

Today, I especially want to thank Lead Senators Robert Campbell, Meredith Futral, John Meriwether, Vic Shelburne, Deborah Willoughby, and Donna Winchell for coordinating the examination of Tenure, Promotion, and Reappointment Guidelines in each college. And thanks are due to Fran McGuire for getting this work started by providing an analysis of Faculty Manual requirements with respect to TPR matters. The Senators from each college generated a report on the guidelines used by each department within their purview. I am pleased to say that no departments were found to be in blatant violation of Faculty Manual requirements, but there are details, communication issues, and other matters that need further attention. I will point out some of these today, not for immediate debate, but for your consideration of what further action might be needed.

1. Paragraph IVD of the Faculty Manual contains some stipulations about the composition of the peer evaluation committee, but it does not say how the membership of the committee is to be determined. In a few departments, the members are appointed by the department chair, which strikes me as being inconsistent with the concept of having a peer evaluation that is separate from administrative review. Should we change the Faculty Manual to state that members of the peer evaluation committee must be elected or otherwise designated by their non-administrative peers or by the departmental bylaws?

2. Paragraph IVD also describes the recommendations of the peer evaluation committee and the department chair as being "separate and independent." This phrase has been the subject of previous Senate debate but not consensus. It is interpreted in various ways in different departments. The polar opposite positions would seem to be:

   a. There is absolutely no communication or collaboration between the TPR committee and the department chair before their separate recommendations are submitted to the Dean. They might even use separate sources for input other than the portfolio submitted by the candidate.

   b. The TPR committee and department chair meet together and work together using the same sources of information to arrive at a consensus before writing their individual summaries.

These are the extremes, and they are, of course, incompatible. Are there requirements closer to a middle ground that we can agree on and insert in the Faculty Manual? The Policy Committee has one recommendation under consideration now, but other strokes of brilliance would certainly be welcome.
3. Paragraph IVD now states that “appointment with immediate tenure, or with probationary periods of two years or less, or immediate appointment to a rank higher than assistant professor must be reviewed in accordance with the department’s regular tenure promotion peer review process.” There are frequent rumors of these provisions being violated by administrative fiat or at least being rushed through under coercive circumstances. If the Faculty Manual provision is violated and contested, remedy could involve reneging on a commitment already made to a new hire – a situation that could be disastrous to the university and to the individual involved. Even if there are no blatant violations, coercive situations often contribute to bad decisions and hostile environments. Are there effective checks and balances that the Senate can implement to avoid the problems cited while still allowing the university to make timely hiring decisions?

4. Donna Winchell provided a very helpful check list for examining the TPR guidelines. Using this, some teams of Senators noted numerous cases in which guidelines stated in the Faculty Manual are not repeated explicitly in the departmental bylaws or TPR guidelines. An example is the Faculty Manual provision that “the chair will also ensure that the affected faculty member is promptly informed in writing as to the results of and rationale for both recommendations...” This raises a question we should consider. While it might be desirable for departmental documents to spell out details of procedures, is it necessary, given the facts that (a) the Faculty Manual has precedence over departmental procedures and bylaws if there are discrepancies, and (b) the Faculty Manual is readily available to everyone on-line?

One approach was recommended by Vic Shelburne and his colleagues in CAFLS.

“It is not surprising that the 10 departments vary so much not only in their presentation of TPR Guidelines but also the methodology for TPR. That is because as departments developed these guidelines, they probably did not use a common template. Ideally, a template with all the Faculty Manual requirements should be created and the Departments could then just add their own requirements (election of members, specific department procedures and expectations by rank) as they see fit. This separate TPR Guidelines document should then be placed on the departmental website along with Departmental Bylaws. This would certainly assist candidates for TPR who must navigate through a rather complicated process.”

Should the Faculty Senate develop such a template, distribute it to each department, and urge each faculty to modify and adopt it? Or rather than trying to get every department to change its bylaws and guidelines, would we be better served by just trying to ensure that everyone is familiar with, keeps handy, and uses the Faculty Manual?

5. Finally, Robert Campbell from BBS raised another issue.

“Many of the current guidelines carry some sort of disclaimer to the effect that reappointment decisions are made on a different basis from tenure decisions, and
tenure cannot be expected on the basis of a series of positive recommendations for reappointment.” [and Robert cites the following example from one department’s guidelines]:

*The standards recognize that performance expectations and reappointment, promotion, and tenure standards may change over time. Thus, decisions made in one year are not necessarily precedents for decisions made in subsequent years.*

[Robert suggests] “Any such disclaimer is inconsistent with the current stress on making criteria for tenure clear to incoming junior faculty and holding to the stated criteria when evaluating those faculty members for tenure 6 years later. Nor are such disclaimers in accord with the venerable management guideline that there should be “no surprises” when adverse evaluations are forthcoming.”

Do we need to confront implications that a moving target is OK, or should we simply interpret statements like to one cited above as meaning that a positive letter in one or more years is no guarantee of a positive tenure decision?

These issues need to be debated further, most likely in the Policy Committee, but I want to ask each of you to ponder the questions and provide feedback to me in writing if you have opinions you want to express. Also, I would like to ask the Lead Senators to look over your reports again and decide if there are individual issues in your college that you think merit a conversation with the department chair or faculty of a particular department. If so, please let me know about these and give me your recommendation as to how we might proceed most effectively in each case.
Undergraduate Course Attendance Policy

The academic resources of Clemson University are provided for the intellectual growth and development of students. Class attendance is critical to the educational process; therefore students should attend scheduled courses regularly if they are to attain their academic goals.

In the event of an emergency the student should make direct contact with the faculty member if possible, preferably before a class or an exam takes place. Students should speak with their faculty members regarding any scheduled absence as soon as possible and develop a plan for any make-up work. It is the student’s responsibility to secure documentation of emergencies, if required.

Faculty must implement fair grading procedures and provide an opportunity to make up missed assignments and examinations that does not unfairly penalize the student when an excused absence is accepted. Such make-up work shall be at the same level of difficulty with the missed assignment or examination. Faculty shall hold all students with excused absences to the same standard for making up missed assignments or examinations. While faculty should seek to make reasonable accommodation for a student involved in university-sponsored activities, students should understand that not every course can accommodate absences and that absences do not lessen the need to meet all course objectives.

Absence from class is detrimental to the learning process, so faculty may use reasonable academic penalties which reflect the importance of work missed because of unexcused absences. Faculty who penalize students for unexcused absences must specify attendance requirements as related to grading in the course syllabus and must keep accurate attendance records. Faculty are obligated to honor exceptions to the university attendance policy for students covered by the Americans with Disabilities Act, as verified through paperwork issued by Student Disability Services.

Enrollment: Only students who are officially registered and have paid appropriate fees may attend classes. Students have the responsibility to insure that drop/add transactions are completed in a timely manner. Registered students that cease attending class will be assigned a failing grade.

All students are required to attend the first scheduled day of classes and labs. Students who cannot attend the first class are responsible for contacting the faculty to indicate their intent to remain in that class. If a student does not attend the first class meeting or contact the faculty member by the second meeting or the last day to add, whichever comes first, the faculty member has the option of dropping that student from the roll. Students must not assume that faculty are obligated to drop them if they fail to attend the first few days of class.

Anticipated Absences: Students should use the Notification of Absence module in MyCLE to notify the faculty member. This communication is only for information and does not verify the student’s reason for absence or impact the faculty member’s evaluation of the student’s academic work. The student must make personal contact with the faculty member as soon as possible.

If a student realizes in the first two weeks of classes that an anticipated number of absences will exceed the number of excused absences permitted in the course, the student should discuss the situation with the faculty member, the student’s adviser, and/or the academic Associate Dean in the college in which the student is enrolled. A suitable resolution should be reached before the end of the second week of the semester.

Students are encouraged to inform faculty of known conflicts as soon as possible, but no later than one week before the date of any assignment or exam.

Unanticipated Absences: Students should use the Notification of Absence module in MyCLE to notify the faculty member. If the student is unable to contact faculty members, the student (or representative) should contact the Office of the Dean of Students who will notify the faculty members of the circumstances, providing a liaison in cases limited by medical confidentiality. A student may be excused from attending class in cases of emergency or other compelling reasons deemed appropriate by the student’s faculty. Excuses for emergency absences must be reported to the faculty member as soon as possible (for example through email), but not more than one week after the return to class. In certain cases, the Dean of Undergraduate Studies (or designee) may provide a letter verifying the student’s absence as excused. Faculty are expected to excuse absences for reasons including:
1. Injury or illness too severe or contagious for the student to attend class, when certified by an attending physician. Physicians and staff at Redfern Health Center do not provide written excuses, however students should retain paperwork of medical visits affirming date and time. Whenever possible, students should visit Redfern as an outpatient without missing class. An absence for a non-acute medical service does not constitute an excused absence. Faculty may, at their discretion, require documentation of medical absences.

2. Death, serious illness, or emergency in a student’s immediate family (faculty may require documentation). Immediate family may include: parent or step-parent, sibling or step-sibling, grandparent or step-grandparent, spouse, child or step-child, spouse’s parents or step-parents, spouse’s grandparents or step-grandparents, legal dependent, legal guardian, and others as deemed appropriate by the faculty member.

3. Participation in authorized University-sponsored activities, not including practice activities. These activities can include field trips, athletic team competitions, judging team competitions, debate team competitions, professional conferences, musical performances, departmental trips, ROTC functions, and mandatory admission interviews for graduate or professional school. Faculty may require documentation from the faculty or staff advisor of the sponsored University group.

4. Required participation in military obligations as certified by the student’s commanding officer.

In the event of a local, regional or national crisis or emergency as recognized by Clemson University (e.g., pandemic, hurricane, other dangerous weather conditions, etc.), students missing classes may not be charged with unexcused absences if the Provost (or designee) has issued a notice that students are excused from class due to that crisis or emergency.

Appeals: Students may appeal, in writing, a faculty member’s decision not to excuse an absence to the academic Associate Dean of the academic unit offering the course. Before taking action, the Associate Dean should request that the faculty member explain his or her denial in writing. Any student who feels that a grade has been affected by a legitimate absence that a faculty did not excuse may appeal the grade through the Academic Grievance process.
MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE
FEBRUARY 12, 2008

1. **Call to Order:** President Charles H. Gooding recognized guests and called the meeting to order at 2:30 p.m. Matt Watkins, Annual Giving Office, noted that the ideas for the faculty and staff appeals have been incorporated with the brochure that will be distributed shortly.

2. **Approval of Minutes:** The Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting dated January 8, 2008 were approved as distributed.

3. **"Free Speech":** Eleanor Hare, Professor Emerita, spoke to the Senate about her concerns regarding the Emeritus College (Attachment A). A question and answer period followed.

4. **Slate of Officers:** President Gooding submitted the slate of officers:
   - **Vice President/President:** Bill Bowerman (AFLS) and Kelly Smith (AAH)
   - **Secretary:** Linda Howe (HEHD) and Linda Li-Bleuel (AAH)

Nominations from the floor were sought and none were received. Nominations were closed. Each candidate for office provided the Senate with their statement of interest.

5. a. **Senate Committees:**

   1) **Welfare Committee** – Chair Bill Bowerman submitted and explained Report dated January 15, 2008 (Attachment B).

   2) **Scholastic Policies Committee** - Chair Antonis Katsiyannis noted the Committee met on January 15, 2008 and detailed what transpired during this meeting (see Report dated January 15, 2008 (Attachment C). A new issue to be addressed by this Committee is graduate student final exams.

   3) **Research Committee** – Chair Christina Wells stated that the next meeting will be tomorrow, February 13, 2008 at 4:00 p.m. See Committee Report dated February 12, 2008 (Attachment D).

   4) **Policy Committee** - Chair Bill Surver submitted and explained Committee Report dated January 29, 2008 (Attachment E) and noted that two items will appear under New Business.
5) Finance Committee – No report.

b. Faculty Senate Select Committees: President Gooding briefly the status of each of the Select Committees noting that each will complete their specific business and report to the Senate at the March or April meeting. He will also make recommendations to President-Elect as to the continuance of these select committees.

c. Other University Committee/Commissions: None

d. Grievance Activity Reports – Senator Des Layne, newly-appointed Grievance Board Chair, thanked new Grievance Board members and other senators who have been members of the Board for their service on this important procedure for faculty. He then presented and reviewed the Grievance Categories I and II Activity Reports from January, 2007 – January, 2008 (Attachment F).


7. Old Business: None

8. New Business:

a. Senator Surver submitted and explained the proposed Faculty Manual change regarding Emeritus Organization Membership, noting that the Executive/Advisory Committee had unanimously approved the proposed change. Much discussion followed. Call to Question was called and seconded. Vote to stop debate was taken and passed with required two-thirds vote. Vote on original motion to approved proposed change to Faculty Manual was taken and passed with required two-thirds vote (Attachment H).

b. Senator Surver submitted and Fran McGuire explained the proposed Faculty Manual change regarding the Clarification of Promotion, Tenure, Reappointment Recommendation by Department Chairs. Much discussion followed. Call to Question was called and seconded. Vote on Call was taken and did not pass so discussion continued. Call to Question was again called and seconded and passed. Vote was then taken on proposed change to the Manual and passed (Attachment I).

9. Announcements:

a. The Provost announced that the department chairs will have a retreat on March 5 to discuss goal setting regarding faculty reviews, including teaching and collaboration. She urged senators to be sure faculty are involved in discussions within respective departments because changes will be made to various pieces of departmental bylaws.

b. Deadline for the Alan Schaffer Faculty Senate Service Award is February 15th. Nominations should be sent to the Faculty Senate Office, Strom Thurmond Institute.
c. The CU-ICAR February Faculty Forum will be held on February 29, 2008 in the Auditorium of the Strom Thurmond Institute. Senators were encouraged to help publicize this event.

d. Senator Surver stated that he attended the Alcohol Summit and noted that President Barker considered this to be a most significant meeting. He asked that any suggestions from senators be forwarded to him.

e. Annual Spring Reception will be held on April 8, 2008 – invitations forthcoming.

f. Next Faculty Senate Meeting – March 11, 2008.

10. Adjournment: 4:22 p.m.

Deborah Thomason, Secretary

Cathy Toth Sturkie, Program Assistant

Absent: V. Shelburne (J. Wang for), Y. An, S. Clarke (J. Field for), B. Simmons, E. Weisenmiller, M. Smotherman (D. Warner for), D. Thomason
Notes for Free Speech

Hello. My name is Eleanor Hare. I am a former Senator, now retired, and a member of the Emeritus College.

Today the Policy Committee will bring a motion to remove the reference to the Emeritus College from the Faculty Manual.

I am here to ask you to refrain from removing the Emeritus College from the Faculty Manual until you have fully examined the consequences of that action.

I became aware of the conflict between the Faculty Manual description of the membership and the membership provisions of the Emeritus College bylaws when a retired faculty member asked, “Why was I not invited to the October meeting of the Emeritus College?” This retiree had been previously invited to Emeritus College functions. Several retirees got together and asked me to bring this issue to the Faculty Senate.

As stated, the first issue is the conflict with the Faculty Manual, which says that membership in an emeritus organization is open to all retired faculty and professional staff. The emeritus organization cited is the Emeritus College. The Emeritus College bylaws restrict regular membership to those who have the emeritus title. The Director may recommend other individuals to the Board for “special membership.” And, if the Board approves, these other individuals may be granted special membership, but can neither vote nor hold office.

This change should be reviewed by both the Welfare and Policy Committees.

As this question was being discussed, other concerns were raised.

The Emeritus College is a cost center. It has an office, a director, and staff. It reports to the Provost. It operates on E&G money. It’s members are faculty. The goals of the Emeritus College include “supporting Clemson’s teaching, research and outreach missions.” These functions are the purview of the Faculty. The role of this college in providing such services should be on terms acceptable to the Faculty, as reviewed by the Faculty Senate.

Thus, the Senate has a legitimate continuing interest and the Emeritus College belongs in the Faculty Manual.

Another concern is faculty governance.

The Constitution of the Faculty of Clemson University provides that “The Faculty shall conduct all parliamentary procedure in accordance with the most recent edition of Robert’s Rules of Order.” The bylaws of the Emeritus College must concur with those of the parent organization. So these bylaws must be based on the democratic model of organization, which means that the members govern.

The bylaws of the Emeritus College remove the possibility of the members governing. For example, neither the Board nor the Director should be able to rescind any action taken by the general membership. Yet, the Emeritus College bylaws allow either the Director or the Board to veto amendments to the bylaws.
Another conflict involves the nominating committee. The director should not select or be a member of the nominating committee. But, in the bylaws of the Emeritus College the Director IS the nominating committee. The Director is also the secretary and the treasurer.

In the Emeritus College bylaws, the Director, and only the Director, can call a business meeting. The members cannot nominate and cannot vote on anything except amending the bylaws, on which they can be overruled. In short, the membership has no input into anything.

There is another question about bylaws. That is, was their adoption legal?

According to the Faculty Manual, all retired faculty and professional staff should have been eligible to vote on the bylaws, but, as best we can determine, these eligible retirees did not receive copies of the proposed bylaws and were not invited to the meeting where the bylaws were approved. We know of some retired faculty (who do not have the emeritus title) who had been invited to previous Emeritus College functions, but were suddenly excluded, beginning with the luncheon meeting where the bylaws were approved. This meeting, by the way, began at 10:00 a.m. with coffee, pastries, displays, and checking our email addresses. It included a luncheon with a speaker, where spouses and other guests were included. Adoption of the bylaws was tacked on at the end of the luncheon and proper procedure, which requires the reading and approval, section by section, was not followed. These are serious violations and should be examined by both the Policy and Welfare Committees.

All current faculty will eventually retire. The bylaws of this organization are a legitimate concern of the faculty through the Senate Welfare Committee.

To summarize, the concerns raised here are:

1. The membership provisions in the bylaws conflict with the Faculty Manual.
2. The Emeritus College is a cost center, having a staff, and using E&G money, and is, therefore, a concern of the Senate.
3. The Emeritus College bylaws violate principles of democratic self governance adopted by the Faculty of Clemson University.
4. The bylaws should be voided because correct mechanics were not followed and the people who should have been voting on the bylaws were not all there.
5. And, remember, someday each of you will be eligible to be a member or this organization.

In closing, we ask you to initiate a serious, and in depth, study of the concerns raised here before removing the Emeritus College from the Faculty Manual.
Monthly Report

The Faculty Senate Welfare Committee held its monthly meeting on January 15, 2008 at 2:00 in Room 113 Lehorts Hall. Senators Li-Bleuel, Futral, White, An, Edwards and Bowerman attended. Also in attendance were Pat Smart, Clay Steadman, Byron Wiley, Gordon Halfacre, Beth Kunkel, Dan Schmiedt, Dave Crockett, and Tim Drake. We report here on the activities of our committee over the past month. Each report is authored by the Lead Senator for that issue.


We invited Clay Steadman, University Counsel, Byron Wiley, Office of Access and Equity, and Gordon Halfacre, University Ombudsman, to meet with the Welfare Committee. Dan Schmiedt, Dave Crockett, and Tim Drake of the Staff Senate were also invited and attended the meeting. The Ombudsman Oversight Committee, chaired by Beth Kunkel, met and had identified issues between the new Clemson University Policy requiring University Officials to report all cases of harassment and/or discrimination to the Office of Access and Equity, that were reported to them. The Standards of Professional Practice require Ombudsman to maintain strict confidentiality of all discussions/correspondence between a client and an Ombudsman, with the exception of a situation where immediate harm would occur. The Oversight Committee, which includes members from both Faculty Senate and Staff Senate, felt that the policy could undermine the effectiveness of the Ombudsman Office. We brought together representatives from the University Counsel’s Office, Office of Access and Equity, and Ombudsman Office to try to resolve this issue. There are legal issues related to simply exempting the Ombudsman from this policy. These are primarily related to harassment. The final outcome of the discussion was to have Gordon find out how other universities deal with this issue and report back to Clay. Then further discussion on how to resolve this issue would begin. We have assigned Frances Edwards of our committee to follow this issue.

Top 20 Goal-Top 20 Compensation  Lead: William Bowerman

Mr. Lawrence Nichols attended our meeting to share with the committee the results of his work on delineating benefits among our list of 32 public universities. Welfare Committee members are to go through his information, and make suggestions on the next step to the process.

Issues Related to Child Care  Lead: Linda Li-Bleuel

Continuing to monitor progress on Child Care. This issue is now one of the priority issues for President Barker. Dr. Pat Smart, who was recently interviewed in the *Daily Messenger*, states the child care center is “going to be a premier center that’s going to have learning objectives with a specific valid curriculum.” Dr. Smart has been working with the early childhood development
people from within the university to make sure they support the curriculum. Clemson University is currently working with Bright Horizons, a company that specializes in establishing child care centers at universities. Target date is still August 2008.

For more information see the following website:

Issues Related to Campus Parking   Lead: Meredith Futral

I have been in contact with Geary Robinson regarding follow-up of the Parking and Transportation Master Plan Final Report. Geary met with Clemson administrators, including Brett Dalton, within the past few weeks. These meetings occurred in order to help develop a budget/pro forma proposal. Once a budget/pro forma proposal is developed, Geary will share it with the Faculty Senate and the Welfare Committee.

Issues Related to Spousal Hires   Lead: Curtis White

Continuing to work with Pat Smart to monitor this issue.

Additional Items

Those present at the Faculty Senate meeting in January were quite generous. They contributed $308 to Chuck Lindell.

The call for nominations for the Alan Schafer Faculty Senate Service Award is going out soon. Cathy Sturkie will send out the call next week.
FACULTY SENATE SCHOLASTIC POLICIES COMMITTEE
MONTHLY MEETING MINUTES
ANTONIS KATSIYANNIS, CHAIR
January 15, 2008 (420 Tillman Hall)

Present: Senators Smith, Willoughby, and Katsiyannis were in attendance
Guests: Jan Murdoch (Associate Provost and Dean of Undergraduate studies) and Stan Smith
(Registrar)

"Length" of final exam
Present wording-Final examinations must be given or due on the dates and at the times
designated in the final examination schedule, except in laboratory and one-credit-hour courses
where the final exam will be given at the last class meeting. (p. 24 in undergraduate Announcements)

The committee recommends that students be allowed to use the entire time allowed for the exam
(Should the issue of on-line courses be further explored?)

Integrity Policy -Undergraduate
Dean Murdoch indicated that the Policy committee and the faculty senate approved the change
regarding the composition of the committee (to allow for tenure-track faculty)...unfortunately
change did not occur in the faculty manual

Integrity Policy-Graduate.
The committee recommends that the Graduate integrity Policy be reviewed by the Scholastic
Policies Committee and the faculty senate. Dr. Felder will be invited to present the policy.
Similarities/differences with the Undergraduate policy will be examined (for the undergraduate
integrity policy visit pages 28 & 29 at
For the graduate integrity policy visit pages 27-30 at

Classroom civility
The committee recommends that a draft general statement be developed by the student senate
(with input from the faculty senate, undergraduate council...) to be included in the undergraduate
announcements. Dean Murdoch will communicate this request to the Student Senate
The next Research Committee meeting will be held on Wednesday February 13 at 4:00 PM in D-136 Poole.

Status of Current Projects

1. Handbook for new research faculty

   Angela Rogers’ English class has completed work on a handbook for new research faculty. Their work can be viewed at http://people.clemson.edu/~angelar/faculty/home.htm. The Research Committee is editing and fact-checking the document. We would like to distribute it to all new faculty and we welcome ideas for the most efficient means of distribution.

2. COMPETES Act

   We have drafted a memo alerting faculty to the grant-related implications of the federal COMPETES Act. Dr. Gallicchio will be reviewing the memo this week prior to its distribution to faculty.

3. Investigation related to Dr. Beck’s free speech to the Senate

   Interviews with relevant faculty members, department heads and IACUC members will be concluded by the end of the month.

4. Barriers to Research Productivity

   We are working with the Jim Self Center to design and administer a short survey to Clemson faculty on barriers to research productivity.

5. Rising Fringe costs on pre-existing grants

   This is a new item of business. A number of investigators have complained that increased fringe rates are being applied to pre-existing grants, effectively reducing funds originally budgeted for student support and purchases. We are meeting with a representative of the Office of Sponsored programs to discuss the problem. Drs. Turnbull (ESPS) and McNealy (Biological Sciences) have offered to assist with fact-finding.

6. Completed/Tabled issues: faculty manual changes proposed by Tracy Arwood (done), larger RGC grants (done), chairs’ control of faculty member grant funds (tabled).
COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Chair: Bill Surver (surverw); Tom Boland (tboland); Alan Grubb (agrub); Des Layne (dlayne); Catalina Marinescu (dcm); Brad Meyer (mbradle); Lydia Schleifer (schleif)

Report From the January 15 Meeting

1. After considerable discussion and numerous e-mails from Emeriti Faculty, the Policy Committee recommends the following:

1. The Faculty Senate should not be involved in the writing of the By-Laws and Policies of the Emeritus College. The same would apply to any campus organization.

2. All Faculty Manual references for Emeriti Faculty remain as they are unless specific recommendations for changes come to the Faculty Senate.

3. The Faculty Senate, through its representative to the Emeritus College, will be assured that there are no conflicts between the rights and privileges granted Emeriti Faculty in the Faculty Manual and the By-Laws of the Emeriti College.

4. Any reference to the Emeriti College be removed from the Faculty Manual. One exception might be a reference that the Emeriti College is available as an organization for Emeriti Faculty.

2. Review of Clemson’s new Research Ethics Policy

The Policy Committee reviewed the proposed changes to Clemson’s Research Ethics Policy and has many concerns regarding major changes to this Policy. Tracy Arwood has been invited and will attend the February meeting of the Committee to address these concerns.
3. Proposed Faculty Manual Change

Proposed change in the Faculty Manual: Part IV Section D (page IV-3 and IV-4)

Current Wording:

The department chair shall ensure that any faculty member eligible for renewal of appointment, tenure, or promotion is given an opportunity to be reviewed. The appropriate committee reviews each case in accordance with departmental procedures and policies, and renders a written recommendation. The department chair does not participate in the deliberations of the committee, but does issue a separate and independent recommendation as to the disposition of the case after receiving the recommendations of the committee. The chair shall provide the committee charged with peer review with a copy of the recommendation. The chair shall also ensure that the affected faculty member is promptly informed in writing as to the results of and rationale for both recommendations, and the faculty member may elect to include a letter of response in the materials forwarded to the dean. In cases of promotion or early tenure consideration, the candidate may withdraw from further consideration at this point.

Proposed Wording:

The department chair shall ensure that any faculty member eligible for renewal of appointment, tenure, or promotion is given an opportunity to be reviewed. The appropriate committee reviews each case in accordance with departmental procedures and policies, and renders a written recommendation. The department chair does not participate in the deliberations of the committee, but may, upon request of the committee, serve as a resource for the committee. In addition, the committee may, upon request of the chair, serve as a resource for the chair. The chair and the committee issue separate recommendations, free from coercion and...
interference from any parties. The department chair and the committee shall provide each other with a copy of their recommendation once both have been completed. The chair shall ensure that the affected faculty member is promptly informed in writing as to the results of and rationale for both recommendations, and the faculty member may elect to include a letter of response in the materials forwarded to the dean. In cases of promotion or early tenure consideration, the candidate may withdraw from further consideration at this point.

Rationale:
The use of "independent" continues to cause problems in interpretation. Therefore removing the word "independent" and replacing it with the reason for desiring independence in the recommendations of the chair and the committee clarifies the intent of this section of the Manual.

4. What is the Faculty Manual?

The Policy Committee has begun a discussion on the Faculty Manual as a governance document. The impetus for this discussion has come from several places. It is apparent that some departments are in violation of the Faculty Manual when establishing TPR guidelines. Does the Faculty Manual take precedence when in conflict with University Committees? What role should the Faculty Senate have in the establishment of University Committees and changes to their membership?
CLEMSON UNIVERSITY GRIEVANCE BOARD
GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE ACTIVITY

GRIEVANCE I PROCEDURE PETITIONS

<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>

AAH AAFS BBS E&S HEHD LIBRARY
Clemson University Grievance Board
Grievance Procedure Activity

Category II Petitions

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

Grievance Activity by College

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>AAH</th>
<th>AFLS</th>
<th>BBS</th>
<th>E&amp;S</th>
<th>HEHD</th>
<th>Library</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Faculty Senate President’s Report  
C. H. Gooding  
February 12, 2008

I would like to comment briefly on several issues, including some that received attention at last week’s meeting of the Board of Trustees in Columbia.

The President, the Provost, and others have been quite busy developing a new 5-year plan for the university. Draft versions of the plan have been vetted before several groups, including the Faculty Senate Executive and Advisory Committees and the Board of Trustees. I think the vast majority of faculty will be pleased with this plan, which makes frequent use of words such as quality, relevance, purpose, core values, balance, and sustainability. I know this teaser actually tells you little about the details, but it is all I can offer until the administration is ready to roll it out. However, I wanted to let you know that a plan is in the works, and that various constituencies, including faculty representatives, are getting opportunities to critique and contribute.

You might have heard that Angie Leidinger is the new Executive Secretary of the Board of Trustees. You will recall that Angie addressed the Senate just last month in her role as Director of Governmental Affairs for Clemson. She will retain this job along with the new role. Many of the day-to-day tasks of the Executive Secretary will continue to be handled by Administrative Coordinator Jeannette Braine-Sperry and others who work in Sikes. Angie’s dual role actually has a natural overlap that I think will serve Clemson well, and I can tell you from experience that future Senate Presidents and Faculty Liaisons to the Board will find it easy to work with both Angie and Jeannette.

One issue of recent interest to the Senate Finance Committee is the effectiveness of the Huron Group, a consultant hired by the university some time back to study various support operations and recommend ways to reduce costs. I learned at the BOT meeting that this group was paid roughly $1 million dollars, and it came up with dozens of ideas, including the planned outsourcing of transportation and printing services. Some of the Huron recommendations were rejected outright for various reasons, some have been implemented, and others are still under study. Those implemented already are estimated to save Clemson over $3 million/year, which can be re-directed to academic needs. CFO Brett Dalton has pledged to work with the Senate Finance Committee to make available further information on this and other financial decisions.

You should also know that some members of the Board of Trustees expressed concern last week about the Faculty Senate becoming a member of the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics. They fear that involvement of Clemson faculty in this organization could become divisive. I tried to allay their concerns by emphasizing the many advantages of having an informed and engaged faculty.
Proposed Faculty manual change to Part III – H (page III-7)

Old Language:

**H. Emeritus Faculty**

Regular faculty members, including library faculty, who have served at least five years at the university and fifteen years in the academic profession receive the title of Emeritus or Emerita appended to their professorial rank upon official retirement. All retired faculty and professional staff are entitled to become members of an emeritus organization, whether or not they meet the requirements above.

Proposed New Language:

**H. Emeritus Faculty**

Regular faculty members, including library faculty, who have served at least five years at the university and fifteen years in the academic profession receive the title of Emeritus or Emerita appended to their professorial rank upon official retirement. All retired faculty and professional staff are entitled to become members of an emeritus organization, whether or not they meet the requirements above.

**Rationale**

The Senate does not wish to mandate membership regulations for a Clemson University organization. That is the organization’s task.
Proposed change in the Faculty Manual: Part IV Section D (page IV-3 and IV-4)

Reviews by Department Chairs

Current Wording:

The department chair shall ensure that any faculty member eligible for renewal of appointment, tenure, or promotion is given an opportunity to be reviewed. The appropriate committee reviews each case in accordance with departmental procedures and policies, and renders a written recommendation. The department chair does not participate in the deliberations of the committee, but does issue a separate and independent recommendation as to the disposition of the case after receiving the recommendations of the committee. The chair shall provide the committee charged with peer review with a copy of the recommendation. The chair shall also ensure that the affected faculty member is promptly informed in writing as to the results of and rationale for both recommendations, and the faculty member may elect to include a letter of response in the materials forwarded to the dean. In cases of promotion or early tenure consideration, the candidate may withdraw from further consideration at this point.

Proposed Wording:

The department chair shall ensure that any faculty member eligible for renewal of appointment, tenure, or promotion is given an opportunity to be reviewed. The appropriate committee reviews each case in accordance with departmental procedures and policies, and renders a written recommendation. The department chair does not participate in the deliberations of the committee, but may, upon request of the committee, serve as a resource for the committee. In addition, the committee may, upon request of the chair, serve as a resource for the chair. The chair and the committee issue separate recommendations, free from coercion and interference from any parties. The department chair and the committee shall provide each other with a copy of their recommendation once both have been completed. The chair shall ensure that the affected faculty member is promptly informed in writing as to the results of and rationale for both recommendations, and the faculty member may elect to include a letter of response in the materials forwarded to the dean. In cases of promotion or early tenure consideration, the candidate may withdraw from further consideration at this point.

Rationale:
The use of "independent" continues to cause problems in interpretation. Therefore removing the word "independent" and replacing it with the reason for desiring independence in the recommendations of the chair and the committee clarifies the intent of this section of the Manual.
1. Call to Order: President Charles H. Gooding recognized guests and called the meeting to order at 2:30 p.m. Matt Watkins, Annual Giving Office, shared and explained the newly-published brochure for the Capital Campaign that will be mailed out later this week. The brochure includes two opportunities for faculty that the Faculty Senate suggested: the Class of ’39 Student Scholarships and the Alan Schaffer Faculty Senate Endowment.

2. Approval of Minutes: The Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting dated February 12, 2008 were approved as written.

3. "Free Speech": None

4. Election of Officers: President Gooding asked for nominations from the floor for the offices of Vice President/President-Elect and Secretary. There being none, nominations were closed and vote for officers was held by secret ballot. Bill Bowerman (AFLS) was elected as Vice President/President-Elect; Linda Howe (HEHD), as Secretary.

5. a. Senate Committees:

1) Finance Committee – Mark Smotherman, Chair, submitted and explained the Committee Report (Attachment A).


3) Scholastic Policies Committee – Antonis Katsiyannis, Chair, submitted and explained the Committee Report (Attachment C).

4) Research Committee – Christina Wells, Chair, submitted and explained the Committee Report (Attachment D).

5) Policy Committee – Bill Surver, Chair, submitted and explained the Committee Report (Attachment E).

b. Faculty Senate Select Committees: None

c. Other University Committee/Commissions: Former Faculty Senate President Beth Kunkel introduced Dave Crockett, Classified Staff Senate, who informed the Senate of and explained a staff development plan. He asked Senators to provide him with feedback of this concept (Attachment F).
6. **President’s Report:** President Gooding submitted and briefly explained the President’s Report dated March 11, 2008 (Attachment G).

7. **Old Business:** None

8. **New Business:**
   
a. Senator Wells submitted and explained the proposed *Faculty Manual* change regarding an addition to the membership of the Research Grants Committee. No discussion followed. Vote to approve proposed change was taken and passed unanimously (Attachment H).

   b. Senator Surver submitted and explained an amendment to the proposed *Faculty Manual* change regarding the Policy on Research Ethics, which was seconded. Discussion ensued regarding the clarity of the motion. Motion to accept amendment was taken and passed unanimously. Vote on amended motion was taken and passed unanimously (Attachment I).

   c. Senator Surver submitted and explained *Faculty Manual* change regarding Revisions to the Policy on Research Ethics for endorsement. Vote on revisions to policy was taken and passed unanimously (Attachment J).

   d. President Gooding submitted and explained a Resolution Expressing Appreciation to Clemson University Printing Services. Vote to approve resolution was taken and passed (Attachment K) (FS08-03-1 P).

9. **Announcements:**
   
a. The Lead Senators provided an update of the status of college elections for the Faculty Senate within their respective colleges.

   b. Next Faculty Senate Meeting – April 8, 2008 with the Annual Spring Reception immediately following meeting at the FirstSun Connector between the Martin Inn and the Madren Center.

10. **Adjournment:** 4:20 p.m

    **Deborah Thomason,** Secretary

    **Cathy Toth Sturkie,** Program Assistant

Minutes of the January 15, 2008, Finance Committee meeting


We discussed questions about the budget report prepared by Jane Gilbert, and a question was raised as to our access to departmental budgets.

Next meeting: February 5, 2008 at 3:30 pm

Minutes of the February 5, 2008, Finance Committee meeting


1. We discussed the scope of the Huron Group final report and its availability.

2. Wayne is following up on an analysis of salary changes for administrators.

3. The committee recommends that President Gooding consider establishing an ad hoc committee to look at undergraduate / graduate / research revenues and expenses, based on the Michigan Tech study.

4. We discussed the upcoming ICAR Forum and any additional questions we would like to see addressed.

Next meeting: TBA (when salary change analysis is available)
Faculty Senate Welfare Committee
Monthly Report
William Bowerman, Chair
February 20, 2008

Monthly Report

The Faculty Senate Welfare Committee held its monthly meeting on February 20, 2008 at 2:00 in Room 113 Lehotsky Hall. Senators Li-Bleuel, Futral, White, An, Edwards and Bowerman attended. Also in attendance were Tim Drake from the Staff Senate. We report here on the activities of our committee over the past month. Each report is authored by the Lead Senator for that issue.

Discussion on Policy for Reporting Harassment/Discrimination and Ombudsman Office
Lead: Frances Edwards

Frances Edwards reported that Clemson’s Legal Council and the Ombudsman were continuing to discuss policies that would deal with those who complained of sexual harassment and the required reporting under federal law. In addition, Frances opened the discussion about the possible need to change the approach of the Grievance Committee that would, if there was a belief that there was any possibility of a claim, it should be sent to the Provost’s office, rather than making the Grievance Committee a final arbiter of many of the claims. The purpose of this change would be to lend more credence to the system and to create an awareness to the Provost’s office and other administrators where there are “pockets” of continuing problems. It was agreed that Des Layne would be contacted to see a statistic of grievances filed with the Grievance Committee vs. the numbers that actually were forwarded to the Provost’s Office. Frances will also write a draft of “Perceptions of the Grievance Process” to be reviewed by the committee for possible dissemination to the faculty in gaining faculty perspective of the grievance process.

Top 20 Goal-Top 20 Compensation  Lead: William Bowerman

Bill Bowerman meet with Lawrence Nichols on Monday. We discussed how to further our joint efforts into understanding how Clemson University stands regarding benefits in comparison with the top 32 public universities. We decided to ask Mr. Nichols to investigate health care and retirement benefits in more detail.

Issues Related to Child Care  Lead: Linda Li-Bleuel

The child care center will be built as planned. The target date is still August 2008. The university is currently working through several administrative layers in order to fulfill this goal. President Barker and Provost Helms are fully behind this endeavor and plan to do whatever is necessary to get this child care center up and running.
Issues Related to Campus Parking      Lead: Meredith Futral

There has been no transportation/parking budget proposal submitted to the welfare committee. Geary Robinson is still working with University officials to develop the proposal. The transportation/parking consultant will soon present the Parking and Transportation Master Plan to the University Administrative Council.

Issues Related to Spousal Hires      Lead: Curtis White

I am continuing to work w/Pat Smart in the Provost Office to monitor any and all reports of spousal hires. The intent is to monitor spousal hires to ensure they follow the search and screen process. There is one pending case which recently came to my attention. I will follow up to get the specifics and report at the next meeting.

Additional Items

Those present at the Faculty Senate meeting in February were quite generous. They contributed $132 to Chuck Lindell.

Four nominations for the Alan Schafer Faculty Senate Service Award were received and the committee will meet to deliberate in the next two weeks.

The last meeting of this Senate Session will be on April 1st, 2-3 pm, in 113 Lehotsky Hall.
Final exam –Graduate Courses
The committee recommends that the final exam statement found in the Undergraduate Announcements be adopted and published in the Graduate Announcements:

Final examinations must be given or due on the dates and at the times designated in the final examination schedule, except in laboratory and one-credit-hour courses where the final exam will be given at the last class meeting. (p. 25 in Undergraduate Announcements). Also, the statement must indicate that students are allowed to use the entire allotted time for the exam (as per a recent change for the Undergraduate Announcements approved by the Faculty Senate).

Dr. Felder will include this item for discussion in the Graduate Advisory Committee.

Academic Integrity Policy-Graduate.
Dr. Felder provided an overview of the Graduate Academic Integrity policy (including a reference regarding its development). The policy was extensively reviewed by a variety of committees with faculty representation (e.g., Graduate Advisory Committee, Graduate Academic Integrity committee, and Graduate). The policy heavily relied on Rutgers University Academic Integrity policy and addressed several issues of concern among faculty (e.g., promotes environment of integrity/communication; allows for faculty flexibility and involvement; differentiates among types of offenses through the use of levels...). On-line modules developed by the graduate school will ensure that graduate students are familiar with the policy; graduate coordinators are expected to have the policy addressed in orientation activities...). Finally, the discrepancy between the Faculty Manual and Graduate Announcements regarding the committee structure was discussed (one faculty member per college in the previous version as opposed to four per college in the new structure). Dr. Felder noted that last year she had asked the Faculty Senate through the Scholastic Policies committee for feedback on the new policy and structure but did not receive any. Regardless of the reason for this lapse, this existing Scholastic Policies committee prefers to have some input. Specifically, Dr. Shelburne questioned the need for 20 faculty on this committee when the Undergrad Academic Integrity Committee has only 10 members and an apparent greater case load. And with the various infraction levels (Levels I and II) not even needing the whole committee, we wondered why the committee needed to be so large and what was the historical case load. When queried on this issue, Dr. Felder noted that there is no case load history based on the new policy (and likewise no record of previous case load history with the old policy).

The committee recommends that the graduate school prepare a committee overview (charge, membership, appeal...) reflecting information include in the graduate announcements. This overview could then be reviewed to replace the existing wording in the Faculty Manual concerning this committee.

Dr. Felder also pointed out that the policy will be examined periodically to ensure that concerns are addressed (such as numbers of faculty required).
The Research Committee met on Wednesday February 13 at 4:00 PM in D-136 Poole. Senators Clark, Howe, Liu, Meriwether, Stuart and Wells were in attendance.

Status of Current Projects

1. Handbook for new research faculty

   Angela Rogers' English class has completed work on a handbook for new research faculty. Their work can be viewed at http://people.clemson.edu/~angelar/faculty/home.htm. Senator Stuart divided the book into four sections and gave one section apiece to senators Clark, Howe, Liu, Meriwether for fact-checking and editing.

2. University Research Grants Committee

   At the request of the Research Grants Committee, we suggest a faculty manual change (under New Business) to add the Associate VP for Research as a permanent ex-officio member of the RGC.

3. Investigation related to Dr. Beck's free speech to the Senate

   After review of the allegations raised during Mary Beck's free speech, the committee concluded that Dr. Beck and her faculty may have grounds for a grievance against specific university staff members. In addition, we have compiled suggested procedural changes for consideration by the VP for Research and the IACUC. Several additional interviews with staff are pending.

4. Barriers to Research Productivity

   We are working with the Jim Self Center to design and administer a short survey to Clemson faculty on barriers to research productivity.

5. Rising Fringe costs on pre-existing grants

   Senator Wells met with Vince Gallicchio, Lynn Kunkle and Mike Strickland to discuss the issue of increasing fringe rates. Ms. Kunkle suggested that the Senate invite Ms. Amy Madden from the Comptroller's Office to speak on this subject during Free Speech.
Faculty Senate Policy Committee Report
Faculty Senate Executive/Advisory Committee
February 26, 2008

COMMITTEE MEMBERS: Chair: Bill Surver (surverw); Tom Boland (tboland); Alan Grubb (agrub); Des Layne (dlayne); Catalina Marinescu (dcm); Brad Meyer (mbradle); Lydia Schleifer (schleif)

Report From the February 19 Meeting

One agendum item

Continuation Review of Clemson's new Research Ethics Policy

The Policy Committee met with Tracy Arwood from the VP for Research and Economic Development Office. Several concerns were presented regarding the new policy. There was strong concern about the process for resolution of a reported violation. There was concern about lack of faculty input into the process and how hearing committees would be selected. Tracy transmitted the concerns of the Committee to the VP and revisions were made to the Ethics Policy that have been approved by the Policy Committee. (See below)

The Policy Committee is recommending that the Faculty Senate endorse the new Research Ethics Policy.

Changes made to Research Ethics Policy at the Request of the Policy Committee

1- At least 3 members on the inquiry committee
2- Majority of members of both committees (inquiry and Investigation) be tenured faculty
3- RIO consults with Faculty Senate President when appointing committee members
4- VPR(DO) consults with Faculty Senate President when appointing RIO
5- Change language to reflect people have an ethical obligation to report misconduct (was "should" report)
6- One clarification regarding legal counsel
I’ve made these changes on the attached draft and highlighted them.

In addition there are changes to the Faculty Manual that the Committee approved and asks for Senate approval. They reflect the changes to the Research Ethics Policy.

*Proposed Faculty Manual Changes*
Policy on Research Ethics. Clemson University recognizes the need for faculty to exercise personal judgment and interpretation in research activities in order to maintain an environment of creativity and discovery within the academic community. Care must be taken to ensure that honest error and ambiguities of interpretation of research activities are distinguishable from outright misconduct. Misconduct is defined as fabrication, falsification, or plagiarism in proposing, performing, or reviewing research, or in reporting research results. Fabrication is making up data or results or recording or reporting made-up data or results. Falsification is manipulating research materials, equipment, or processes, or changing or omitting data or results such that the research is not accurately represented in the research record. Plagiarism is the appropriation of another person’s ideas, processes, results, or words without giving appropriate credit. Research misconduct does not include honest error or differences of opinion.

Allegations or complaints involving the possibility of misconduct can be raised by anyone, and are subject to the university Policy for Responding to Allegations of Research Misconduct. The allegation should be made to the Research Integrity Officer in a confidential manner. Procedures regarding inquiry and investigation of the allegation are defined in the Policy for Responding to Allegations of Research Misconduct. For further information contact the Office for Research Compliance.
What is the proposed Staff Development Program?
An employee-driven, peer-reviewed framework to encourage and reward classified and unclassified non-faculty staff performance and professional development.

Guiding Principles:
• Directly supports Clemson’s stated goals and strategies
• Provides tangible benefits to the work unit, the University and the community
• Rewards performance, job-related skills/knowledge, service and volunteerism
• Participation is optional, but available to all qualified staff
• Has well-defined success criteria, evaluation and rewards
• Has challenging, yet attainable success criteria

How does it work?
• Eligible staff members interested in participating, with support of their supervisor, would prepare a “development plan” including activities in three areas:
  ▪ Professional Development (skills training, seminars, mentoring, job-related committees, etc.)
  ▪ Personal Development (education – college and short courses, etc.)
  ▪ University Involvement (campus committee, service activities, University events, etc.)
• Development plans would be reviewed, approved, monitored and evaluated by oversight committees comprised of staff in comparable types of roles (peer-driven)
• Employees who successfully complete the program would receive an agreed upon permanent salary adjustment

Eligibility Criteria: pilot group size to be limited to 150 staff based on the following criteria:
• 10+ years of state service
• Greater than 1 year in current position
• EPMS ratings of Meets or better
• No Disciplinary action within past 2 years
• Special circumstances may be considered if the above criteria are not met
• Limited to 5% of unit staff
• Program must be completed within a year (regular EPMS cycle)

The Process:
➢ Spring 2007 – Ad Hoc committee established with representatives of various staff constituencies (Staff Senate, Women’s Commission, Black Faculty and Staff Commission, Faculty Senate, etc.)
➢ Spring-Fall 2007: Research and development of proposed framework. Information sharing with various constituencies
➢ November 2007-February 2008 – Input and feedback from President Barker and individual members of the Administrative Council
➢ February 2008 – Agreement in concept from Administrative Council and Board of Trustees and support for development of a specific proposal
➢ March 2008 – Input and feedback from constituencies; specific proposal developed for Administrative Council for input and feedback
➢ June 2008 – Final report to Administrative Council for action
➢ Fall 2008 – If approved, form steering committees
➢ February 2009 – Implement program in conjunction with 2009 EPMS cycle
Faculty Senate President’s Report
Charles H. Gooding
March 11, 2008

At next month’s meeting I hope to have a summary report from each of the select committees that has been active during the current Senate year so that we can conclude some items of business and make informed recommendations on the continuation or redirection of unfinished work.

The Athletic Council is continuing its analysis of Clemson’s status with respect to “best practices” recommended by the Coalition of Intercollegiate Athletics. Among the practices recommended is an annual report on appropriate matters to the Faculty Senate by the Faculty Athletic Representative to the NCAA and/or the Chair of the Athletic Council. Such reports have been presented in the past at Clemson, but not always on a regular basis. I have discussed the timing and content of this report with Larry Laforge and Janie Hodge, and we have tentatively selected the August or September Senate meeting as the best time for an annual update. This plan is based on the typical volume of Senate business during these months and on the availability of timely data on the new freshman class of student athletes and the academic performance of those continuing.

The following item of information, which was passed by the Undergraduate Student Senate some time ago, was brought to the attention of the Faculty Senate Executive/Advisory Committee at the February meeting by the Scholastic Policies Committee.

Clemson University Core Values Statement

Thomas Green Clemson, in conceiving this university, envisioned that it would be “a high seminary of learning.” Fundamental to the pursuit of this vision is the common foundation provided to students, faculty, staff and all members of the University family by the understanding and adoption of the Clemson University Core Values:

Integrity, Honesty, Respect

Therefore, as heirs to the university Clemson dreamed of long before us, we each pledge this to our University and peers:

As a member of the Clemson University family, I will uphold Clemson’s Core Values as I pursue excellence in all aspects of my life.

The EAC asked that I commend the undergraduate student government for their work in developing and disseminating this statement. Certainly integrity, honesty, and respect are values that we should all embrace in our work at Clemson as well as in our personal lives.
On February 29 approximately 100 people attended the Faculty Senate Forum on CU-ICAR. Presentations were made by President Jim Barker, CU-ICAR Director Bob Geolas, Vice President Chris Przirembel, Mechanical Engineering Department Chair Imtiaz Haque, Chief Financial Officer Brett Dalton, and Provost Dori Helms. A question and answer period followed the formal presentations. This event was important and successful in terms of the opportunity it provided for open, candid communication as well as the specific information exchanged. The combined set of Powerpoint slides used by the speakers is available on the Faculty Senate web site, and a videotape of the entire proceedings can be checked out from the Faculty Senate office or the Cooper Library reserve section.

Vice President Bryan Simmons and I met with the Provost, also on February 29, to discuss progress on updating the faculty evaluation system. She has signed recent Faculty Manual revisions submitted by the Senate to clarify that administrators have routine access to electronic summaries of student evaluations but not to individual comments made by students unless those comments are submitted by the faculty member for review. However, the Provost asked that we consider two further revisions to this policy. In her view a compilation of individual student evaluations and comments over time should be a part of the record of every faculty member who goes up for reappointment or tenure or for post tenure review. She presented rather compelling reasons why inclusion of a complete record of student evaluations, along with other indicators of teaching effectiveness, is in the best interests of both the faculty member under review and the university. Bryan and I agreed that this issue merits further discussion so expect it to be an item on the agenda of the Scholastic Policies Committee and probably on the floor of the Senate in the coming months.

Finally, I am pleased to announce that Professor John Huffman of the Chemistry Department has been selected to be the 2008 recipient of the Alan Schaffer Service Award sponsored by the Provost and the Faculty Senate. Some of you may not know John, but he served the Senate in many roles over multiple terms, primarily during the 80s and 90s. To quote nominator Alan Grubb, John Huffman was selected to recognize his “tireless work on behalf of faculty, faculty interests and rights, and faculty governance” and for his “willingness to serve the Senate and faculty in various capacities, all the while earning distinction as a nationally renowned chemist and teacher.” John will be recognized at the April Senate reception.
Proposed Faculty Manual Change to Part VII Section E # 5 (page VII – 12)

Old Language

5. **Research Grants Committee** consists of two faculty representatives elected for three-year terms by the faculty of each college plus one member elected for a three-year term from the library. The chair is elected annually by the committee. This committee receives applications for grants in support of research from faculty members in all departments of the university. Eligible faculty are those with tenure, tenure-track, or emeritus faculty status. Only one submission per person is allowed. Faculty who have received a URGC grant within the previous two years are not eligible. The committee makes grants to new faculty members initiating research and to faculty members initiating research in a new area or in areas where other sources of support are inadequate or nonexistent. Priority is given to new faculty (5 years or less at Clemson). Grant applications may be obtained from the Office of Sponsored Programs. Applications are solicited annually through announcements on World Wide Web.

New Language

5. **Research Grants Committee** consists of two faculty representatives elected for three-year terms by the faculty of each college plus one member elected for a three-year term from the library. **The chair is elected annually by the committee. The Associate Vice President for Research serves as a permanent ex-officio member and does not vote on grant awards or the selection of the committee chair.** This committee receives applications for grants in support of research from faculty members in all departments of the university. Eligible faculty are those with tenure, tenure-track, or emeritus faculty status. Only one submission per person is allowed. Faculty who have received a URGC grant within the previous two years are not eligible. The committee makes grants to new faculty members initiating research and to faculty members initiating research in a new area or in areas where other sources of support are inadequate or nonexistent. Priority is given to new faculty (5 years or less at Clemson). Grant applications may be obtained from the Office of Sponsored Programs. Applications are solicited annually through announcements on World Wide Web.

Rationale

The Associate VP for research provides continuity and “corporate memory” to the Committee.
Old Language

5. **Policy on Research Ethics.** Clemson University recognizes the need for faculty to exercise personal judgment and interpretation in research activities in order to maintain an environment of creativity and discovery within the academic community. Care must be taken to ensure that honest error and ambiguities of interpretation of research activities are distinguishable from outright misconduct. Misconduct is construed as dishonest deviation from accepted practices in conducting research activities, or fraudulent failure to comply with university, regulatory, and funding agency requirements affecting specific aspects of the conduct of research. This includes falsification of data, plagiarism, the misappropriation of others’ ideas (the unauthorized and intentionally dishonest use of privileged information such as may be gained during peer, paper, or grant reviews), malicious and public misrepresentation of a colleague’s ethical research behavior, conflicts of interest that could influence the researcher’s decisions or conclusions, or which could provide unfair gain to the researcher, other misuse of position as researcher for personal gain, or exploitation (such as failure to credit work, misrepresentation of a research relationship) of students, or other persons, for research purposes.

Allegations or complaints involving the possibility of misconduct can be raised by anyone, and are subject to the university Policy for Responding to Allegations of Research Misconduct. The allegation should be made to the Research Integrity Officer in a confidential manner. Procedures regarding inquiry and investigation of the allegation are defined in the Policy for Responding to Allegations of Research Misconduct. For further information contact the Office for Research Compliance.

**Rationale:**

These changes are congruent with changes in the research ethics policy.
# Policy for Responding to Allegations of Research Misconduct
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I. Introduction

A. General Policy

Clemson University (CU) expects ethical conduct on the part of all those engaged in research. As articulated in CU’s professional ethics statement, researchers at CU seek to employ the highest standards of intellectual honesty.

Through its Office of Research and Economic Development (ORED), CU seeks to provide leadership in supporting a culture of research integrity within the University, a culture in which all participants in the CU research enterprise internalize and pursue the goal of self-directed responsible conduct of research. CU is proud of its tradition of excellence in research and of our longstanding commitment to the highest standards for scientific integrity and the responsible conduct of research. It is every researcher’s responsibility to promote a commitment to intellectual honesty and personal responsibility for one’s actions, and to respect everyone involved in the research enterprise. As an institution, we are committed to preventing misconduct in research and support good faith efforts to intervene in such misconduct.

B. Scope

This policy and the associated procedures apply to all individuals at Clemson University engaged in research as defined in Section II of this document, including any research that is supported by the federal government or for which federal support is requested. This policy applies to any person paid by, under the control of, or affiliated with the institution, such as scientists, trainees, technicians and other staff members, students working as laboratory or research assistants, fellows, guest researchers, or collaborators at CU.

This policy and associated procedures applies to all allegations of research misconduct and will normally be followed when an allegation of possible research misconduct is received by any institutional official or committee. Particular circumstances in an individual case may dictate variation from the normal procedure deemed in the best interests of the institution and funding agency. Any change from normal procedures also must ensure fair treatment to the subject of the inquiry and/or investigation. Any significant variation should be approved in advance by the Vice President for Research and Economic Development of Clemson University.

Research practica are an exception to this policy. Research practica (usually in the form of course-related research projects and/or directed studies) are designed to provide students an opportunity to practice various research methods such as interview, observation and survey techniques, laboratory and field procedures, measurement of behavior (e.g., reaction time, speech, problem solving) as well as data analysis. Research practica also allow for skills development exercises such as literature reviews and online searches. Typically such projects are quite limited in scope, do not lead to generalizable knowledge and are not undertaken with that goal in mind. For example, a student may interview a peer when the interview does
not involve any sensitive, personal information or do literature reviews for a course-related research paper. These projects are considered "classroom exercises" and do not fall under the scope of this research misconduct policy. However, thesis and dissertation research done by graduate students for terminal degrees would fall under the purview of this policy.

II. Definitions

A. **Allegation** means any written or oral statement or other indication of possible research misconduct made to an institutional official.

B. **Conflict of interest** means the real or apparent interference of one person's interests with the interests of another person, where potential bias may occur due to prior or existing personal or professional relationships.

C. **Deciding Official** means the Vice President for Research and Economic Development (VPRED) of Clemson University. The VPRED will make determinations on allegations of research misconduct and any responsive institutional actions. The Deciding Official will not be the same individual as the Research Integrity Officer.

D. **Federal support** means federal grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements or applications therefore.

E. **Good faith allegation** means an allegation made with the honest belief that research misconduct may have occurred. An allegation is not in good faith if it is made with reckless disregard for or willful ignorance of facts that would disprove the allegation.

F. **Inquiry** means gathering information and initial fact-finding to determine whether an allegation or apparent instance of research misconduct warrants an investigation.

G. **Investigation** means the formal examination and evaluation of all relevant facts to determine if research misconduct has occurred, and, if so, to determine the responsible person, the seriousness of the research misconduct and to evaluate appropriate action.

H. **NSF** means the National Science Foundation.

I. **OIG** means the Office of the Inspector General, the office within the National Science Foundation (NSF) that is responsible for the research misconduct and research integrity activities.

J. **ORI** means the Office of Research Integrity, the office within the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) that is responsible for the research misconduct and research integrity activities of the U.S. Public Health Service.
K. *PHS* means the U.S. Public Health Service, an operating component of the DHHS.

L. *PHS regulation* means the Public Health Service regulation establishing standards for institutional inquiries and investigations into allegations of research misconduct, which is set forth at 42 C.F.R. Part 93.

M. *Research* for the purposes of this document is defined as any systematic investigation, including research development (pilot testing), designed to develop or contribute to generalizable knowledge. Generalizable knowledge includes any systematically generated products of research intended for dissemination beyond the institutional setting (e.g., program evaluation research for internal use would not usually be applicable).

N. *Research Integrity Officer* means the institutional official responsible for assessing allegations of research misconduct and determining when such allegations warrant inquiries and for overseeing inquiries and investigations.

O. *Research misconduct* for the purposes of this document and as defined by the federal Office of Science and Technology Policy is fabrication, falsification, or plagiarism in proposing, performing, or reviewing research, or in reporting research results. Fabrication is making up data or results or recording or reporting made-up data or results. Falsification is manipulating research materials, equipment, or processes, or changing or omitting data or results such that the research is not accurately represented in the research record. Plagiarism is the appropriation of another person’s ideas, processes, results, or words without giving appropriate credit. Research misconduct does not include honest error or differences of opinion. A finding of research misconduct requires that—(a) There be a significant departure from accepted practices of the relevant research community; and (b) The misconduct be committed intentionally, knowingly, or recklessly; and (c) The allegation be proven by a preponderance of the evidence.

P. *Research record* means any data, document, computer file, computer diskette, or any other written or non-written account or object that reasonably may be expected to provide evidence or information regarding the proposed, conducted, or reported research that constitutes the subject of an allegation of research misconduct. A research record includes, but is not limited to, grant or contract applications, whether funded or unfunded; grant or contract progress and other reports; laboratory notebooks; notes; correspondence; videos; photographs; X-ray film; slides; biological materials; computer files and printouts; manuscripts and publications; equipment use logs; laboratory procurement records; animal facility records; human and animal subject protocols; consent forms; medical charts; and patient research files.

Q. *Respondent* means the person against whom an allegation of research misconduct is directed or the person whose actions are the subject of the inquiry or investigation. There can be more than one respondent in any inquiry or investigation.
R. **Retaliation** means any action that adversely affects the employment or other institutional status of an individual that is taken by an institution or an employee because the individual has in good faith, made an allegation of research misconduct or of inadequate institutional response thereto or has cooperated in good faith with an investigation of such allegation.

S. **Complainant** means a person who makes an allegation of research misconduct.

III. Rights and Responsibilities

A. Research Integrity Officer

The Vice President for Research and Economic Development, in consultation with the Faculty Senate President, will appoint the Research Integrity Officer who will have primary responsibility for implementation of the procedures set forth in this document. The Research Integrity Officer will be an institutional official who is well qualified to handle the procedural requirements involved and is sensitive to the varied demands made on those who conduct research, those who are accused of research misconduct, and those who report apparent research misconduct in good faith.

The Research Integrity Officer will appoint the inquiry and investigation committees, in consultation with other institutional officials as appropriate, and will ensure that necessary and appropriate expertise is secured to carry out a thorough and authoritative evaluation of the relevant evidence in an inquiry or investigation. The Research Integrity Officer will attempt to ensure that confidentiality is maintained.

The Research Integrity Officer will assist inquiry and investigation committees and all institutional personnel in complying with these procedures and with applicable standards imposed by government or external funding sources. The Research Integrity Officer is also responsible for maintaining files of all documents and evidence and for the confidentiality and the security of the files.

The Research Integrity Officer will report to ORI or other federal agencies as required by regulation and keep them apprised of any developments during the course of the inquiry or investigation that may affect current or potential federal funding for the individual(s) under investigation or that the federal agency needs to know to ensure appropriate use of Federal funds and otherwise protect the public interest.

B. Complainant

The complainant will have an opportunity to testify before the inquiry and investigation committees, to review portions of the inquiry and investigation reports pertinent to his/her allegations or testimony, to be informed of the results of the inquiry and investigation, and to be protected from retaliation. Also, if the Research Integrity Officer has determined that the complainant may be able to provide pertinent information on any portions of the draft report, these portions will be given
to the complainant for comment.  

The complainant is responsible for making allegations in good faith, maintaining confidentiality, and cooperating with an inquiry and/or investigation.

C. Respondent

The respondent will be informed of the allegations when an inquiry is opened and notified in writing of the final determinations and resulting actions. The respondent will also have the opportunity to be interviewed by and present evidence to the inquiry and investigation committees, to review the draft inquiry and investigation reports, and to have the advice of personal counsel but counsel may not participate in the committee (inquiry or investigation) proceedings.

The respondent is responsible for maintaining confidentiality and cooperating with the conduct of an inquiry or investigation. If the respondent is not found guilty of research misconduct, he or she has the right to receive reasonable and practical institutional assistance in restoring his or her reputation.

D. Deciding Official

The Deciding Official will receive the inquiry and/or investigation report and any written comments made by the respondent or the complainant on the draft report. The Deciding Official will consult with the Research Integrity Officer or other appropriate officials and will determine whether to conduct an investigation, whether research misconduct occurred, whether to impose sanctions, or whether to take other appropriate administrative actions [see section X].

IV. General Policies and Principles

A. Responsibility to Report Misconduct

All employees, individuals or committees associated with CU have an ethical obligation to report observed, suspected, or apparent research misconduct to the Research Integrity Officer. If an individual or committee is unsure whether a suspected incident falls within the definition of research misconduct, they may call the Research Integrity Officer to discuss the suspected research misconduct informally. If the circumstances described by the individual do not meet the definition of research misconduct, the Research Integrity Officer will refer the individual or allegation to other offices or officials with responsibility for resolving the problem.

At any time, an employee may have confidential discussions and consultations about concerns of possible research misconduct with the Research Integrity Officer and will be counseled about appropriate procedures for reporting allegations.
Individuals may also report suspected misconduct directly to a funding agency.

B. Protecting the Complainant

The Research Integrity Officer will monitor the treatment of individuals who bring allegations of research misconduct or of inadequate institutional response thereto, and those who cooperate in inquiries or investigations. The Research Integrity Officer will ensure that these persons will not be subject to retaliation in the terms and conditions of their employment or other status at the institution and will review instances of alleged retaliation for appropriate action.

Employees should immediately report any alleged or apparent retaliation to the Research Integrity Officer.

Also the institution will protect the privacy of those who report research misconduct in good faith to the maximum extent possible. For example, if the complainant requests anonymity, the institution will make an effort to honor the request during the allegation assessment or inquiry within applicable policies and regulations and state and local laws. The complainant will be advised that if the matter is referred to an investigation committee and the complainant's testimony is required, anonymity may no longer be guaranteed. CU will undertake reasonable and practical efforts to protect the positions and reputations of those persons who, in good faith, make allegations.

The RIO may notify University Administrators as deemed appropriate.

C. Protecting the Respondent

Inquiries and investigations will be conducted in a manner that will ensure fair treatment to the respondent(s) in the inquiry or investigation and confidentiality to the extent possible without compromising public health and safety or thoroughly carrying out the inquiry or investigation.

Institutional employees accused of research misconduct may consult with legal counsel, faculty or staff ombudsman or a non-lawyer personal adviser (who is not a principal or witness in the case) to seek advice.

D. Cooperation with Inquiries and Investigations

CU employees will cooperate with the Research Integrity Officer and other CU officials in the review of allegations and the conduct of inquiries and investigations. Employees have an obligation to provide relevant evidence to the Research Integrity Officer or other institutional officials on research misconduct allegations.

E. Preliminary Assessment of Allegations

Upon receiving an allegation of research misconduct, the Research Integrity
Officer will immediately assess the allegation to determine whether the allegation falls under the definition of research misconduct, whether there is sufficient evidence to warrant an inquiry, and whether funding agencies must be notified.

V. Conducting the Inquiry

A. Initiation and Purpose of the Inquiry

Following the preliminary assessment, if the Research Integrity Officer has determined that the allegation provides sufficient information to allow specific follow-up, and falls under the definition of research misconduct, he or she will immediately initiate the inquiry process. In initiating the inquiry, the Research Integrity Officer should identify clearly the original allegation and any related issues that should be evaluated. The purpose of the inquiry is to make a preliminary evaluation of the available evidence and testimony of the respondent, complainant, and key witnesses to determine whether there is sufficient evidence of possible research misconduct to warrant an investigation. The purpose of the inquiry is not to reach a final conclusion about whether research misconduct definitely occurred or who was responsible. The findings of the inquiry must be set forth in an inquiry report.

B. Sequestration of the Research Records

After determining that an allegation falls within the definition of research misconduct, the Research Integrity Officer must ensure that all original research records and materials relevant to the allegation are immediately secured. The Research Integrity Officer may consult with knowledgeable individuals for advice and assistance in this regard.

C. Appointment of the Inquiry Committee

The Research Integrity Officer, in consultation with the Faculty Senate President and other institutional officials as appropriate, will appoint an inquiry committee and committee chair within 15 calendar days of the initiation of the inquiry. The inquiry committee should consist of individuals who do not have real or apparent conflicts of interest in the case, are unbiased, and have the necessary expertise to evaluate the evidence and issues related to the allegation, interview the principals and key witnesses, and conduct the inquiry. These individuals may be scientists, subject matter experts, administrators, lawyers, or other qualified persons, and they may be from inside or outside the institution. There must be a minimum of three individuals on the inquiry committee and a majority of the committee members must be tenured faculty.

The Research Integrity Officer will notify the respondent of the proposed committee membership within 10 calendar days of the appointment of the inquiry committee.
If the respondent submits a written objection to any appointed member of the inquiry committee or expert based on bias or conflict of interest within 5 days of notification of the membership, the Research Integrity Officer will determine whether to replace the challenged member or expert with a qualified substitute.

D. Charge to the Committee and the First Meeting

The Research Integrity Officer will prepare a charge for the inquiry committee that describes the allegations and any related issues identified during the allegation assessment and states that the purpose of the inquiry is to make a preliminary evaluation of the evidence and testimony of the respondent, complainant, and key witnesses to determine whether there is sufficient evidence of possible research misconduct to warrant an investigation. The purpose is not to determine whether research misconduct definitely occurred or who was responsible.

At the committee’s first meeting, the Research Integrity Officer will review the charge with the committee, discuss the allegations, any related issues, and the appropriate procedures for conducting the inquiry, assist the committee with organizing plans for the inquiry, and answer any questions raised by the committee. The Research Integrity Officer and a representative of the Office of General Counsel will be present or available throughout the inquiry to advise the committee as needed.

E. Inquiry Process

The inquiry committee will normally interview the complainant, the respondent, and key witnesses as well as examining relevant research records and materials. Then the inquiry committee will evaluate the evidence and testimony obtained during the inquiry. After consultation with the Research Integrity Officer and a representative of the Office of General Counsel, the committee members will decide whether there is sufficient evidence of possible research misconduct to recommend further investigation. The scope of the inquiry does not include deciding whether research misconduct occurred or conducting exhaustive interviews and analyses.

VI. The Inquiry Report

A. Elements of the Inquiry Report

A written inquiry report must be prepared that states the name and title of the committee members and experts, if any; the allegations; federal support, if any; a summary of the inquiry process used; a list of the research records reviewed; summaries of any interviews; a description of the evidence in sufficient detail to demonstrate whether an investigation is warranted or not; and the committee's recommendation as to whether an investigation should be undertaken and whether any other actions should be taken. A representative of the Office of General Counsel will review the report for legal sufficiency.
B. Comments on the Draft Report by the Respondent and the Complainant

The Research Integrity Officer will provide the respondent with a copy of the draft inquiry report for comment and rebuttal and will provide the complainant, if he or she is identifiable, with portions of the draft inquiry report that address the complainant's role and opinions in the investigation.

1. Confidentiality

The Research Integrity Officer may establish reasonable conditions for review to protect the confidentiality of the draft report.

2. Receipt of Comments

Within 10 calendar days of their receipt of the draft report, the complainant and respondent will provide their written comments, if any, to the inquiry committee. Any comments that the complainant or respondent submits on the draft report will become part of the final inquiry report and record. Based on the comments, the inquiry committee may revise the report as appropriate.

C. Time Limit for Completing the Inquiry Report

The inquiry committee will normally complete the inquiry and submit its report in writing to the Research Integrity Officer no more than 45 calendar days following its first meeting, unless the Research Integrity Officer approves an extension for good cause. If the Research Integrity Officer approves an extension, the reason for the extension will be entered into the records of the case and the report. The respondent also will be notified of the extension.

D. Inquiry Decision and Notification

1. Decision by Deciding Official

The Research Integrity Officer will transmit the final report and any comments to the Deciding Official, who will make the determination of whether findings from the inquiry provide sufficient evidence of possible research misconduct to justify conducting an investigation. The inquiry is completed when the Deciding Official makes this determination, which will be made within 60 calendar days of the first meeting of the inquiry committee. Any extension of this period will be based on good cause and recorded in the inquiry file. If an investigation is warranted, it must begin within 30 calendar days of the Deciding Official's determination.
2. Notification

The Research Integrity Officer will notify both the respondent and the complainant in writing of the Deciding Official's decision of whether to proceed to an investigation and will remind them of their obligation to cooperate in the event an investigation is opened. The Research Integrity Officer will also notify all appropriate institutional officials of the Deciding Official's decision.

VII. Conducting the Investigation

A. Purpose of the Investigation

The purpose of the investigation is to explore in detail the allegations, to examine the evidence in depth, and to determine specifically whether research misconduct has been committed, by whom, and to what extent. The investigation will also determine whether there are additional instances of possible research misconduct that would justify broadening the scope beyond the initial allegations. This is particularly important where the alleged research misconduct involves clinical trials or potential harm to human subjects or the general public or if it affects research that forms the basis for public policy, clinical practice, social services, education policy or public health practice. The findings of the investigation will be set forth in an investigation report.

B. Sequestration of the Research Records

The Research Integrity Officer will immediately sequester any additional pertinent research records that were not previously sequestered during the inquiry. This sequestration should occur before or at the time the respondent is notified that an investigation has begun. The need for additional sequestration of records may occur for any number of reasons, including the institution's decision to investigate additional allegations not considered during the inquiry stage or the identification of records during the inquiry process that had not been previously secured. The procedures to be followed for sequestration during the investigation are the same procedures that apply during the inquiry.

C. Appointment of the Investigation Committee

The Research Integrity Officer, in consultation with the Faculty Senate President and other institutional officials as appropriate, will appoint an investigation committee and the committee chair within 15 calendar days of the notification to the respondent that an investigation is planned or as soon thereafter as practicable. The investigation committee should consist of individuals who do not have real or apparent conflicts of interest in the case, are unbiased, and have the necessary expertise to evaluate the evidence and issues related to the allegations, interview the principals and key witnesses, and conduct the investigation. These individuals may be scientists,
administrators, subject matter experts, lawyers, or other qualified persons, and they may be from inside or outside the institution. Individuals appointed to the investigation committee may also have served on the inquiry committee. There must be a minimum of three individuals on the investigation committee and a majority of the committee members must be tenured faculty.

The Research Integrity Officer will notify the respondent of the proposed committee membership within 10 days of the appointment of the investigation committee. If the respondent submits a written objection to any appointed member of the investigation committee or expert within five days of notification of the membership, the Research Integrity Officer will determine whether to replace the challenged member or expert with a qualified substitute.

D. Charge to the Committee and the First Meeting

1. Charge to the Committee

The Research Integrity Officer will define the subject matter of the investigation in a written charge to the committee that: Describes the allegations and related issues identified during the inquiry; Identifies the respondent; informs the committee that it must conduct the investigation as prescribed in paragraph E. of this section; defines research misconduct; Informs the committee that it must evaluate the evidence and testimony to determine whether, based on a preponderance of the evidence, research misconduct occurred and, if so, the type and extent of it and who was responsible; Informs the committee that in order to determine that the respondent committed research misconduct it must find that a preponderance of the evidence establishes that: (1) research misconduct, as defined in this policy, occurred (respondent has the burden of proving by a preponderance of the evidence any affirmative defenses raised, including honest error or a difference of opinion); (2) the research misconduct is a significant departure from accepted practices of the relevant research community; and (3) the respondent committed the research misconduct intentionally, knowingly, or recklessly; Informs the committee that during the investigation, if additional information becomes available that substantially changes the subject matter of the investigation or would suggest additional respondents, the committee will notify the Research Integrity Officer, who will determine whether it is necessary to notify the respondent of the new subject matter or to provide notice to additional respondents; and, Informs the committee that it must prepare or direct the preparation of a written investigation report that meets the requirements of this policy and federal regulations.

2. The First Meeting
The Research Integrity Officer, with the assistance of a representative of the Office of General Counsel, will convene the first meeting of the investigation committee to review the charge, the inquiry report, and the prescribed procedures and standards for the conduct of the investigation, including the necessity for confidentiality and for developing a specific investigation plan. The investigation committee will be provided with a copy of these instructions and, where federal funding is involved, the federal regulation.

E. Investigation Process

The investigation committee will be appointed and the process initiated within 30 calendar days of the completion of the inquiry, if findings from that inquiry provide a sufficient basis for conducting an investigation.

The investigation will normally involve examination of all documentation including, but not necessarily limited to, relevant research records, computer files, proposals, manuscripts, publications, correspondence, memoranda, and notes of telephone calls. Whenever possible, the committee should interview the complainant(s), the respondents(s), and other individuals who might have information regarding aspects of the allegations. Interviews of the respondent should be tape recorded or transcribed. All other interviews should be transcribed, tape recorded, or summarized. Summaries or transcripts of the interviews should be prepared, and included as part of the investigatory file.

VIII. The Investigation Report

A. Elements of the Investigation Report

The final submitted report, which will go to the Deciding Official and any other required entities, must describe the policies and procedures under which the investigation was conducted, describe how and from whom information relevant to the investigation was obtained, state the findings, and explain the basis for the findings. The report will include the actual text or an accurate summary of the views of any individual(s) found to have engaged in research misconduct as well as a recommendation regarding any sanctions to be imposed and administrative actions to be taken by the institution.

B. Comments on the Draft Report

1. Respondent

The Research Integrity Officer will provide the respondent with a copy of the draft investigation report for comment and rebuttal. The respondent will be allowed 10 calendar days to review and comment on the draft report. The respondent's written comments will be attached to the final report. The findings of the final report should take into account the respondent's
3. Institutional Counsel

The draft investigation report will be transmitted to the representative of the Office of General Counsel for a review of its legal sufficiency. Comments should be incorporated into the final report as appropriate.

4. Confidentiality

In distributing the draft report, or portions thereof, to the respondent and complainant, the Research Integrity Officer will inform the recipient of the confidentiality under which the draft report is made available and may establish reasonable conditions to ensure such confidentiality. For example, the Research Integrity Officer may request the recipient to sign a confidentiality statement or to come to his or her office to review the report.

C. Institutional Review and Decision

Based on whether the investigation was thorough, fair and complete, the Deciding Official will make the final determination whether to accept the investigation report, its findings, and the recommended institutional actions. If this determination varies from that of the investigation committee, the Deciding Official will explain in detail the basis for rendering a decision different from that of the investigation committee in the institution's letter transmitting the report to the relevant funding agency or agencies. The Deciding Official's explanation should be consistent with the definition of research misconduct in this document, the institution's policies and procedures, and the evidence reviewed and analyzed by the investigation committee. The Deciding Official may also return the report to the investigation committee with a request for further fact-finding or analysis. The Deciding Official's determination, together with the investigation committee's final report, constitutes the final investigation report for purposes of federal review.

When a final decision on the case has been reached, the Research Integrity Officer will notify both the respondent and the complainant in writing. In addition, the Deciding Official will determine whether law enforcement agencies, professional societies, professional licensing boards, editors of journals in which falsified reports may have been published, collaborators of the respondent in the work, or other relevant parties should be notified of the outcome of the case. The Deciding Official
comments in addition to all the other evidence.

2. Complainant

The Research Integrity Officer will provide the complainant, if he or she is identifiable, with those portions of the draft investigation report that address the complainant's role and opinions in the investigation. The report should be modified, as appropriate, based on the complainant's comments.
will inform University Administrators as necessary to implement appropriate corrective actions and/or sanctions. The Research Integrity Officer is responsible for ensuring compliance with all notification requirements of funding or sponsoring agencies.

D. Transmittal of the Final Investigation Report to relevant entities.

After comments have been received and the necessary changes have been made to the draft report, the investigation committee should transmit the final report with attachments, including the respondent's and complainant's comments, to the Deciding Official, through the Research Integrity Officer. The Research Integrity Officer will submit the final report to ORI and/or other relevant entities.

E. Time Limit for Completing the Investigation Report

An investigation should ordinarily be completed within 120 days of its initiation, with the initiation being defined as the first meeting of the investigation committee. This includes conducting the investigation, preparing the report of findings, making the draft report available to the subject of the investigation for comment, submitting the report to the Deciding Official for approval, and submitting the report to the relevant entities.

IX. Specific Requirements for Reporting to ORI or OIG When PHS or NSF Funding Is Involved

A. A decision to initiate an investigation must be reported in writing by the Research Integrity Officer to the ORI or OIG on or before the date the investigation begins. At a minimum, the notification should include the name of the person(s) against whom the allegations have been made, the general nature of the allegation as it relates to the definition of research misconduct, and the PHS applications or grant number(s) involved. ORI or OIG must also be notified of the final outcome of the investigation and must be provided with a copy of the investigation report. Any significant variations from the provisions of the institutional policies and procedures should be explained in any reports submitted to ORI.

B. If an institution plans to terminate an inquiry or investigation for any reason without completing all relevant requirements of the PHS regulation when PHS funding is involved, the Research Integrity Officer will submit a report of the planned termination to ORI, including a statement of the reasons for the proposed termination.

C. If the institution determines that it will not be able to complete the inquiry and/or investigation within the time frames required, the Research Integrity Officer will submit to ORI or OIG a written request for an extension that explains the delay, reports on the progress to date, estimates the date of completion of the report, and describes other necessary steps to be taken. If the request is granted, the Research
Integrity Officer will file periodic progress reports as requested by the ORI or OIG.

D. When PHS or NSF funding or applications for funding are involved and an admission of research misconduct is made, the Research Integrity Officer will contact ORI or OIG for consultation and advice. Normally, the individual making the admission will be asked to sign a statement attesting to the occurrence and extent of research misconduct. When the case involves PHS funds, the institution is not permitted to accept an admission of research misconduct as a basis for closing a case or not undertaking an investigation without prior approval from ORI.

E. The Research Integrity Officer will notify ORI or OIG at any stage of the inquiry or investigation if:
   1. there is an immediate health or safety hazard involved;
   2. there is an immediate need to protect Federal resources, reputations or other interests;
   3. there is an immediate need to protect the interests of the person(s) making the allegations or of the individual(s) who is the subject of the allegations as well as his/her co-investigators and associates, if any;
   4. it is probable that the alleged incident is going to be reported publicly;
   5. the scientific community or the public should be informed; or
   6. if research activities should be suspended; or
   7. there is a reasonable indication of possible civil or criminal violation.

X. Institutional Administrative Actions

Clemson University will take appropriate administrative actions against individuals when an allegation of research misconduct has been substantiated.

If the Deciding Official determines that the alleged research misconduct is substantiated by the findings, he or she will decide on the appropriate actions to be taken, after consultation with the Research Integrity Officer. The actions may include:

- withdrawal or correction of all pending or published abstracts and papers emanating from the research where research misconduct was found.
- removal of the responsible person from the particular project, letter of reprimand, special monitoring of future work, probation, suspension, salary reduction, or initiation of steps leading to possible rank reduction or termination of employment;
- restitution of funds as appropriate.
- completion of appropriate training, specified by the Deciding Official.
- disciplinary action against the respondent, up to and including termination from employment.

XI. Other Considerations

A. Termination of Institutional Employment or Resignation Prior to Completing Inquiry or Investigation
The termination of the respondent's institutional employment, by resignation or otherwise, before or after an allegation of possible research misconduct has been reported, will not preclude or terminate the research misconduct procedures.

If the respondent, without admitting to the research misconduct, elects to resign his or her position prior to the initiation of an inquiry, but after an allegation has been reported, or during an inquiry or investigation, the inquiry or investigation will proceed. If the respondent refuses to participate in the process after resignation, the committee will use its best efforts to reach a conclusion concerning the allegations, noting in its report the respondent's failure to cooperate and its effect on the committee's review of all the evidence.

B. Restoration of the Respondent's Reputation

If the institution finds no research misconduct and, where relevant, if ORI concurs, after consulting with the respondent, the Research Integrity Officer will undertake reasonable and practical efforts to restore the respondent's reputation. Depending on the particular circumstances, the Research Integrity Officer should consider notifying those individuals aware of or involved in the investigation of the final outcome, publicizing the final outcome in forums in which the allegation of research misconduct was previously publicized, or expunging all reference to the research misconduct allegation from the respondent's personnel file. Any institutional actions to restore the respondent's reputation must first be approved by the Deciding Official.

C. Protection of the Complainant and Others

During the research misconduct proceeding and upon its completion, regardless of whether the institution, OIG, or ORI determines that research misconduct occurred, the RIO must undertake all reasonable and practical efforts to protect the position and reputation of, or to counter potential or actual retaliation against, any complainant who made allegations of research misconduct in good faith and of any witnesses and committee members who cooperate in good faith with the research misconduct proceeding. The DO will determine, after consulting with the RIO, and with the complainant, witnesses, or committee members, respectively, what steps, if any, are needed to restore their respective positions or reputations or to counter potential or actual retaliation against them. The RIO is responsible for implementing any steps the DO approves.

D. Allegations Not Made in Good Faith

If relevant, the Deciding Official will determine whether the complainant's allegations of research misconduct were made in good faith. If an allegation was not made in good faith, the Deciding Official will determine whether any administrative action should be taken against the complainant.
E. Interim Administrative Actions

Institutional officials will take interim administrative actions, as appropriate, to protect Federal funds and ensure that the purposes of the Federal financial assistance are carried out.

XII. Record Retention

After completion of a case and all ensuing related actions, the Research Integrity Officer will prepare a complete file, including the records of any inquiry or investigation and copies of all documents and other materials furnished to the Research Integrity Officer or committees. The Research Integrity Officer will keep the file for seven years after completion of the case to permit later assessment of the case. Authorized federal personnel will be given access to the records upon request.

NOTES:

1 42 C.F.R. § 93.212, 45 C.F.R. §689.2(b).
2 42 C.F.R. § 93.215, 45 C.F.R. §689.2(b).
3 42 C.F.R. § 93.308 and 309, 45 C.F.R. §689.4.
4 42 C.F.R. § 93.310(g).
5 42 C.F.R. § 93.304(k).
6 42 C.F.R. § 93.304(l).
7 42 C.F.R. § 93.304 (a) and (b).
8 42 C.F.R. § 93.307(g).
9 42 C.F.R. § 93.310(a).
10 42 C.F.R. § 93.310(f).
11 42 C.F.R. § 93.313.
12 42 C.F.R. § 93.310(a).
13 42 C.F.R. § 93.310(e).
14 42 C.F.R. § 93.310(g).
15 42 C.F.R. § 93.313.
16 42 C.F.R. § 93.311(a).
17 42 C.F.R. § 93.309, 45 C.F.R. 689.4(b).
18 42 C.F.R. § 93.313, 45 C.F.R. 689.4(b).
19 42 C.F.R. § 93.311(b), 45 C.F.R. 689.4(b).
20 42 C.F.R. § 93.311(c), 45 C.F.R. 689.4(b).
21 42 C.F.R. § 93.316.
22 42 C.F.R. § 93.318(a), 45 C.F.R. 689.4(c)(1).
23 42 C.F.R. § 93.318(b), 45 C.F.R. 689.4(c)(2).
24 42 C.F.R. § 93.318(e), 45 C.F.R. 689.4(c)(5).
25 42 C.F.R. § 93.318(f).
RESOLUTION EXPRESSING APPRECIATION
TO CLEMSON UNIVERSITY PRINTING SERVICES

FS08-03 1 P

Whereas, the Faculty Senate has had a longstanding relationship with the Clemson University Printing Services;

Whereas, Printing Services has provided a variety of services to the Faculty Senate in an excellent manner and oftentimes in “rush” circumstances;

Whereas, responses to the Faculty Senate’s many requests have always been handled in a timely, friendly and helpful manner;

Whereas, the Faculty Senate has depended upon Printing Services especially when hosting such events as its annual Spring Reception, Faculty Senate Retreats and Forums, the Class of ’39 Celebration, Library Appreciation Receptions, and gatherings with the Board of Trustees as well as its monthly meetings; and

Whereas, Printing Services employs personable, highly professional, and loyal people with whom it has always been a pleasure to work;

Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Clemson University Faculty Senate expresses its appreciation of these services and of its long association with Clemson University Printing Services;

Resolved, That the Faculty Senate is sorry this relationship must end and will miss working with such wonderful people; and

Further resolved, That the Faculty Senate offers best wishes to each of these individuals in their transition to new employment at Clemson or to new adventures in their future.
1. **Call to Order:** The meeting was called to order by President Charles H. Gooding at 2:34 p.m.

2. **Approval of Minutes:** The Faculty Senate meeting minutes dated March 13, 2008 were approved as distributed.

3. **“Free Speech”: None**

4. **Special Order of the Day:** Amy Madden, Comptroller's Office, provided a history and an update on fringe benefits and noted that a small increase in proposals would be incorporated soon for fringe benefits. She asked senators to talk with colleagues to help them understand this increase. (Attachment A).

5. **Committees:**
   a. **Senate Committees**
      1) **Finance Committee** — Mark Smotherman, Chair, submitted the 2007-08 Finance Committee Report (Attachment B). Senator Wayne Sarasua then explained the results of an analysis of salary increases for administrators, noting that justifications were provided for these increases.

      2) **Welfare Committee** — Chair Bill Bowerman submitted and explained the End-of-Year Report (Attachment C).

      3) **Scholastic Policies Committee** — Chair Antonis Katsiyannis submitted and briefly explained the 2007-2008 Activity Report (Attachment D).

      4) **Research Committee** — Chair Christina Wells reported on the Committee's efforts this year and noted that a written report will be submitted soon. (Attachment E).

      5) **Policy Committee** — Bill Surver submitted and explained the Final Report of the Policy Committee Report dated (Attachment F).
   
   b. **Faculty Senate Select Committees:**
      1) **Emeritus College Issues** — Chair Lydia Schleifer submitted the Select Committee Report dated April 8, 2008 and moved for acceptance by the Senate. Motion was seconded. There was no discussion. Vote to accept Report was taken and passed unanimously (Attachment G).
2) Faculty Ranks and Titles – President Gooding provided a brief history of this Select Committee and offered his advice to the Senate regarding the continuation of the Committee. He then submitted the Report, on behalf of Chair Hap Wheeler, for acceptance by the Senate. Vote to accept Report was taken and passed unanimously (Attachment H).

c. Other University Committee/Commissions: President Gooding’s Report to the Board of Trustees was shared with the Senate (Attachment I).

6. Old Business:
   a. Senator Katsiyannis submitted and explained the proposed *Faculty Manual* change, Graduate Academic Integrity Committee, for approval. There was no discussion. Vote was taken and passed unanimously (Attachment J).

   b. Senator Surver submitted for approval and explained the proposed *Faculty Manual* change, Retention Committees. There was no discussion. Vote was taken to approve proposed change and passed unanimously. (Attachment K).

7. Presentations and Congratulations:
   President Gooding presented:
   (a) the hot-off-the-press *Faculty Senate Brochure – Five Decades of Service* and announced that they are ready for wide distribution;
   (b) the Alan Schaffer Faculty Senate Service Award to long-time Faculty Senator and Grievance Board member and Chair, John Huffman, and unveiled a perpetual plaque which will hang in the Library that will include names of all recipients of this Award;
   (c) Faculty Senate Certificates to Retiring Senators and Alternates; and
   (d) congratulated Beth Kunkel, who will be recognized at Graduation as the Algernon Sydney Sullivan Award Faculty recipient.

8. President Gooding provided his Outgoing President’s Remarks (Attachment L) and introduced Bryan Simmons as the 2007-2008 Faculty Senate President.

Deborah Thomason, Secretary

Cathy Toth Sturkie, Program Coordinator
9. **New Business:**
   a. The 2008-09 Faculty Senators introduced themselves.

   b. President Simmons informed the Senate that an Orientation/Luncheon will be held on May 13\textsuperscript{th} prior to the Faculty Senate meeting and that invitations would be mailed soon.

   c. Senators were asked to return their committee preference questionnaires as quickly as possible so that the new Senate session may proceed.

   d. Senators were asked to inform Cathy Sturkie of the two college representatives to the Advisory Committee as soon as possible – one to be designated as the college lead senator.

10. **Announcements:**
    a. The next Faculty Senate meeting will be on May 13, 2008 at 2:30 p.m. at the Madren Center

11. **Adjournment:** 4:40 p.m.


\[\text{Linda Howe, Secretary}\]

\[\text{Cathy Toth Sturkie, Program Coordinator}\]

Absent: D. Layne (G. Wang for), C. Rice, L. LiBleuel (J. Field for), F. Edwards, S. Stuart (D. Warner for), B. Meyer
Clemson University
Pooled Fringe Benefit Rates Update
Fiscal Year 2009

Fringe Benefits at Clemson

- Clemson University offers many benefits to all employees
- Clemson's pooled fringe benefit rates group all of the benefits offered into four rates
- A pooled fringe benefit rate is a percent of employer fringe expense to gross salary for defined groups of employees
- Pooled fringe benefit rates are submitted annually for approval by the Federal Government
Pooled Fringe Benefit Method is a Best Practice

- Provides a **simpler calculation** for monthly expenditures
- Provides a **simpler budget calculation** for both departments and grants
- Used by **top research institutions and top 20 institutions**

Pooled Fringe Benefits?

- The Federal Government allows employer fringe benefits to include:
  - Employer Taxes and Worker's Compensation
  - Health and Retirement Plans
  - Other Employee Programs
    - Tuition Plans, Wellness Programs, Daycare Operations
    - Other common benefits
- Clemson's pooled fringe benefit rates include:
  - Employer Taxes and Worker's Compensation
  - Health and Retirement Plans
  - Employee Free Tuition
  - Termination Pay
Clemson employees are grouped based on benefit program code:

- 9 Month Employees = 27.9%
- 12 Month Employees = 32.8%
- Students = 6.2%
- Part Time/Temporary Employees = 20.8%

### Pooled Fringe Rates History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY07</th>
<th>FY08</th>
<th>FY09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9 Month Employees</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Month Employees</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part Time/Temp Employees</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Clemson University Pooled Fringe Benefit Rates History

Pressures Increasing Employer’s Benefit Costs

- Clemson’s health and retirement plans are managed by the state
  - South Carolina government has passed legislation which increased employer health and/or retirement costs
- Clemson’s worker's compensation costs are based on South Carolina's actual experiences and claims
- Any increases in employer fringe costs are included in the next proposed pooled fringe rate
  - Unplanned increases may create short falls which will be recovered in future rates (retirement and worker's compensation changes in FY07 impacted the FY09 rates)
SC Worker's Compensation Rates

- Professional/Clerical: 0.87% FY07, 0.90% FY08
- Other: 4.10% FY07, 4.86% FY08
- Pilots: 8.62% FY07, 8.11% FY08
- Public Safety: 15.90% FY07

Pooled Fringe Benefit Rate Cycle

- December 2007
  - FY09 fringe benefit rates were submitted to Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) for review and approval
    - Rates are based on actual experience during FY07 plus any anticipated changes in expenditures

- May/June 2008
  - Expect to receive approval from DHHS
Communication Plan

- January/February 2008 – communication to University through meetings with:
  - Administrative Council
  - Provost Advisory Council
  - Research Deans
  - Clemson Business Officers Group
  - Human Resources Advisory Council
  - Grant Coordinators

Contact Information

- Calculation or Financial Information
  - Amy Madden maddena@clemson.edu
  - Beverly Leeper bkl@clemson.edu

- Employee or Benefit Information
  - Erik Flemming eflemm@clemson.edu
Report of the 2007-2008 Finance Committee

Members: R. Campbell, R. Figliola, H. Liu, W. Sarasua, M. Smotherman, and G. Tissera

The 2007-2008 Finance Committee worked on the following issues this year.

1. In the spring of 2007, the format of the annual employee salary report was changed to remove the percent salary changes. The committee requested, with subsequent full Senate support, that the previous format be restored; and, we want to thank the Office of Institutional Research for honoring this request for the report of $50,000 and above salaries. With OIR help, we later studied the average percent salary changes for different categories of employees with salaries of $50,000 and above. A report on these salary changes is planned for the April 8 Senate meeting.

2. In the fall, the committee recommended to President Gooding to reestablish the Budget Accountability Committee. He suggested that we first work with the Provost and the CFO to explore how the Finance Committee could serve the same function. We agreed and chose as a starting point to look into a suggestion that the Provost had significantly cut the CBBS budget. Provost Dori Helms agreed to supply us with budget numbers from her office, and Ms. Jane Gilbert of the Provost's office prepared a report for us. We wish to thank Provost Helms and Ms. Gilbert for their openness to our request and their help with understanding the numbers. The report indicated that no cuts were made to CBBS.

3. The committee met with Dean Bruce Rafert to discuss Graduate Assistantship Differentials. An overview of the budgeting of GADs was published in the September 18 committee minutes.

4. The committee attempted to investigate the use of funds obtained from differential tuition in CBBS. A set of slides was provided by Senior Associate Dean Jim McCubbin regarding the general categories of the expenditures of the additional tuition funds in CBBS, but we did not have detailed numbers for the expenditures. We recommend that any college that considers implementing increased tuitions put in place a mechanism that helps ensure that the additional funds are spent in accordance with the justifications for needing the differential tuition structure.

5. Committee chair Smotherman and President Gooding met with the interim Clemson CBO, Mr. Steve Copeland, and discussed the prioritization of capital projects. The committee discussed the process, and an overview of the process was published in the October 23 committee minutes.

6. Committee chair Smotherman met with the Clemson HR Director, Mr. Lawrence Nichols, and the Procurement Services Director, Mr. Mike Nebesky, and discussed the limited per diem meal allowances. An overview was published in the April 3 committee minutes. We also encouraged President Gooding to discuss the issue with the faculty senate presidents at other schools in South Carolina. A complicating factor in requesting legislative action on increasing the per diem allowances was a news report in August 2007 that Clemson University spent $12.7 million on travel and meals in FY2006, and an individual Clemson faculty member spent $47,295 on travel and meals in FY2006. (Similar expenditures were reported for USC.)
7. Committee chair Smotherman discussed budgeting for study abroad programs with the Director for International Programs and Services, Ms. Teresa Wise, in the Office for International Affairs. Ms. Wise and Ms. Lisa Lynch, the Fiscal Manager for International Programs, are willing to help anyone trying to set up a study abroad program. OIA provides a Faculty-Led Study Abroad Programs: Budget Worksheet (Excel spreadsheet) and a Faculty-Led Study Abroad Programs: Development, Approval and Implementation Guide (36 pp. pdf) on their forms page (http://www.clemson.edu/ia/forms/index.html). The Guide details the approval process, which must begin with the department chair, and also discusses budgeting. Faculty typically are paid a salary equivalent to the summer school 3.25% per-credit-hour rate (travel and lodging expenses are also covered).

The 2007-2008 Finance Committee recommends that next year’s Finance Committee consider the following items.

1. We think it is important for the next committee to continue 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 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. It is not clear that the conventional wisdom about undergrad education subsidizing graduate education and research is correct. Dean Rafert shared with us a study at Michigan Tech that showed the opposite, namely, that graduate education and research were subsidizing undergrad education. We think a select committee of faculty and administrators should repeat this study for Clemson so that better business decisions can be made on actual revenues/expenditures.

4. These are five recommendations that we repeat from our study of GADs.
   a. Consider ways to encourage the faculty to aim for a better external-to-internal funding ratio for GRA GADs.
   b. Consider and recommend ways to help reduce losses due to uncharged GADs.
   c. Recommend improvements in financial reports available to PIs so that financial status of grants is more comprehensible (and thus uncharged GRA GAD money is clearly evident to the PI).
   d. Lobby for PIs to be able to carry over year-to-year any remaining return-from-indirect funds so that they may be accumulated and used for GRA stipends and GADs.
   e. Identify and recommend changes to financial policies and practices that put Clemson at a competitive disadvantage in recruiting top graduate students.

Submitted April 8, 2008
Analysis of Salary Data

Background
Salary reports for Fall 2007 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 salary increases. At first glance, the data seems to indicate that administrators received, on average, higher salary increases than non-administrative faculty. To verify this, the senate finance committee contacted OIR to request salary data broken down by factbook category, college, and job title; and omitting new employees and any employees who received promotions. OIR provided an Excel spreadsheet to allow the finance committee to sort and stratify data however we wished.

Procedure
The spreadsheet provided by OIR contained 1767 records and included all employees with salaries greater than $50k annually.

Of those 217 records included a note code “b” which indicates that the salary change was related to a change in position or responsibilities. Removal of these records left 1550 records. Other records were also omitted from the analysis for various reasons including new hires, and salary changes due to change in contract. The “Other” adjustment note seemed to target a specific category of employee—mostly athletic staff. These were removed from the analysis. Further, all athletic personal were filtered because of the differences in their pay structure, funding sources, and performance evaluation procedures from other campus employees.

After stratifying the data by factbook category, outliers were identified in two categories that greatly skewed the mean salary increases in those categories. For example, one individual in the research faculty category had received a 67% increase. With only 18 records in this category, the resulting mean salary increase is 7.39%. Removing this individual reduced the mean to 3.88%. It was learned that the two individuals identified as outliers had received a promotion or change in duties that was not reflected in the notes column of the salary database. These two outliers were removed. This left 1315 records that were included in the final stratification.

Results
The table and graphs on the next page provide a summary of the results of the stratification. One other piece of data not shown is that the mean salary increase for Department Chairs is 6.8% (38 records).
Summary of Salary Increases Stratified by Factbook Category (Fall 2007 Data)
(salary changes due to promotions or change-in-duties are not included – see Procedure section)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factbook Category</th>
<th>Average % Increase</th>
<th>Median % Increase</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Average Annual Increase</th>
<th>Average Monthly Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1315</td>
<td>$3,324</td>
<td>$323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>$3,891</td>
<td>$324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Faculty</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>$7,025</td>
<td>$642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Faculty</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>729</td>
<td>$2,877</td>
<td>$313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Faculty</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>$3,560</td>
<td>$315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Service Faculty</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$2,820</td>
<td>$241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Professional Faculty</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$3,386</td>
<td>$287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>$2,711</td>
<td>$226</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Minutes of the April 3, 2008, Finance Committee meeting

Members present: R. Campbell, W. Sarasua, and M. Smotherman

1. Wayne Sarasua presented the results of his analysis of the average salary increase. He will prepare a handout for the April 8 Senate meeting and discuss the results at that meeting.

2. Mark Smotherman met with Lawrence Nichols (HR Director) and Mike Nebesky (Procurement Services Director) about the per diem meal allowances.
   a. An exception to the state per diem limits is available when a banquet ticket is purchased separately from a conference registration. See the "Meals" section of http://virtual.clemson.edu/groups/procurement/travel_policy.htm
   b. When approved in advance, employees can be reimbursed with non-state money for actual expenses that exceed the state per diem limits.
   c. For federal reporting and auditing purposes, grants obtained by the university follow the state guidelines for reimbursing travel and meals, rather than allowing grant-by-grant differences.

3. Mark Smotherman is preparing a final report of the committee's work during 2007-2008 and will email a draft for review.

This was the last scheduled meeting of the 2007-2008 Finance Committee.
Monthly Report

The Faculty Senate Welfare Committee held its final monthly meeting of the 2007-2008 term on April 1, 2008 at 2:00 in Room 113 Lehotsky Hall. Senators Li-Bleuel, Futral, White, An, Edwards and Bowerman attended. Also in attendance were Tim Drake from the Staff Senate and Dr. Pat Smart from the Provost’s Office. We report here on the activities of our committee over the past year. Each report is authored by the Lead Senator for that issue.

Discussion on Policy for Reporting Harrasment/Discrimination and Ombudsman Office
Lead: Frances Edwards

Clemson’s Legal Council and the Ombudsman are continuing to discuss policies that would deal with those who complained of sexual harassment and the required reporting under federal law. Both Clay Steadman and Gordon Halfacre will be reporting back to the new Welfare Committee on the information that they receive on how other universities handle this requirement after attending their respective national meetings.

For the next committee consideration, there may be a need to change the approach of the Grievance Committee that would, if there was a belief that there was any possibility of a claim, it should be sent to the Provost’s office, rather than making the Grievance Committee a final arbiter of many of the claims. The purpose of this change would be to lend more credence to the system and to create an awareness to the Provost’s office and other administrators where there are “pockets” of continuing problems. The committee should work with Des Layne to see a statistic of grievances filed with the Grievance Committee vs. the numbers that actually were forwarded to the Provost’s Office. Frances will also write a draft of “Perceptions of the Grievance Process” to be reviewed by the committee for possible dissemination to the faculty in gaining faculty perspective of the grievance process.

Top 20 Goal-Top 20 Compensation  Lead: William Bowerman

The Welfare Committee initiated a comparison of benefits among the top 30 public universities (U.S. News & World Report, 2006 rankings) which includes 32 universities. After our process was initiated, Mr. Lawrence Nichols was also been assigned by the President and the Board of Trustees to review and compare our benefits with the same 32 universities that our committee has been using. We initially focused on two benefits, bereavement and child care. The results of these two reviews were presented to the Senate. The child care issue review found that only Clemson University did not have a single child care center for its employees.

We have met several times with Mr. Nichols to ensure that we work cooperatively to provide the faculty with a single report. We discussed how to further our joint efforts into understanding how Clemson University stands regarding benefits in comparison with the top 32 public
universities. We decided to ask Mr. Nichols to investigate health care and retirement benefits in more detail over the coming year. Mr. Nichols has provided his preliminary report to the committee and we are working closely with him on this issue. Our recommendation for the next Senate is to consider appointment of a Senate Select Committee to oversee this work and include members from the Staff Senate.

**Issues Related to Child Care**  
Lead: Linda Li-Bleuel

Continuing to monitor progress on Child Care. A review of the Top 30 Public Universities found that only Clemson University did not have a university Child Care Center. This issue is now one of the priority issues for President Barker.

The child care center will be built as planned. The target date is still next year, however, a number of problems need to be worked out. The university is currently working through several administrative layers in order to fulfill this goal. President Barker and Provost Helms are fully behind this endeavor and plan to do whatever is necessary to get this child care center up and running. They have appointed Dr. Pat Smart to spearhead this issue. The new committee should continue to monitor this issue.

**Issues Related to Campus Parking**  
Lead: Meredith Futral

Details of the campus parking plan are found at:

http://stuaff.clemson.edu/parking/docs/ptmpResults.pdf

There has been no transportation/parking budget proposal submitted to the welfare committee. Geary Robinson is still working with University officials to develop the proposal. The transportation/parking consultant will soon present the Parking and Transportation Master Plan to the University Administrative Council. This issue should continue to be a priority for the new committee.

**Issues Related to Spousal Hires**  
Lead: Curtis White

We worked closely with Pat Smart in the Provost Office to ensure that none of the spousal hires interfered with departmental planned hires. Our mission was to make sure that spousal hires did not take precedence over planned departmental needs and that all of them followed the faculty manual hiring procedures. Our information indicated that none of that happened this year but there were some spousal hiring done. These were handled by Pat Smart and Lawrence Nichols on a case by case basis. I suggest that this process continue to be monitored and that some parameters are put in place to ensure approved processes are followed.

**General Welfare Issues**  
Lead: Yanming An

A proposal to form a committee, comprised of Past-Presidents of the Faculty Senate, to conduct exit interviews of faculty who voluntarily leave the university was reviewed, and then approved by the Senate.
Major Accomplishments during 2007-2008

- Initiated a review and comparison of benefits among the US News and World Report Top 32 Public Universities.
- Contributed significantly to progress on Day Care for Infants.
- Reviewed a proposal for a review process for faculty who voluntarily leave the university. This process was approved by the Senate.
- Facilitated a meeting between the University Ombudsman, University Legal Counsel, and the Office of Access and Equity related to the requirement to report of discrimination and harassment by the Ombudsman based on a new university policy.
- Had a very active and engaged committee, with every single member of the committee responsible for a major activity.

Recommendations for 2008-2009 Welfare Committee

- Consider appointing a Senate Select Committee on Benefits, including Staff Senate membership
- Continue to work on all other 2007-2008 priorities
- Develop a survey of faculty related to the Grievance Process, to better understand perceptions and past-experiences of faculty with this process

Additional Items

Those present at the Faculty Senate meeting in March were quite generous. They contributed $107 to Chuck Lindell.
Reevaluation of the Academic Calendar: According to Registrar Smith 12 distinct activities that take place on Mondays and Tuesdays prior to starting classes, particularly in the fall. These activities include convocation, general student advising, financial aid activities (deferred notes); fee payment; department/college meetings...Changing the calendar, therefore, was questioned! (8-14-07)

Big Thursday: The committee favors the Big Thursday activity in line with its long tradition at Clemson. Members, however, were concerned about the effect this event may have on classes and other academically related activities if the event takes place at 7:30 at the amphitheater. Committee members suggest the following:
1. Hold event at the Soccer Field (possibly starting earlier)
2. Hold the event across from Fike and consider marching to the Amphitheater around 9:00
3. Hold event at the amphitheater starting at 9:00 (8-14-07)

Student Assessment of Instruction: Student assessment of instruction is mandatory for all instructors at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. Summary of statistical ratings from student assessment of instruction will become part of the personnel review data for annual review, reappointment, tenure and promotion, and for post-tenure review consideration. The university will retain electronic copies of all summaries of statistical ratings for the purpose of verification that the evaluations have been carried out. Summary of statistical ratings from student assessment of instruction would be available to department chairs through the data warehouse but the actual responses from students (including comments) would not be available unless the faculty opted to submit them. Faculty may also opt to make available additional information regarding their teaching (9-18-07).

Admission of student athletes: Request to the president that
- The Guidelines and Procedures on Admission of Athletes should be submitted to the NCAA for review prior to the 2009 NCAA review.
- Wide range participation of faculty (senate), athletic council, faculty rep, and other constituents is sought when the present policy is reviewed at the end of the academic year (10-16-07)

Addition to the membership of the "summer reading" committee: Ex officio member from student Affairs (10-16-07)

Attendance Policy: With the assistance of Dr. Appling, the committee suggested a policy regarding class attendance for inclusion in the Undergraduate Announcements (11-20-07; 12-4-08)

Grade Inflation: A study similar in scope to the one completed in 1996 was endorsed by the committee (11-20-07; 12-4-08)
**Length" of final exam:** The committee recommended that students be allowed to use the entire time allowed for the exam (1-15-08)

**Integrity Policy –Undergraduate:** Discrepancy on committee membership between faculty manual and undergraduate announcements clarified (1-15-08).

**Integrity Policy-Graduate:** Policy was reviewed; questions/comments were shared with Graduate School (Felder); committee membership of 4 members per college to be reviewed in light of number of violations; language for inclusion in the faculty manual suggested (1-15-08; 2-19-08; 3-4-08)

**Classroom civility:** The committee recommends that a draft general statement be developed by the student senate (with input from the faculty senate, undergraduate council...) to be included in the undergraduate announcements. Dean Murdoch will communicate this request to the Student Senate (1-15-08)

**Core values-** CORE values statement developed by student government was presented (Integrity, Honesty, Respect) (2-19-08)

**Retention Committee:** A Freshman/sophomore Retention Committee intended to formulate academic policies and practices for student retention was endorsed by the committee for inclusion in faculty manual (2-19-08)

**Final exam** (Graduate Courses): The committee recommends that the final exam statement found in the Undergraduate Announcements (including a reference that students be allowed to use the entire time allowed for the exam) be adopted and published in the Graduate Announcements (2-19-08)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Katsiyannis, Antonis (Chair)</th>
<th>Teach Ed</th>
<th>407C Tillman</th>
<th>656-5114</th>
<th>antonis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Girgis, Adly</td>
<td>ECE</td>
<td>303A Riggs</td>
<td>656-5936</td>
<td>adly1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelburne, Vic</td>
<td>For Natl Res</td>
<td>212 Lehotsky</td>
<td>656-4855</td>
<td>vshlbrrn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, Kelly</td>
<td>Phil/Rel</td>
<td>208 Hardin</td>
<td>656-5366</td>
<td>kcs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weisenmiller, Eric</td>
<td>Graph Comm</td>
<td>G-01 Tillman</td>
<td>656-3653</td>
<td>emweise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willoughby, Deborah</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>409 Edwards</td>
<td>656-1437</td>
<td>willoud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winchell, Donna</td>
<td>Engl</td>
<td>609 Strode</td>
<td>656-7892</td>
<td>winched</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Major Action Items

1. Clemson University Policy On Prayer

The Policy Committee recommended that no statement be added to the Faculty Manuel regarding a University Policy On Public Prayer. This item was a carryover from the previous year and was thoroughly debated by the Policy Committee. The decision to not include a statement was approved and endorsed by the Executive/Advisory Committee and the Faculty Senate. The Policy Committee did propose that, if a Policy On Public Prayer was appropriate, it should be proposed by the Clemson Administration.

2. University Sexual Harassment Policy

Access and Equity, with the support of General Council, proposed that grievance 1 petitions regarding sexual harassment be heard by Access and Equity and not the University Grievance Board. Their rationale was that our current Grievance Procedures violated a mandate from the OCR. The Policy Committee challenged this request and asked General Council to transmit our current policy to the OCR in Washington and obtain their ruling if our policy was in violation of Federal Guidelines as was suggested. As a result, there was no objection raised by the OCR and the Policy Committee recommended that Grievance 1 petitions regarding sexual harassment continue to be heard by the University.
Grievance Committee. The Executive/Advisory Committee and the Faculty Senate approved this. Minor wording changes to the Faculty Manual regarding the Access and Equity Policy were also approved.

3. Reconstitution of the Clemson University Research Council

The Policy Committee was informed that the Clemson Research Council under the Office of the Vice President for Research and Economic Development has not met under the current Vice President. The mission of the Research Council is to monitor research and make recommendations to the Vice President regarding research priorities and initiatives. The Policy Committee agreed with the concerns and a letter was written to the Vice President from the Faculty Senate President and the Chair of the Policy Committee requesting that the Research Council be re-established immediately. The Vice President responded favorably to the request and the Research Council is now meeting on a regular basis.

4. Emeritus College

The establishment and governance of the Emeritus College has been a hotly debated campus issue. The Policy Committee was asked to consider a series of items regarding the By-Laws, membership, and other issues related to the Emeritus College. A Senate Select Committee, with the Chair being a member of the Policy Committee, was appointed to determine the validity of these charges. Their final report is forth coming. The Policy Committee did recommend that reference to the Emeritus College regarding membership be removed from the Faculty Manual. This was approved by the Executive/Advisory Committee and the Faculty Senate. The Policy Committee also recommended
that the By-Laws of the Emeritus College and not a Faculty Senate issue but their approval is the responsibility of the Provost. The Policy Committee will consider the report of the Select Committee once it is submitted.

5. Policy on Research Ethics

The Policy Committee at the request of the Vice President for Research and Economic Development was requested to endorse a new policy on Research Ethics. The policy was developed in response to new Federal Regulations regarding Research Ethics. The Policy Committee responded with several concerns including the lack of appropriate faculty representation on hearing panels, eliminating input from the Faculty Senate President, and other editorial changes. The Policy Committee transmitted its recommendations to the Vice President and they were incorporated into the new policy. The Executive/Advisory Committee and the Faculty Senate approved the recommendations of the Policy Committee.

6. Clarification of “Separate and Independent” Letters From Department Chairs and TPR Committees

Several attempts have been proposed to clarify the wording of “separate and independent” with regards to letters from Chairs and TPR Committees. The Policy Committee recommended changes to the Faculty Manual to “hopefully” make this distinction. The recommendation was approved by the Executive/Advisory Committee and approved by the Faculty Senate.

Action Items for the 2008-09 Policy Committee

1. Resolution of all issues regarding the Emeritus College

The Policy Committee will respond to any recommendations made by the Senate Select Committee. We await their report.
2. **Ranks and Titles**

The Select Committee For Ranks and Titles has submitted its report. There are several recommendations that will require Policy Committee action. Hopefully issues centered on Lecture positions and rights and privileges can be resolved.

3. **Policy For Academic Ethics**

The Policy Committee has received requests that a Policy for Violation of Academic Ethics be considered. The Committee will work with the Rutland Center to determine if such a policy is necessary and also to establish what are appropriate ethics and what constitutes a violation of those ethics. The results of these discussions will also be applicable to the Research Ethics Policy.

4. **What is the Faculty Manual and What Does It Govern?**

The Policy Committee will undertake a thorough review of the Faculty Manual and make recommendations as to what is appropriate material to be contained in the Manual. This is not intended to reduce the jurisdiction of the Manual but to insure that its policies are being properly carried out.
Report of the Faculty Senate Select Committee on Emeritus Issues

April 8, 2008

Committee Members: Lydia Schleifer (chair), Lucy Rollin, Dave Senn, Pat Smart, Deborah Thomason

The Faculty Senate Select Committee on Emeritus Issues (FSSCEI) was charged by Charlie Gooding, Faculty Senate President, with the following questions:

1) Are the rights, roles, and privileges of emeritus faculty described in the Faculty Manual sufficiently complete, correct and desirable?

2) What are the pros and cons of changing the name of the Emeritus College to Emeritus Society or something similar (recalling that this was brought before the Senate last spring and tabled)?

3) What are the pros and cons of the Emeritus College having one or more voting representative(s) on the Faculty Senate?

4) Should the Senate take a more active role than it does now to inform the faculty about emeritus issues? If so, what should be done?

5) Anything else that the Committee thinks is appropriate.

Each of these questions is addressed in the following sections, which also include selected portions of the Faculty Manual or Emeritus College website information.

- Are the rights, roles, and privileges of emeritus faculty described in the Faculty Manual sufficiently complete, correct and desirable?

The following passages excerpted from the Faculty Manual include all mentions of the provisions for emeritus faculty. The emeritus faculty members who were on the FSSCEI agreed that the FM does adequately describe the rights, roles, and privileges of emeritus faculty.

From G. TERIed Faculty:

Upon exiting the TERI program, faculty members who have sufficient years of service become emeritus faculty. (III-7)

From H. Emeritus Faculty:
Regular faculty members, including library faculty, who have served at least five years at the university and fifteen years in the academic profession receive the title of Emeritus or Emerita appended to their professorial rank upon official retirement. All retired faculty and professional staff are entitled to become members of an emeritus organization, whether or not they meet the requirements above.

In recognition of their service to the university, their honored place in the university community, and their ongoing capacities for advancing human knowledge and contributing to the intellectual and cultural life of the university, emeritus faculty as scholars have certain rights and privileges accorded to them by Clemson University. For example, they are members of the university faculty (see Part VII below, Faculty Constitution, Article I, Section 1) and are welcome to participate fully in all meetings of the university faculty. Colleges and academic departments may extend similar invitations to their retired colleagues. (III-7)

From I.: Retired Faculty

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

Those retired faculty who remain professionally active shall be allocated office and laboratory space to an extent commensurate with the level of their activity. Not less than three nor more than twelve months prior to retirement, the faculty member shall submit to the department chair a brief description of the nature and proposed level of activity. (III-7)

5. Research Grants Committee consists of two faculty representatives elected for three-year terms by the faculty of each college plus one member elected for a three-year term from the library. The chair is elected annually by the committee. This committee receives applications for grants in support of research from faculty members in all departments of the university. Eligible faculty are those with tenure, tenure-track, or emeritus faculty status. (VII-12)

ARTICLE I: THE FACULTY

Section I. Membership
The Faculty of Clemson University consists of the President; Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost; other administrators with faculty rank; faculty with regular appointments as Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, or Instructor; Librarians; Emeritus Faculty; and such other individuals as the faculty may duly elect. (VII-17)

As a rule, there shall be thirty-five members of the Faculty Senate. Emeritus faculty are excluded from the Faculty count for the purpose of Senate seat allocation. (VIII-3)

The Provost shall publicize a proposed amendment at least three weeks prior to the meeting at which action is to be taken. Amendments may be considered at either of the regular faculty meetings held at the conclusion of the long semesters. A two-thirds majority vote of the members present is required for passage with a quorum defined as at least one-half of the faculty, exclusive of emeritus faculty. (VIII-7)

- What are the pros and cons of changing the name of the Emeritus College to Emeritus Society or something similar (recalling that this was brought before the Senate last spring and tabled)?
The name Emeritus College has been approved by the Provost and is preferred by the EC members who were on the FSSCEI. The term “college”, more so than the terms “association” and “society”, conveys the nature of the activities that the Emeritus College director and advisory board envision as being the focus of the Emeritus College. Such activities are those that are consistent with the goals of the EC summarized in the following section (obtained from the EC’s website). A drawback of the use of the term “college” is that some Clemson University employees have reservations about the implication that the EC is a college on a par with the five academic colleges of Clemson University. Others have expressed concerns about the use of Clemson University resources to support the activities of the EC, about the EC’s accountability, and about the extent of faculty governance within the EC. Overall, the main disadvantage of using the term “college” seems to be the misunderstanding about the EC’s purpose and the nature of its activities.

The Emeritus College uses the goals below to help direct its efforts.

- To identify and advance the continuing intellectual interests of retired faculty.
- To facilitate the service of retired faculty to the University, community and society.
- To help disseminate retirees’ accumulated knowledge, wisdom and expertise under the Clemson aegis.
- To provide a seamless transition for faculty into retirement as well as a focal point for activities and social interaction.
- To encourage and facilitate retired faculty involvement with students, junior faculty, alumni, faculty governance, University administration and the greater Clemson community.
- To support Clemson in the continuation of research and scholarly pursuits, including publication and grantsmanship.
- To serve as an incentive for recruitment of senior faculty and for retiring faculty to remain contiguous to the University.

Insofar as the above are realized, the common good of the Emeritus College is to provide a means by which retired faculty may keep their minds vigorous, their interests impacting others and their intellect sharp for the betterment of academia. (from the EC website)

- What are the pros and cons of the Emeritus College having one or more voting representative(s) on the Faculty Senate?

The EC members who are on the FSSCEI have conveyed that they do not perceive the need for the EC to have voting representatives on the Faculty Senate. In addition, they do not perceive a need for the EC to have a liaison to the Faculty Senate. They would like to be able to attend Faculty Senate meetings if interested, and to be able to make, maybe once a year, presentations about EC matters to the Faculty Senate.
- Should the Senate take a more active role than it does now to inform the faculty about emeritus issues? If so, what should be done?

Yes, the Senate should take an active role in informing the faculty about emeritus issues since so many of the faculty will someday become Emeritus faculty. The Senate can publicize information about the EC’s website, and consider cosponsoring EC presentations or workshops for faculty.

- Anything else that the Committee thinks is appropriate.

In section G. TERIed Faculty of the FM, it looks like ANY (regular and special) faculty member can be a TERIed faculty member, and that “upon exiting the TERI program, faculty with “sufficient years of service become emeritus faculty”. Does this mean that Lecturers in the TERI program can become Emeritus faculty?

In section H. Emeritus Faculty, the sticking point is the statement that “(a)ll retired faculty and professional staff are entitled to become members of an emeritus organization, whether or not they meet the requirements above.” (which are the number of years required to have the Emeritus title). The implication could be that being entitled means not having to apply for membership or wait to be invited to join the EC. In addition, the reference to “an emeritus organization” could be interpreted as THE Emeritus College, and not a retirement association (such as the one available for retired staff).

With regard to the second paragraph of the Emeritus section, if all TERIed faculty can become Emeritus (as in my question above) what is the implication of the statement that emeritus faculty “are members of the university faculty and are welcome to participate fully in all meetings of the university faculty”? Does this mean attendance only, or does it mean voting rights also?

G. TERIed Faculty
Faculty (and staff) who meet retirement eligibility criteria with the South Carolina Retirement System may sign a TERI (Teacher and Employee Retention Incentive) agreement under which their retirement pension is deposited in a non-interest-bearing account while they continue to perform their regular duties for up to five years. TERIed faculty enjoy all the rights, privileges, and responsibilities of regular faculty. Upon exiting the TERI program, faculty members who have sufficient years of service become emeritus faculty. Additional information about the TERI program can be found on the Office of Human Resources website. (III-7)

In summary, this report recommends that the Faculty Manual not, as this time, be revised to include guidelines and provisions directly related to the Emeritus College. The rights and privileges of emeritus faculty are already addressed in the FM. Some EC members perceived the process of passing the EC bylaws as a violation of the Faculty Manual and as resulting in an EC that is more exclusionary than desirable. The FSSCEI is not in a position to make a determination of whether there is a violation of the
FM; however, the committee has discussed the idea of exploring ways in which the EC can be more inclusive, consistent with the EC's purpose of contributing to Clemson University.

This report also recommends that the FSSCEI continue to examine issues related to the Emeritus College and further consider the issue of how much oversight the Faculty Senate and Faculty Manual should have with regard to the Emeritus College.
Introduction
The committee was formed in March 2005 by President Webb Smathers and continued by Presidents Connie Lee and Beth Kunkel. The members were Charlie Gooding, Bob Green, Mickey Hall and Rachel Mayo with Eleanor Hare and Holey Ulbrich, ex-officio. The committee was reconstituted in the fall of 2007 by President Charlie Gooding. Dan Warner, Donna Winchell, Alan Grubb and Bryan Simmons were added to the committee with Lawrence Nichols, ex-officio. Catherine Watt and Jessica Pierce were the committee’s primary contacts in Institutional Research.

The original charge of the committee was broad: that it consider problems relating to all the special faculty titles. In addition the charge included recommending any new titles, especially those for teaching faculty. The total scope of the undertaking was considerably more complex than expected. What follows is a very brief summary of the committee’s findings and suggestions for future consideration by the Faculty Senate. One overarching recommendation is that the Policy Committee of the Senate monitor the use of ranks and titles and make recommendations as needed. Oversight will prevent abuses of policy and lead to recommendations which will allow the necessary flexibility so that faculty will have opportunities to be productive. Perhaps the Policy Committee could schedule a review of the status of ranks and titles each fall. A second recommendation is that the appointment of all faculty, including their titles (with the exception of non-teaching lecturers) be approved by a departmental faculty. The Policy Committee may evaluate the Faculty Manual to determine if there any loopholes which would engender appointment of faculty without departmental approval and establish ways by which this policy can be effectively enforced.

Lecturers
Currently there are approximately 450 lecturers employed by Clemson University. The University recognizes three titles within this category: lecturer, senior lecturer and (since the inception of this committee) non-teaching lecturer. The distinction between lecturer and non-teaching lecturer is now evident in telephone book listings. The state classifies all these as lecturers and as faculty. According to their business title, the vast majority of those classified as lecturer (and senior lecturer) appear to be involved in instruction. However, there are some whose business title brings into question their level of commitment to teaching. Hiring someone into a lecturer position at Clemson can be initiated by the head of any academic department or non-academic unit.

The motivation behind hiring people into non-teaching jobs and giving them the title of lecturer stems principally from the expressed need to pay a higher salary than could be paid in an available and appropriate state job classification without obtaining special approval from the State Office of Human Resources. The state has restrictive guidelines for salaries of classified staff. Hiring salaries are somewhat more flexible for
unclassified staff. At educational institutions, South Carolina recognizes faculty as a special type of unclassified employee and places no restrictions on salary. Whenever possible, Clemson hires higher level staff at competitive salaries using recognized, unclassified staff titles that are appropriate to the job. If that is not possible, Clemson hires staff as lecturers and designates them internally as non-teaching lecturers. The state has discouraged this practice and has told Clemson on numerous occasions not to use the title unless the person hired will be performing lecturer duties. Most peer institutions polled claim they do not use this practice. However, it is possible that they misunderstood the intent of the question. Both USC and MUSC have used lecturer and instructor titles for non-teaching personnel, but the practice does not seem to be nearly as common as at Clemson.

There is concern that calling individuals “lecturer” who do not teach could result in errors in counting for various surveys and reporting requirements. Clemson cannot “hide” administrators in this way because the state requires the university to submit a complete organization chart for each academic and non-academic unit each year. When Institutional Research reports statistics such as number of faculty or student/faculty ratios, they use internal job titles that describe what individuals actually do. This is one reason why the internal designation “non-teaching lecturer” was created. Some people fall into gray areas when such counting is done (e.g., people who were hired as staff, but teach an occasional course related to their areas of work; people who once were faculty, but now have a job that is primarily administrative). The number of ambiguous cases is unknown, but presumed modest, so it does not lead to significant errors in counting.

It appears that departments can utilize state approved unclassified titles in some of the cases where the title lecturer is used. Some of these require submission of a position description, which departments often do not want to write. Of the titles on the approved list, the ones most likely to apply are the Research Associate, Scientist, and Academic Program Director series. (In some cases Academic Program Director has been interpreted broadly to mean a person in charge of any program at an academic institution; i.e., it is not restricted to the heads of academic units that teach students and conduct research.)

Recommendations:
1. Whenever possible, units should use existing unclassified titles rather than relying on the title of “lecturer.” An attempt should be made to convert as many existing non-teaching lecturers as possible to an appropriate unclassified position.
2. The Administration should enter into dialogue with the state to recognize additional unclassified titles, such as “administrative professional”, with appropriate pay scales in order to reduce the dependency on the title “lecturer.”
3. The Office of Institutional Research should seek input from units as to the job duties of all lecturers. This should reduce any error in reporting instructional faculty.
4. A clear grievance procedure for non-instructional lecturers and other unclassified staff should be established.
5. The Staff Senate should consider allowing non-instructional lecturers and other unclassified staff to participate in this governing body.

Numbers 1, 4 and 5 are essentially consistent with the minutes dated March 22, 2006 of the Task Force on Lecturers and Unclassified Employees chaired by Clay Steadman.

**Research Faculty**
Current there are approximately 45 faculty with the title of: research assistant professor, associate professor or professor. There are also about 115 employees with the title research associate. The practice of categorizing employees as both has ceased. In the recent past, the state converted any faculty with split designation to research faculty. However, some include both in their business titles. Research Associates are not considered faculty by Institutional Research.

The *Faculty Manual* (part 111, paragraph E.4) stipulates that research faculty "are supported exclusively (including fringe benefits) from external funds or foundation accounts." However, it is clear that a number of such faculty are being funded from accounts other than these. Approximately 13 have some portion of their money coming from the E+G account and a number from PSA accounts. Because part of the PSA funds come from the federal government, the support of these faculty has been considered extramural. The source of the E+G money is difficult to know with certainty, as indirect funds from grants are put into these accounts. If this were the case for some faculty, then that portion of their support arguably could be considered extramural. Finally, there are faculty who are supported on extramural funds of PI’s other than themselves. While this meets the letter of the faculty manual stipulations, it may be argued that some of these employees would be better classified as research associates.

In any case, it is clear that the stipulations of the Faculty Manual are not being strictly enforced in many cases. One of the stated reasons for the deviations is so that non-tenure track employees can be competitive in applying for grants. In general, employees with non-faculty titles (including research associate) or titles such as lecturer, do not normally compete well in the proposal process, or their proposals are not considered.

**Recommendations:**
1. The faculty manual should be revised such that the source of funds for research faculty is unspecified. The principal emphasis should be on the fact that these are non-tenure track positions and a significant function of the faculty is to conduct research. It is expected that hybrid positions will arise. For example a lecturer may transition to a research faculty if they take on research duties.
2. Specific expectations for the faculty member in terms of fund-raising and other research performance issues should be addressed in contracts.
3. As with all faculty, compliance with part 111, paragraph E.4 of the *Faculty Manual* should be enforced such that research faculty are appointed only upon initiation by a departmental faculty and are subject to "annual review utilizing the faculty activity system for faculty continuance." This should address the concerns of the Senate, and the faculty in general, that such positions can be established.
administratively, using funds and lines that might otherwise go to tenure-track positions.

Teaching Faculty

One of the charges of the committee was to consider tracks for faculty whose principal responsibility was teaching. During deliberations, faculty who might be considered clinical in some capacity were also discussed. These faculty perform duties such as teaching laboratory classes, e.g., nursing clinicals, and supervising students in professional field placements, e.g., education's student teachers. Currently most of these employees hold lecturer titles and the only advancement is from lecturer to senior lecturer, which does allow for a three-year contract. An internet search revealed that many institutions do have clinical faculty of one form or another, typically non-tenure track faculty whose responsibilities are limited to teaching and/or clinical supervision.

Institutional Research conducted a survey on this matter for the committee through the equivalent offices at 12 regional Universities (Alabama, Alabama-Birmingham, Arkansas, Auburn, Delaware, Georgia State, Kentucky, LSU, North Carolina-Chapel Hill, Mississippi, Tennessee, and Virginia). The question asked was: “Have you considered alternative titled ranks for those who are almost exclusively involved with teaching? If so, would they be tenure-track or not?” Three institutions indicated that such ranks were being considered, but no action had been taken. Three indicated that clinical, teaching or academic prefixes were used. Five institutions reported using only lecturer or an equivalent title, with one of these having a title equivalent to our senior lecturer. Two institutions simply replied “no” to the question. Only one institution indicated that they had discussed making such positions tenure-track.

Recommendations:

Clemson University should explore the creation of “clinical faculty” or “faculty of practice,” whichever title appears more appropriate to the University’s needs. The intent is to provide an opportunity for professional growth for non-tenure track but full-time faculty who are primarily involved in instruction and/or clinical supervision. Typical provisions follow.

These faculty would
• be appointed at the “instructor,” “assistant,” “associate,” or “professor” level for fixed, renewable terms and be eligible for promotion from level to level. Criteria for appointment, reappointment and promotion to and within these positions would be developed by departments (approved by Dean and Provost) and focus specifically on the assigned teaching and/or clinical supervisory tasks. All appointments and reappointments would be contingent upon availability of funds.
• participate in all usual employment benefits.
• undergo annual performance review, reappointment and promotion reviews as do tenure track faculty.
• participate in faculty governance and committees with the exception of matters regarding reappointment, tenure, and promotion of tenure track faculty.
• be eligible to apply for regular, tenure track positions where qualified, although time in clinical or faculty of practice positions would not count toward probationary period.

These recommendations are based on a review of non-tenure track ranks at comparable institutions such as University of Georgia, University of Iowa, University of Michigan, University of Nebraska, Oklahoma State University, University of South Carolina, and the Non-Tenure Track Statement of the MLA (Modern Languages Association).

Vanity Titles
It has come to the committee’s attention that some faculty hold titles not identified in the Faculty Manual. One such title involves the use of the prefix “Distinguished.” It is not clear that in each case these titles were initiated by a departmental faculty. Further, without any definition of the basis for awarding these titles, they could be construed as endowed or titled professorships. These are stipulated by the Manual as being funded, at least in part, by endowments or other non-state sources. The argument for such titles as “Distinguished” is that they may be of value in recruiting highly meritorious faculty and, identifying existing faculty who have made exceptional contributions to their field.

Recommendation:
The Faculty Senate should consider a regular rank having the prefix “Distinguished”, with criteria established such as those in section III, paragraph D of the Faculty Manual for the usual ranks of the professorship. It is assumed that promotion to this rank would be handled in the same way as identified for the usual ranks. It is anticipated that only a small percentage of the faculty would hold this rank.
Faculty Senate Report to the Board of Trustees
Spring 2008
Charles H. Gooding, Faculty Senate President

One of the highlights of the spring semester was a three-hour forum on CU-ICAR, hosted at the Strom Thurmond Institute on February 29 by the Faculty Senate. The forum was designed to bring campus faculty and staff up to date on progress and plans for research programs and graduate education at the Greenville facility and the role of CU-ICAR in upstate economic development. Over 100 people attended to hear presentations by President Jim Barker, CU-ICAR Executive Director Bob Geolas, Vice President Chris Przirembel, Mechanical Engineering Department Chair Imtiaz Haque, CFO Brett Dalton, and Provost Dori Helms. A question and answer period followed, and not surprisingly, inquiring minds wanted to know more about resource allocations and what effect investments in CU-ICAR are having on other programs on campus. The forum was a significant contribution to strengthening of dialog, openness, understanding, and trust between the faculty and the university administration.

The Senate Policy Committee completed its collaboration with Tracy Arwood from the Office of Research and Economic Development to develop a new university policy on research ethics that is in line with the latest government guidelines. The full Senate endorsed the new policy at its March meeting.

The Scholastic Policies Committee recommended clarifications in Faculty Manual provisions on administrative access and use of student evaluations of instructors, which are now completed electronically. Discussions with the Provost are continuing on this and other policies and procedures that relate to the evaluation of faculty for reappointment, tenure, and promotion as well as annual performance reviews of faculty and periodic post-tenure review.

The Welfare Committee has been working with the University Ombuds Office, Access and Equity, and the General Counsel to clarify the obligations and limitations of the ombudspersons in dealing with potential cases of harassment or unlawful discrimination.

New Faculty Senate officers were elected at the March meeting. Bryan Simmons of Graphic Communications took over as President on April 8, Bill Bowerman of Forestry and Natural Resources was elected Vice President/President-Elect, and Linda Howe of Nursing was elected Secretary.
Proposed Change in the Faculty Manual: Part VII, B 2 f (page VII-5)

Old Language

Graduate Academic Integrity Committee. Allegations of violations of academic integrity on the part of a graduate student should be brought to the attention of the Graduate Academic Integrity Committee through the Office of the Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School. The committee’s policies and procedures are available through the Graduate School. Membership of this committee consists of five tenured faculty members involved in graduate education (one from each college elected by the collegiate faculty for two-year terms) and two graduate students approved by the Graduate Student Senate for no more than a two-year term. A chairperson will be elected from within the Committee's membership. The chairperson is a voting member of the Committee. The Dean is the administrative coordinator and non-voting member of the Academic Integrity Committee. All proceedings of the committee are confidential. Details may be found in Graduate School Announcements.

Proposed New Language

Graduate Academic Integrity Committee. Allegations of violations of academic integrity on the part of a graduate student should be addressed according to the policy and the procedures of the Graduate Academic Integrity Committee. The Graduate Academic Integrity Committee membership consists of four tenured faculty members from each of the academic colleges who serve two-year staggered terms and five graduate students, one from each college, and one selected from the interdisciplinary programs of the Graduate School, all of whom serve one year terms. An associate dean of the Graduate School is the administrative coordinator and non-voting member of the Graduate Academic Integrity Committee. The full text of the policy and procedure of the Graduate Academic Integrity Committee may be found in the Graduate School Announcements and on-line at www.grad.clemson.edu/academicintegrity

Rationale: The new language is congruent with the current Graduate School policy
RETENTION COMMITTEE(S)

The following committees were proposed by the Office of the Undergraduate Dean.

The Freshman Retention Committee formulates academic policies and practices for retaining students from freshman to sophomore year. The committee reviews best practices in freshman retention and Clemson data on student success and recommends strategies for faculty to impact these indicators positively. Voting membership consists of six elected tenured or tenure-track faculty, one from each college and the library. Voting members serve two year terms. Nonvoting members include the President of the Freshman Council, who serves a one-year term, and the Dean of Undergraduate Studies, who serves as chair.

The Sophomore Retention Committee formulates academic policies and practices for retaining students from sophomore to junior year. The committee reviews best practices in sophomore retention and Clemson data on student success and recommends strategies for faculty to impact these indicators positively. Voting membership consists of six elected tenured or tenure-track faculty, one from each college and the library. Voting members serve two year terms. Nonvoting members include a sophomore appointed by the President of the Undergraduate Student Senate, who serves a one-year term, and the Dean of Undergraduate Studies, who serves as chair.

The Scholastic Policies committee questioned the need for two committees and suggested the development of one committee as follows

The Freshman/Sophomore Retention Committee formulates academic policies and practices for retaining students from freshman to sophomore to junior year. The committee reviews best practices in freshman/sophomore retention and Clemson data on student success and recommends strategies for faculty to impact these indicators positively. Voting membership consists of six elected tenured or tenure-track faculty, one from each college and the library. Voting members serve two year terms. Nonvoting members include a member from the Freshman Council, who serves a one-year term, a sophomore appointed by the President of the Undergraduate Student Senate, who serves a one-year term, and the Dean of Undergraduate Studies, who serves as chair.
Faculty Senate President’s Report
Charles H. Gooding
April 8, 2008

My comments today might remind you of an acceptance speech at Hollywood’s Academy Awards ceremony because I consider having served as Faculty Senate President for the last year to be an honor, and there are people I want to thank for making it possible. Yes, there was work involved, and there were innumerable meetings to attend, but it has been a privilege for me to represent the faculty and to work with so many interesting people. I thank you all for supporting me, and I especially want to thank the following individuals.

Senate Officers
Bryan Simmons, Vice President
Deborah Thomason, Secretary

Standing Committee Chairs
Mark Smotherman, Finance
Bill Bowerman, Welfare
Antonis Katsiyannis, Scholastic Policies
Christina Wells, Research
Bill Surver, Policy

Select Committee Chairs
Lydia Schleifer, Emeritus College Issues
Hap Wheeler, Ranks and Titles

Last week I heard Dan Schmiedt, outgoing President of the Staff Senate, say something simple, but profound to his committee chairs, and I want to say the same thing to you. “You didn’t have to do this.” It wasn’t part of your job as a faculty member, and there were other ways you could have invested your time. But each of you spent countless selfless hours in service to your colleagues and to the university, and I thank you for that.

I also want to thank Pat Smart, the Provost’s liaison to the Faculty Senate, Beth Kunkel, Past President of the Senate, and John Ballato, Faculty Representative to the Board of Trustees for their frequent wise counsel. I enjoyed working with numerous members of the university’s Administrative Council and I appreciate their cooperation, and I enjoyed working with Staff Senate President Dan Schmiedt and undergraduate and graduate student leaders Josh Bell, Seth Vining, and Tom Richey.

I want to thank Provost Dori Helms and President Jim Barker for their belief in the concept of shared governance and their genuine respect for the Faculty Senate. And thank you, Dori, for the salary support that enabled me to devote 50% of my time to Senate work over the last year.

And most especially I want to thank my long time friend, invaluable colleague, and Senate Goddess, Cathy Sturkie, for providing constant help, guidance, and encouragement.
Finally, I want to leave you with a condensed form of the five traits of leadership I asked you to adopt as our model early in the Senate year. These originally came from an address I heard by Dr. Eugene Washington, Provost at the University of California, San Francisco. They are worth remembering as we close one Senate year and open the next.

Great leaders are truth seekers. They recognize the empowerment that comes with truth, and they know that the basis for critical decision-making and action must be the discernment of truth. They seek the truth, and they are not afraid to change their opinions when facts point to truth they had not previously seen or understood.

Great leaders are on a mission that is not about a specific task or project, but about a meaningful life. Their sense of mission is driven by two forces - the unquenchable desire to make the world a better place, and the recognition that life is finite. Your time on stage is limited. Make good use of it.

Great leaders are nurturers. They derive joy from developing other people’s talents, freeing individuals to express themselves, and supporting others in achieving their goals.

Great leaders focus on their team or cause, rather than on their own accomplishments. For them the reward is in the achievement of the goal rather than in the recognition for doing it.

Great leaders draw from a reservoir of faith, which may include, but is not limited to religious traditions. The faith of which Dr. Washington spoke includes faith in the ability of people, including yourself, to do good things; faith that truth and good ideas will eventually prevail; and faith in the potential of things unseen. Some things must be believed before they can be seen. Great leaders have the faith that is often required to see the lights of a path forward when others are lost in darkness and despair.

Go and be great leaders, and thank you for an incredible year.
MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
MAY 13, 2008

1. Call to Order: The Faculty Senate Meeting was called to order at 2:34 p.m. by President Bryan Simmons and guests were recognized and introduced.

2. Approval of Minutes: The Faculty Senate Minutes dated April 8, 2008 were approved as written.

3. "Free Speech": None

4. Special Order of the Day: Geary Robinson, Director of Parking Services, and Tony Dickerson, Student Affairs Business Officer, provided an update of current and future parking plans. Various scenarios for financial planning assumptions and recommendations were also presented and the Faculty Senate was asked to provide feedback. Senators were directed to the website: www/Clemson.edu/studentaffairs/parking for more information and newly-updated information on the "Parking and Transportation Master Plan." A comparison with Top 50 institutes was also provided (Attachment A). Questions and answers were then exchanged.

5. Election of Senate/Faculty Representatives to University Committees: Normal voting rules were suspended in order to allow elections by plurality. Elections of Faculty Senators/Faculty representatives to University Committees were held by secret ballot.

6. Committee Reports:
   a. Senate Committees:
      1) Finance Committee – Chair Wayne Sarasua stated that there was no report but that the issue of parking would be addressed this year.
      2) Welfare Committee – Chair Christina Wells stated that this Committee will spearhead a faculty survey (its biggest issue) this year. A Faculty Senate Faculty Survey has not been undertaken since 1999.
      3) Scholastic Policies - Senator Vic Shelburne for Chair Antonis Katsiyannis noted that there was no report.
      4) Research Committee – Chair John Meriwether stated that the Committee will address unfinished business from the last Senate Session.
      5) Policy Committee – Senator Alan Grubb for Chair Bill Surver noted that this Committee will meet in late May to address an allegation of a Faculty Manual violation. An issue the Committee was asked to pursue was that of
classified/unclassified staff in various University situations and whether or not clarifications should be made in the *Faculty Manual*, where appropriate.

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

7. **President's Report:** President Simmons stated that he enjoyed giving scholarship awards to students at both graduation exercises and that in between the graduation exercises he had an opportunity to talk with some Trustees, the President and the Provost on various issues. President Simmons shared with the Senate that two of our former senators were honored at the morning Graduation: Beth Kunkel, as the recipient of the Algernon Sydney Sullivan Award and Alma Bennett, the 2007 Class of '39 Award for Excellence recipient. President Simmons announced that David Guynn, Forestry and Natural Resources, was selected as the 2008 Centennial Professor.

Fran McGuire was asked and then explained a surprise given to former Class of '39 Award recipients. The former recipients were recently called to President Barker's office for an unknown reason. President Barker presented each of them with a framed, signed and numbered watercolor of the Bell Tower by President Barker. This action by our President has reinforced in the minds of the recipients his personal touch and thoughtfulness with so many other, more consuming University business at hand.

8. **Old Business:** None

9. **New Business:**
   a. Each Senator introduced her/himself.

10. **Announcements:**
    a. President Simmons stated that the June Faculty Senate meeting is canceled, as is the May Executive/Advisory Committee meeting.

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

[Signature]
Linda Howe, Secretary

[Signature]
Cathy Toth Sturkie, Program Coordinator

Absent: H. Liu, B. Surver, Y. An, S. Clarke, G. Tissera, M. LaForge, L. Schleifer (C. Cantalupo for), E. Weisenmiller, J. King, P. Srimani, A. Katsiyannis (B. Green for), D. Willoughby (J. Lindle for)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Cost of Commuter Permit for a Surface Lot Space</th>
<th>Cost of General Parking as a Visitor on Football Gameday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arizona State University</td>
<td>Range $180-$600</td>
<td>$180-$480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baldwin-Wallace College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ball State University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boise State University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BYU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cal State Fullerton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carroll College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Washington University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clemson University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus Regional Airport Authority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creighton University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dartmouth College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida Atlantic University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Mason University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia College &amp; State University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Southern University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa State University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IUPUI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas State University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennesaw State University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent State University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lehigh University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana State University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi State University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri State University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico State University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeastern State University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Michigan University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Virginia Community College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma State University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OU Medical Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger Williams University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutgers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose State University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seton Hall University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Adventist University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarleton State University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas A&amp;M University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas at Austin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost for UNNUMBERED space in a non-gated surface lot</strong></td>
<td><strong>Range is between $180 - $600</strong></td>
<td><strong>$180 - $480</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>Parking Costs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Ohio State University</td>
<td>$606 - $311.50, depending upon your classification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Towson University</td>
<td>$42.75/mo or $35.75/mo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The College of New Jersey</td>
<td>$16/Month $192/yr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. T. Dallas</td>
<td>$140/yr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Davis</td>
<td>$210 per year, $155 per semester</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ of Colorado at Boulder</td>
<td>$394 (lot specific) or $279 (zone parking)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of Central Missouri</td>
<td>$233 a year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of North Texas</td>
<td>$564 per year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Northern Colorado</td>
<td>Free to Faculty/Staff - University pays $90 to TPS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Arizona</td>
<td>$42.75/month</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Arkansas Medical Sciences</td>
<td>$564 per year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California, Davis</td>
<td>$204 uncovered $432 covered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Central Oklahoma</td>
<td>$144.00-$264.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Colorado at Boulder</td>
<td>$585 for the 2008 permit year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Denver</td>
<td>$160-255 per year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Denver</td>
<td>$10 per day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Houston</td>
<td>$17.00 month</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Kansas</td>
<td>$117/yr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Kentucky</td>
<td>$381 per year. Not limited to staff though.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Michigan</td>
<td>$400 (general), $898 (premium)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Missouri - Columbia</td>
<td>$267.67 academic or $89.22 quarterly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Nebraska Medical Center</td>
<td>Determined by pay, from $0.75 to $6.00 bi weekly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of New Hampshire</td>
<td>$50/Sem Summer is $50 but is prorated weekly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Texas</td>
<td>$161.50 or $131.75/semester</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oklahoma</td>
<td>$456 per year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oklahoma - Health Sciences Center</td>
<td>$456 per year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Southern Indiana</td>
<td>$204.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Tennessee</td>
<td>$144.00-$264.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Tennessee</td>
<td>$300 annually</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Texas at Dallas</td>
<td>$36/month, $46/month, or $70/month</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Texas at El Paso</td>
<td>$455, $705 or $1,045</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Virginia</td>
<td>$117/yr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wisconsin - Madison</td>
<td>$33/month</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wisconsin-Stout</td>
<td>$140/yr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington State University</td>
<td>$455, $705 or $1,045</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington University in St. Louis</td>
<td>$190 per year, $145 per semester</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Washington University</td>
<td>$190 per year, $145 per semester</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wichita State</td>
<td>$394 (lot specific) or $279 (zone parking)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Kentucky University</td>
<td>Free and $20 in garage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Missouri</td>
<td>$260/year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Southern Indiana</td>
<td>$456 per year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Tennessee</td>
<td>$260/year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Tennessee</td>
<td>$260/year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE JUNE, 2008

FACULTY SENATE MEETING

WAS CANCELED
THE JULY, 2008

FACULTY SENATE MEETING

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

2. Approval of Minutes: The Faculty Senate Minutes dated May 13, 2008 were approved as written.

3. "Free Speech": None

4. Special Order of the Day: Arlene Stewart, Director of Student Disabilities Services, provided information to Senators regarding services offered from this office which include: information on Kurzweil 3000, the Test Proctoring Center, faculty accommodating letters and temporary disabilities. Questions and answers were then exchanged.

5. Committee Reports:
   a. Senate Committees:
      1) Finance Committee – Chair Wayne Sarasua submitted and briefly described the Committee Report dated August, 2008 (Attachment A).
      2) Welfare Committee – Chair Christina Wells submitted and briefly described the Committee Report dated August 19, 2008 (Attachment B).
      3) Scholastic Policies – Chair Antonis Katsiyannis reported that the Committee met immediately prior to today’s Senate meeting.
      4) Research Committee – Chair John Meriwether submitted and briefly described the Committee Report dated August 19, 2008 (Attachment D).
      5) Policy Committee – Chair Bill Surver submitted and briefly described the Committee Report dated August 19, 2008 (Attachment E).
   b. University Commissions and Committees: None

6. President’s Report: President Simmons provided information on Senate issues undertaken during the summer by him:
   1) Based on recommendations from the Faculty and the Staff Senates, he and Dave Crockett wrote a letter to President Barker (Attachment F) stating the Senates’ concerns. President Barker asked Geary Robinson to meet with Senate Presidents Simmons and Crockett in an effort to answer any questions. Both Senate Presidents Simmons and Crockett believed they had made some progress; however, they
now understand that the parking issue will go forward to the Administrative Council in
the formats presented to the Faculty Senate in May. This issue will be closely monitored.

2) President Simmons attended the summer conference of the
Coalition of Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA—our membership endorsed by the Faculty
Senate last year) and found it to be very helpful. COIA membership decided not to rate or
rank universities based reported survey measures regarding academics and athletics.
Ratings and ranking are problematic and subjective at times.

3) President Simmons also attended the CU Research
Foundation Meeting and the Board of Trustees Retreat.

4) The draft University cell phone policy has been circulated
for comments. This new policy would change University cell phones to personal cell
phones with the University paying stipends based on a tier usage system. The issue of
privacy was a concern. Under the draft policy, the University would have the right to go
through personal phone calls.

7. Old Business: None

8. New Business: None

9. Announcements:
   a. President Simmons stated that the next Faculty Senate meeting will
   be on September 9, 2008.

   b. The next Executive/Advisory Committee meeting will be on
   August 26, 2008.

   c. An exchange of parking questions, answers, information and
general discussion ensued.

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

Linda Howe, Secretary

Cathy Toth Sturkie, Program Coordinator
June 4, 2008

James F. Barker, President
Clemson University
201 Sikes Hall

Dear President Barker:

The Clemson University Staff and Faculty Senates recently reviewed presentations from Geary Robinson of Parking Services on the ‘pro-formas’ developed to address the University's growing parking deficiency. We understand that parking is a very difficult problem to resolve, and no one solution will satisfy all faculty and staff constituencies.

It is our understanding that Mr. Robinson will present the ‘pro-formas’ to the Administrative Council in the near future. While we greatly appreciate receiving a preview of the proposals, both Senates are obliged to make certain that the Council is aware that neither Senate is in a position to support or endorse either proposal as presented. We would like to examine alternatives for funding and implementation that would ameliorate the anticipated negative impact on our constituents before either pro-forma is accepted by the Administration.

We would welcome an opportunity to discuss the specifics of our concerns with you and/or the Administrative Council.

Thank you for your time.

Yours truly,

David J. Crockett,
Staff Senate President

J. Bryan Simmons,
Faculty Senate President

DJC/JBS/cts
1. Call to Order: The Faculty Senate Meeting was called to order at 2:32 p.m. by President Bryan Simmons, and guests were recognized and introduced.

2. Approval of Minutes: The Faculty Senate Minutes and Academic Convocation Minutes dated August 19, 2008 were approved as distributed.

3. “Free Speech”: Donald E. Beasley, Associate Chair and Professor of Mechanical Engineering, spoke to the Senate about a possible noise reduction policy (Attachment).

4. Special Order of the Day: Doris R. Helms, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, presented the Five Year Plan for the University and asked for Faculty Senate input.

5. Committee Reports:
   a. Senate Committees:
      1) Finance Committee – Chair Wayne Sarasua submitted and briefly described the Committee Report dated September 9, 2008 (Attachment).

      2) Welfare Committee – Chair Christina Wells submitted and briefly described the Committee Report dated September, 2008 and asked Senators to make deletions/additions to a listing of questions that may appear on the Faculty Survey (Attachment).

      3) Scholastic Policies - Chair Antonis Katsiyannis submitted the Committee Report dated August 19, 2008 (Attachment).

      4) Research Committee – Chair John Meriwether submitted and described the Committee Report dated September 9, 2008 (Attachment).

      5) Policy Committee – Chair Bill Surver submitted and briefly described the Committee Report dated August 19, 2008 (Attachment).

   b. University Commissions and Committees: None

6. President’s Report: President Simmons stated that:
   1) he and others have spent much time investigating alleged Faculty Manual violations; and
2) there are questions about the carpooling survey that was recently distributed and concerns that state-owned service vehicles are permanently parking in faculty parking spaces.

7. Old Business: None

8. New Business: None

9. Announcements:
   a. President Simmons stated that the next Faculty Senate meeting will be on October 14, 2008.
   
   b. Nominations for the 2008 Class of '39 Award for Excellence are due in the Faculty Senate Office, Thurmond Institute, by October 17, 2008.

10. Adjournment: President Simmons adjourned the meeting at 4:22 p.m.

   Linda Howe, Secretary

   Cathy Toth Sturkie, Program Coordinator

Absent: H. Luo, J. Wang, B. Bowerman, Y. An, L. Li-Bleuel (C. Adams for), G. Tissera (K. Smith for), E. Weisenmiller, W. Goddard, T. Boland
Clemson has no systematic planning that serves to reduce noise on central campus during prime learning hours, say 8 am to 1 pm. Some examples: Often during my 9:30 class in Riggs the dumpsters outside of Fernow café are emptied... creating a truly amazing amount of noise. During my final exam for second summer session the sidewalk outside of Riggs was being jack hammered. A recent survey of classroom conditions by the assessment committee includes questions concerning noise; responses indicated that noise is an issue.

A noise reduction policy should address specific areas of the campus during specific hours of the day. One of the areas most affected by noise pollution is along Fernow Street, but there are other areas that are similar.

The following activities/machinery should be prohibited around classroom buildings between the hours of 8 am and 1 pm weekdays, with extended hours during exam week:

- Emptying dumpsters
- Noise producing lawn/grounds maintenance devices including leaf blowers
- Non-essential construction equipment
- Deliveries of food to Fernow café and similar deliveries that are easily scheduled

The following should be prohibited from central campus 24/7:

- Music on external speakers of CAT buses
- Motorcycles without mufflers (straight pipes)

We could make simple internal changes immediately and going forward we could include our noise policy in contracts with external contractors. Also, devising a schedule for grounds maintenance that avoids classroom buildings during the hours 8-1 could be an interesting creative inquiry project, especially for Industrial Engineering students. Why not build some green ideas into noise reduction? Does the removal of leaves require a gasoline engine?

One additional suggestion. I believe that Fernow street should be closed to vehicular through traffic, except for CAT buses, during the hours 8-4:30. Noise would be helped, but safety is a larger concern. The combination of pedestrians and vehicles in this area presents a real safety issue.
Finance Committee Report, 9/9/2008

- Review of the University Budget
- Revisiting Salaries
- Does our undergraduate education subsidize grad?
- Eek GADS
- Any suggestions?

2008-2009 Faculty Senate Finance Committee: Yanming An (AFLS), Shima Clarke (AAH), Mary LaForge (BBS), Daniel Smith (AAH), Steve Stuart (E&S), Wayne Sarasua, Chair (E&S)

The committee plans to work with Provost Helms and Jane Gilbert to review the 2008 budget, make a comparison with previous years, and work toward a better understanding on the policies regarding and the effect of performance credits. The budget will not be available for at least another month.

During last year's work on review of salaries an issue arose regarding the salary report. The annual salary report lists only E&G funds. The committee plans to determine a breakdown of employees that get additional compensation from non-E&G funds (e.g., from the Foundation) and the policies governing the additional compensation. We also plan to revisit raises this year.

It is not clear that the conventional wisdom about undergrad education subsidizing graduate education and research is correct. During one of the previous year's finance committee meetings, Dean Rafert shared a study at Michigan Tech that showed the opposite, namely, that graduate education and research were subsidizing undergrad education. The committee intends to take a closer look at Clemson's case.

We will continue to study GADS this year. Some possibilities based on the five recommendations from last year's Finance Committee recommendations:
  a. Consider ways to encourage the faculty to aim for a better external-to-internal funding ratio for GRA GADs.
  b. Consider and recommend ways to help reduce losses due to uncharged GADs.
  c. Recommend improvements in financial reports available to PIs so that financial status of grants is more comprehensible (and thus uncharged GRA GAD money is clearly evident to the PI).
  d. Lobby for PIs to be able to carry over year-to-year any remaining return-from-indirect funds so that they may be accumulated and used for GRA stipends and GADs.
  e. Identify and recommend changes to financial policies and practices that put Clemson at a competitive disadvantage in recruiting top graduate students.
Faculty Senate Welfare Committee
September Report

The Faculty Senate Welfare Committee met at 1:30 PM in D-136 Poole Ag. Center on September 3, 2008. In attendance were Senators Wells, Wang, Marinescu, Stewart and Futral. President Bryan Simmons and Dr. Pat Smart were also present.

1. Faculty Senate Survey. We are conducting a survey of Clemson faculty, following closely the methodology of the survey conducted by the Senate in 1999. President Simmons has asked that we present the results of this survey by February 2009, thereby allowing the current Senate to take action based on its findings.

Results of the previous survey are available in pdf form and will be emailed upon request (contact Senator Wells at cewells@clemson.edu). A copy of the 1999 survey questions will be distributed today.

At the Sept. 3 meeting, Senator Stewart volunteered to seek out survey instruments that will allow for efficient collection and analysis of data at a reasonable cost. The committee also agreed to solicit input on survey questions at the September 9, 2008 Faculty Senate meeting.

2. Childcare. Dr. Smart provided us with an update on the planned child development center, which remains a front burner issue for her and Provost Helms. The University is close to signing a donor for the center, which President Barker would like to see built in the Douthit Hills area. Because construction at Douthit Hills will take 2-3 years, the administration is investigating the possibility of leasing temporary space at the Patrick Square development near Issaqueena Trail.

The committee discussed ways to (1) keep Clemson faculty up-to-date on progress toward a child development center and (2) recognize the efforts of the President and Provost while strongly reiterating the importance of this issue to all University administrators.

3. Parking. Senator Futral, a member of the parking advisory committee, provided an update on parking issues at the University. A pilot carpool/vanpool program will likely be implemented in the coming year; there will be an online survey to gauge interest in this program. Another utilization study is also planned.
Scholastic Policies

Faculty Award (commencement)

Grade Inflation study update

Next meeting: September 23
420 Tillman Hall (2:30-3:30)
Senators Dawson, Goddard, Willoughby, Weisenmiller, Shelburne, and Katsiyannis were in attendance.

Introductions

Review of 2007-08 main issues (Reevaluation of the Academic calendar, Big Thursday, Student Assessment of Instruction, Admission of Student Athletes, Grade Inflation, Integrity Policies for Undergraduates and graduate Students, Classroom Civility, Core Values, Length of Final Exam for graduate and undergraduate courses)

Meeting Times-420 Tillman Hall (2:30-3:30).
Sept 23, Oct 21, Nov 18, Dec 9, Jan 20, Febr 17, March 17

New Issues:
Faculty Award given to students at graduation (includes a medallion and engraving of names for those attaining a 4.0 GPA)

Common Exams (math, sciences) administered on Mondays and lack of availability of large rooms

Request that the Brian Simmons, President of the faculty Senate, send a follow up letter to the Provost inquiring on the status of the “Grade Inflation” study

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>
• Intellectual Property/Patent Policy revisions

The Faculty Senate Research Committee met on 4 September with Associate Dean Caron St. Johns and Vincie Albritton (director, technology transfer office, CURF). Dr. St. Johns chaired the committee that was given the charge of revising and modernizing the Clemson Intellectual Property section of the Faculty Manual (Section 4, Part 10, Patent Policy). Also present were Dr. David Zumbrunnen, Prof. of Mechanical Engineering, Dr. Richard Figliola, (Prof. of Mechanical Engineering), and Dr. Vince Gallichio, Executive Vice President for Research. Dr. Zumbrunnen presented a number of concerns regarding the current patent policy. Transparency regarding how expenses are charged against royalty proceeds combined with the need for regular reporting of such expenses were specific highlights mentioned in his presentation.

The discussions were extensive and broadsweeping. The primary focus of the comments was the new Intellectual Property patent policy document that has been undergoing a final review in the Vice President for Research's office for the past few months. The IP document on Patent Policy section of the Faculty Manual has been revised extensively to put into place a modernized patent policy document to replace the current version that has not been revised since adoption in 1991. Clemson University has one of the country's highest patent return rates for public universities. The discussion taking place in the meeting centered upon issues relating to patent attorney support to faculty members submitting a Disclosure or Patent application, the distribution model adopted for royalty dispersement, and the way fees and advertising expenses are charged against the gross proceeds of patent licensing. The activity of applying for a patent starts with a Disclosure that is filed by the Faculty member. This activity is handled by the Technology Transfer office of the Clemson University Research Foundation.

In view of the importance of this activity to Clemson University faculty and staff, it is clear that CURF is understaffed. This affects the ability of CURF Technology Transfer office to respond to the needs of the Faculty members that want to secure patent applications. The scope of the Patent Policy document is being broadened to include copyrights and other aspects of Intellectual Property. The IP document is being reviewed by Clemson legal office. Once this effort is concluded, it is expected that the IP document will be presented to the Faculty Senate for approval by the Research Committee and the Policy Committee.
Faculty Senate Policy Committee Report
Faculty Senate Meeting
19 August 2008

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 has met twice and the next meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, September 16. The following were discussed and action taken:

1. Resolution of a possible violation of the Faculty Manual.

2. Tentatively approved a draft statement regarding Post Tenure Review and changing two satisfactory ratings to two marginal ratings from the current two fair ratings. This will be presented at our next meeting for a final vote and then to the ex/adv committee and then to the Senate.

3. Again, did not endorse the Student Senate’s statement on Clemson’s core values.

4. Policy Committee/Faculty Senate informational newsletter containing pertinent Faculty Manual Guidelines.

The Committee established the following as priority items for this Faculty Senate year.

1. Review current Faculty Manual policy on Academic Freedom and recommend possible changes.

2. Investigate possible Faculty Manual violations regarding Faculty evaluations – who sees what and when.


4. Transmitting reminders of Faculty Manual polices at appropriate times during year. (For example, at the time of promotion and tenure decisions)
5. Work with the Grievance Board to assure that all grievance procedures are followed.

6. Review the Faculty Senate's Select Committee on Ranks and Titles final report and recommend possible Faculty Manual policy changes. We will likely focus on teaching versus non-teaching Lecturers.

7. Review recommended Faculty Manual changes transmitted by the Office of the Ombudsman.

8. Review Clemson's policy of cluster hires.

9. Discuss adding a "Gender Identity" statement to Clemson's nondiscrimination statement.
MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
OCTOBER 14, 2008

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

2. Approval of Minutes: The Faculty Senate Minutes dated September 9, 2008 were approved as written.

3. “Free Speech”: None

4. Special Order of the Day: Kay Wall, Dean of Clemson University Libraries, heightened the awareness of the Senate regarding a ninety percent cut in state funding for PASCHAL, a partnership of academic funding for higher education libraries.

5. Old Business: None

6. New Business:
   a. Motion was made to postpone indefinitely the proposed Faculty Manual Change, Ombuds Section, which was seconded. No discussion. Vote to postpone was taken and passed unanimously (Attachment).

   b. Senator Bill Surver submitted for approval and explained the Faculty Manual Clarification, Uniform Date of Implementation. No discussion. Vote to accepted proposed change was taken and passed unanimously (Attachment).

7. Committee Reports:
   a. Senate Committees:
      1) Finance Committee – Chair Wayne Sarasua submitted and briefly described the Committee Report dated October 14, 2008 (Attachment).
      2) Welfare Committee – Chair Christina Wells provided a list of questions for the Faculty Survey based on feedback from Senators. She asked that Senators look at the draft and email comments to her. Senator Wells also asked that each standing committee look at the questions that pertain to the committee’s respective areas.
      3) Scholastic Policies - Chair Antonis Katsiyannis submitted and explained the Committee Report dated September 23, 2008 (Attachment).
      4) Research Committee – Chair John Meriwether submitted and described the Committee Report dated October 9, 2008 (Attachment).
      5) Policy Committee – Chair Bill Surver submitted and briefly described the Committee Report dated October 14, 2008 (Attachment). He reminded
Senators to make sure that their departments are following procedures within the Faculty Manual.

b. University Commissions and Committees: None

8. President’s Report: President Simmons stated that:
   1) he and Bill Bowerman have been working with the Provost and President regarding budget issues. The Administration shared possibilities and asked our thoughts. The tone of the discussion was somber, but the Administration does want to hear our ideas.

   2) he has requested that the Faculty Senate President be allowed to sit in during Administrative Council meetings (not as a member).

   3) the Senate should be thinking of nominees for the Faculty Representative to the Board position (Faculty Manual, Appendix B). The Call for Nominations will be distributed in December, 2008.

9. Announcements:
   a. The Board of Trustees Dinner hosted by the Faculty Senate will be Thursday, October 16, 2008, beginning at 6:30 p.m. at the Owen Pavilion.

   b. Nominations for the 2008 Class of ’39 Award for Excellence are due in the Faculty Senate Office, Thurmond Institute, by October 17, 2008.

   c. President Simmons stated that the next Executive/Advisory Committee meeting will be on October 28, 2008.

   d. President Simmons stated that the next Faculty Senate meeting will be on November 11, 2008.

   e. Provost Helms provided information about the budget, noting that more information will be available after, and if, the Legislature meets later this month. Decisions will be made with the guiding focus being the protection of our vision, moving forward and with the students in mind.

10. Adjournment: President Simmons adjourned the meeting at 3:46 p.m.

   Linda Howe, Secretary

   Cathy Toth Sturkie, Program Coordinator

Absent: P. Dawson, Y. An, L. Li-Bleuel (K. Smith for), M. LaForge, C. Marinescu
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](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](http://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.
The specific revision of the Faculty Manual will take effect upon final approval by the Provost, or the Board of Trustees for those changes subject to the Board’s approval. The approved resolution will be incorporated into both the master hard copy of the Faculty Manual maintained in the Faculty Senate Office by the Program Assistant and the electronic version of the Faculty Manual no later than July 1st to be used during the next academic year. This process of incorporation will be at the direction of the Editorial Consultant and under the oversight of the Senate President. When it is completed, the Senate President will report to the Senate and Provost that the Manual has been updated. Overall responsibility for maintaining and distributing the Clemson University Faculty Manual is vested in the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost and is carried out by the Faculty Senate Office.

Proposed new language

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

Rationale

Stipulating a uniform date for the implementation of Manual changes avoids the technical and communication difficulties inherent in a variable starting date.
Finance Committee Report, 10/14/2008

- Clemson Fees
- Travel reimbursement
- Clemson’s policy on reduced fees for faculty
- Does our undergraduate education subsidize grad?
- Away with GADs

2008-2009 Faculty Senate Finance Committee: Yanming An (AFLS), Shima Clarke (AAH), Mary LaForge (BBS), Daniel Smith (AAH), Steve Stuart (E&S), Wayne Sarasua, Chair (E&S)

Provost Helms indicated that the state contribution to tuition for UVA is less than half of what Clemson gets for South Carolina. A check of the fees from both institutions: 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?” The finance committee plans to research other institutions with regard to fees.

Steve Stuart brought up an issue that was relayed to him by one of his colleagues. When you file to get reimbursed for travel expenses from a grant account, you must request reimbursement within 60 days. If you submit the paperwork after that date, you must also submit a written explanation where you humbly debase yourself and promise that it will never happen again. His colleague’s question is about the justification for this rule, and whether it is necessary. The committee plans to follow up on this on why this is necessary.

Here is Clemson’s policy on reduced tuition/fees for siblings of faculty or staff. There is NO reduction. Some preliminary research shows that MANY public schools do reduce or totally waive fees for children of faculty or staff. Shima Clarke is researching this further.

It is not clear that the conventional wisdom about undergrad education subsidizing graduate education and research is correct. During one of the previous year’s finance committee meetings, Dean Rafert shared a study at Michigan Tech that showed the opposite, namely, that graduate education and research were subsidizing undergrad education. The committee intends to take a closer look at Clemson’s case. Steve Stuart is taking the lead on this.

The committee has decided that they don't have interest in studying GADs this year.
SCHOLASTIC POLICIES COMMITTEE

Faculty Scholarship Award

Institutional Biosafety Committees-Request for a "Safe Teaching Committee" to review teaching activities involving hazards

Undergraduate Integrity Policy-Simplified procedure for first time offenders of plagiarism

Next Meeting: October 21 at 2:30 in 420 Tillman Hall
Faculty Senate Scholastic Policies Committee
Monthly Meeting Minutes
Antonis Katsiyannis, Chair
September 23, 2008 (420 Tillman Hall)

Present: Dawson, Goddard, Shelburne, Weisenmiller, Willoughby, Katsiyannis
Guests: Marvin Carmichael, President's Office, Jan Murdoch, Undergraduate Dean, Abby C. Daniel, Student Senate

Faculty Scholarship Award: Carmichael provided background information on the award. 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)

Undergraduate Integrity Policy—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 CI)

Institutional Biosafety Committees—Request for a “Safe Teaching Committee” to review teaching activities involving hazards
- Committee members suggested that Tracey Artwood, Office of research Compliance and Robin Newberry, EHS attend the October meeting regarding this issue.
Committee members suggested that we rely on the review of teaching protocols involving hazards (except chemicals) by a committee constituted of department safety coordinators. Committee members also emphasized the need of addressing this issue at college/department level.
- Current practices also involve online modules for the use of hazards.

Next Meeting: October 21 at 2:30 in 420 Tillman Hall
<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:vshlbmn@clemson.edu">vshlbmn@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>
Faculty Senate Research Committee  
Monthly Report  
John Meriwether, Chair  
October 9, 2008

- Research Handbook development  
- NSF Principal Investigator Certification  
- Update re IP update rewrite

The Faculty Senate Research Committee met on 9 October with Ms. Denise James, the Faculty Senate webmaster, regarding the development of a Research Handbook intended for use by new faculty members. Several questions came up in this discussion: 1), is this web link material assembled by students still of interest?, 2), how would the web material be updated and validated?, 3) where would the Research Handbook web link be posted? 4), should the scale of the web link material be broadened to include other aspects of the research atmosphere within Clemson University?. It was also suggested that this work be conducted and vetted by more experienced personnel. The Committee resolved to study the material assembled thus far and we will decide whether to continue this effort at our next meeting.

Ms. Roberta Elrod has requested an opportunity in the November 2008 meeting of our Committee to make a presentation regarding a NSF PI Certification program. We look forward to listening to her talk.

John Ballato reported via e-mail to the Research Committee that the draft of the IP manual update has been revamped. He is optimistic that the draft would be brought forward to our Committee for review and discussion in the near future.
Faculty Senate Policy Committee Report  
Faculty Senate  
14 OCTOBER 2008

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 has met on September 16 and the following have been approved by the Executive and Advisory Board and are brought to the Senate for discussion and approval.

1. Change in the Ombudsman Faculty Manual description
2. Clarification of start date for Senate approved policies

The Senate President and Policy Committee Chair investigated possible violations of the Faculty Manual. It was determined that there were none; however, there is concern regarding e-mails and memos from Deans and Department Chairs.

The Committee established the following as priority items for this Faculty Senate year.

1. Review current Faculty Manual policy on Academic Freedom and recommend possible changes.
2. Review the makeup of search committees with attention to Staff membership. We are working with the Staff Senate to review and make possible changes to current policy.
3. Review recommendations of Senate Select Committee on Ranks and Titles with emphasis on Lecturers. The Staff Senate is a participant.
4. Exploring the possibility of an Academic Faculty Misconduct Policy.
5. Cluster hire procedures and hiring without advertising and/or appropriate interviews.
Recent items submitted to the committee

1. Collegiality policy and how may it be used as a component of the Annual Evaluation.

2. Role of Directors in the Annual Evaluation process.
MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
NOVEMBER 11, 2008

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

3. "Free Speech": None

4. Special Order of the Day: Information regarding the Staff Development Plan was shared with the Senate by Dave Crockett, President of the Staff Senate, and Beth Kunkel, a member of the Committee which devised the Plan. They also explained that due to the budget constrictions, the number of participants in the first class of the Plan has been lowered to six, but that President Barker wants the Plan to continue as developed otherwise. Questions and answers were then exchanged.

5. Old Business: None

6. New Business:
   a. Senator Bill Surver submitted for approval and explained the proposed Faculty Manual Change, Part II-Section A, Faculty Rights. No discussion. Vote to accept proposed change was taken and passed unanimously.

7. Committee Reports:
   a. Senate Committees:
      1) Finance Committee - Chair Wayne Sarasua submitted and briefly described the Committee Report dated October 21, 2008.
      2) Welfare Committee - Chair Christina Wells stated that the Faculty Survey would be distributed to all faculty soon and is to be returned by December 5th. She also stated that a donor has been identified for the child care center, but there is still debate as to a location. The Welfare Committee is drafting a resolution supporting the President and the Provost for their efforts regarding the budget crisis which should be brought forward to the Senate in January.
      3) Scholastic Policies - Chair Antonis Katsiyannis submitted and explained the Committee Report dated October 21, 2008.
4) **Research Committee** – Chair John Meriwether submitted and described the Committee Report dated November 6, 2008.

5) **Policy Committee** – Chair Bill Surver submitted and briefly described the Committee Report dated November 11, 2008.

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

8. **President’s Report:** President Simmons:
   a. announced that William T. Pennington, Jr. was elected by the Faculty Senate to be the 2008 recipient of the Class of ’39 Award for Excellence.

   b. noted that the most recent information from the President’s Office includes the Faculty Senate and faculty-at-large in the important aspects of Phases 2 and 3 of the budget plan. Persons will be identified to serve on task forces that will be announced soon. The timeline for the work of these task forces will be completed by February 2009. He asked that faculty trust the President and the Provost who have served us very well over the past several years. Many questions and answers were then exchanged between the Senators and Lawrence Nichols, Chief Human Resources Officer. Mr. Nichols referred faculty to the Human Resources website and asked that further questions be emailed to him at lnichol@clemson.edu.

9. **Announcements:**
   a. President Simmons stated that the next Executive/Advisory Committee meeting will be on November 25, 2008.

   b. President Simmons stated that the next Faculty Senate meeting will be on December 9, 2008.

   c. The Celebration of the Great Class of ’39 hosted by the Faculty Senate will be held on January 12, 2009 – invitations forthcoming.

   d. The Bell Tower Ceremony at the Carillon Gardens to honor Bill Pennington, 2008 Class of ’39 Aware Recipient, will be held on January 13, 2009.

10. **Adjournment:** President Simmons adjourned the meeting at 4:09 p.m.

    Linda Howe, Secretary

    Cathy Toth Sturkie, Program Coordinator

Absent: Y. An (C. Adams for), L. Li-Bleuel (K. Smith for), W. Stewart, P. Rangaraju

2.
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*. 
Finance Committee - October 21, 2008

Attendees: Mary Laforge, Steve Stuart, Danny Smith, Yanming An, Wayne Sarasua

Guest: Brent Emerson, Director, Resource Efficiency and Process Improvement

1. Steve Stuart introduced our Special Guest--Brent Emerson who is from the CFO's office. Brent talked to us about a new "program" on campus that focuses on process improvement, improved resource utilization, and improved efficiency in operations and processes. Brent noted that a number of our board of trustees come from manufacturing backgrounds where process efficiency is essential. Some of the techniques could be applied to Clemson. The program at Clemson is brand new and includes a high level Discovery Council--currently made up of key administrators, some faculty--the current co-chair is the Current IE Department Chair, and some students. Below the Discovery Council is a Support Level. The support level 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 senates does not currently provide input at the support level, however, the staff senate does have some involvement. The finance committee recommends that the faculty senate participate in the University's process improvement program. As a first step, the senate should consider hearing the overview presentation that Brent gave to the finance committee. Further, Brent could also discuss the attached PPT presentation. This was not covered in Brent's overview to the finance committee.

2. Wayne gave a brief status report on fees. Clemson's fees/tuition are amongst the highest in the nation for public schools. Yet, many schools have a lower state contribution. The committee is doing research on this to find out why. Our next point of contact is the CFO.

3. No update on Clemson's policy on reduced tuition/fees for children of faculty or staff.

4. The committee plans to ask Jane Gilbert from the provost's office to come and talk to the committee about the University budget. We hope to schedule this for the November meeting.

5. Steve Stuart passed a Michigan Tech study that found that their graduate education and research were subsidizing undergrad education. The committee intends to take a closer look at Clemson's case. Steve Stuart is taking the lead on this. He has already been in contact with Dean Rafert.

Next meeting: Tuesday, November 18 at 2:00 Lowry Conference Room

FINANCE COMMITTEE Wayne Sarasua, Chair (E&S)

Yanming An (AAH)
Shima Clarke (AAH)
Mary LaForge (BBS)
Daniel Smith (AAH)
Steve Stuart (E&S)
SCHOLASTIC POLICIES COMMITTEE

Request for a "Safe Teaching Committee" to review teaching activities involving hazards

Undergraduate Integrity Policy-Clarification on proposed alternative for first time offenders of plagiarism

Online Exams

Common Exams

Summer Reading Committee
FACULTY SENATE SCHOLASTIC POLICIES COMMITTEE
MONTHLY MEETING MINUTES
ANTONIS KATSIYANNIS, CHAIR
October 21, 2008 (420 Tillman Hall)

Present- Goddard, Shelburne, Weisenmiller, Katsiyannis
Guests: Stan Smith, Registrar; Tracey Arwood, Office of Research Compliance; Robin Newberry, EHS; Abby C. Daniel, Student Senate

Request for a “Safe Teaching Committee” to review teaching activities involving safety hazards

- Tracy Arwood and Robin Newberry provided background information regarding the suggestion for creating such a committee. Currently, there is no mechanism regarding the review of teaching activities (typically in labs) involving hazards although there are certain “generic” procedures in place. The review of such activities is not mandated by state or federal agencies (The Institutional Biosafety Committee reviews research activities and the EHS covers chemicals but its authority is restricted to employees; also, there are regulations which do affect teaching labs, specifically protocols involving vertebrate animals and use of radioactive materials). A potential problem of the current situation is liability for faculty/Clemson. An ad hoc committee created by the Office of Research Compliance is recommending a university level committee.

- 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.

Undergraduate Integrity Policy-Clarification on proposed alternative for first time offenders of plagiarism.

- Jeff Appling indicated that the proposed procedure for first time offenders of plagiarism is an additional option that faculty and students may utilize. Certainly, faculty may choose to utilize current procedures outlined in the undergraduate announcements. The intent of the proposed procedure to allow for wider reporting, allow for a “teaching moment”, and reduce the load of the integrity committee.

Online Exams

- 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.”
Common Exams
- Conflicts have surfaced for courses utilizing common testing times, particularly scheduled for Mondays because of rooms large enough to accommodate students are taken by sororities. These conflicts will no longer be an issue as sorority meetings have moved to Sundays starting in fall 2009. For spring 2009 conflicts, the registrar’s office will assist faculty to ensure availability of sufficient accommodations.

Summer Reading Committee
Current Reading: The Summer Reading Advisory Committee recommends to the Provost and the President of the University one or more selections of a book for the Freshman Summer Reading Program, as well as suggesting related themes for that year’s Presidential Colloquium. The Provost and the President of the University have final approval authority for the book to be selected. The committee is chaired by the Dean of Undergraduate Studies, who serves as an ex-officio and nonvoting member along with the Director of the Freshman Summer Reading Program. Voting membership consists of the Director of Freshman Writing; the Director of the Presidential Colloquium Series, a student member appointed by the President of Student Government, and a faculty member from each of the colleges and the library. In addition, a representative from the Division of Student Affairs will serve as a non-voting ex-officio member. The student and faculty representatives serve one-year renewable terms.

Proposed reading: The Summer Reading Advisory Committee recommends to the Provost and the President of the University one or more selections of a book for the Freshman Summer Reading Program, as well as suggesting related themes for that year’s Presidential Colloquium. The Provost and the President of the University have final approval authority for the book to be selected. The committee is chaired by the Dean of Undergraduate Studies, who serves as an ex-officio and nonvoting member along with the Director of the Freshman Summer Reading Program, a representative from the Division of Student Affairs, and the Chief Diversity Officer. Voting membership consists of the Director of Freshman Writing; the Director of the Presidential Colloquium Series, a student member appointed by the President of Student Government, and a faculty member from each of the colleges and the library. The student and faculty representatives serve one-year renewable terms.
Faculty Senate Research Committee
Monthly Report
John Meriwether, Chair
November 6, 2008

- Research Handbook development
- NSF Principal Investigator Certification

The Faculty Senate Research Committee did not meet on November 6, 2008, as scheduled as there was no business to consider.

Ms. Roberta Elrod had requested an opportunity to make a presentation regarding a NSF PI Certification program but this presentation was postponed to December.

By e-mail consensus the Research Committee decided to cancel further development of a web-based Research Handbook as no one believed that this document would serve a useful purpose beyond what is already available to the incoming faculty and staff.

We are still waiting for the administration submission of the draft version of the intellectual property appendix for review and discussion.
The Policy Committee met on October 21 and the following was approved by the Executive/Advisory Committee and is being presented under new business for Senate discussion and approval.

1. Change to Part II Section A of the Faculty Manual

The Committee also discussed the following items:

1. Review current Faculty Manual policy on Academic Freedom.

3. Review recommendations of Senate Select Committee on Ranks and Titles with emphasis on Lecturers. The Staff Senate is a participant.

4. Exploring the possibility of an Academic Misconduct Policy.

5. Collegiality policy and how may it be used as a component of the Annual Evaluation.

6. Change in the evaluation scale for Post Tenure Review.

7. Changes to the Faculty Manual regarding Ombuds Office.

Next Committee meeting is Tuesday, November 18 at 3:15 in Room 224 Long Hall.
1. **Call to Order:** The Faculty Senate Meeting was called to order at 2:32 p.m. by President Bryan Simmons, and guests were recognized and introduced.

2. **Approval of Minutes:** Deferred until the January, 2009 meeting.

3. **“Free Speech”:** None

4. **Old Business:** None

5. **New Business:** None

6. **Committee Reports:**

   a. **Senate Committees:**
      1) **Scholastic Policies** – Report was submitted (Attachment).

      2) **Finance Committee** – Chair Wayne Sarasua stated that Committee awaits salary information and decided that it would not take a public stand on current furlough/budget situation.

      3) **Welfare Committee** – Senator Meredith Futral stated that 508 completed survey responses have been received thus far. Data will be presented at the February Faculty Senate meeting so that the current Senate can address any immediate action items that are identified within the Survey. Computer problems that have been experienced will be explained in the next survey reminder.

      4) **Research Committee** – Senator Christine Piper submitted and explained the Committee Report dated December 4, 2008 (Attachment). She noted that Senator and Committee Chair John Meriwether attended and participated in the recent (and first of the last year) Research Council meeting. A second meeting is scheduled for the spring semester, as required by the *Faculty Manual*.

      5) **Policy Committee** – Senator Jeremy King submitted and briefly described the Committee Report dated December 9, 2008 (Attachment) and noted that the next meeting will be held on January 20, 2009.

   b. **University Commissions and Committees:** None
7. **President’s Report**: President Simmons:
a. reported that names have been forwarded to the President for possible inclusion on the University Budget Task Forces and then shared a listing of the task forces, membership and the amount of monies each is to work with (cuts and/or savings). University Legal Counsel, Clay Steadman noted that there have been 40 million dollars in cuts to the University which will not be returned. He also stated that by law, Clemson must finish by June 30th in the black. Much discussion followed and questions were answered by Provost Helms, such as: there will be fewer faculty members next year; not all lecturers will be lost and task forces will look at general education requirements. President Simmons spoke about the communication loop and was told that the work of the task forces will be made available to faculty for input into the process. Senator Vic Shelburne asked about the actual University budget and discussion continued about media misrepresentation.

b. stated that the Faculty Senate Presidents of the public institutions of higher education plan to reorganize and meet early in the New Year.

8. **Announcements**:
a. President Simmons stated that the next Executive/Advisory Committee meeting will be on December 16, 2008.

b. President Simmons stated that the next Faculty Senate meeting will be on January 13, 2009.

c. The Celebration of the Great Class of ’39 hosted by the Faculty Senate will be held on January 12, 2009 and to please respond attendance plans.

d. The Bell Tower Ceremony at the Carillon Gardens to honor Bill Pennington, 2008 Class of ’39 Aware Recipient, will be held on January 13, 2009.

9. **Adjournment**: President Simmons adjourned the meeting at 3:32 p.m.

Linda Howe, Secretary

Cathy Toth Sturkie, Program Coordinator

Absent: T. Boland, S. Clarke (C. Adams for), A. Grubb, L. Howe (J. Lindle for), L. Li-Bleuel (K. Smith for), L. Schleifer, S. Stuart, G. Wang, D. Warner (S. Harcum for), C. Wells,
Assignment and Sale of Textbooks and Other Course Materials to Students
SC Ethics Act and faculty assigning own textbooks...

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: ________________________________
Principal Investigator Certification Program
iThenticate pilot program

The Faculty Senate Research Committee met on 4 December with Ms. Roberta Elrod, who is the Director of Sponsored Programs Accounting and Administration (Post-Award). Also present were Ms. JoAnne Williams, Interim Director of the Office of Sponsored Programs (OPA) and Ms. Nalinee Patin, database administrator in OPA. Ms. Elrod provided a briefing regarding the details of an online tutorial concerning the rules and regulations that govern the administration of research awards. A rollout of this web-based PowerPoint training tutorial will take place in January 2009. Beginning next March all Clemson University principal investigators (PI) and co-PIs must take this tutorial prior to the submission of any proposal from Clemson University to a funding agency. The purpose of this one hour tutorial is to make sure that all PIs and co-PIs at Clemson University are aware of the constraints regarding the administration of funded research, especially in connection with purchasing and hiring of students and associates. Once a PI or co-PI has taken this tutorial, a refresher tutorial would be scheduled every three years. The tutorial is made up of audio-visual modules pertaining to separate aspects of the research award administration. A pilot program involving a small number of Clemson University PIs has been conducted with favorable comments rendered. The time required is nominally one hour.

Ms. Tracey Arwood, the Director of the Office of Research Compliance, presented details regarding a pilot study concerning the use of a computer program called iThenticate that may eventually be applied to all research proposals submitted to funding agencies. The initiation of this study would take place in January, 2009. This program is intended to detect instances in which passages included within a PI proposal are found to be similar or identical with published material. The use of this screening tool is meant largely to assure funding agencies that due diligence is being exercised within the Office of Sponsored Programs to avoid possible cases of plagiarism that might intentionally or accidentally be committed in submitted proposals. Its use will be transparent to the PI and will not delay the submission of the proposal to the research agency. The decision to use this screening device at Clemson University is a response to the increased number of examples of plagiarism in research proposals submitted by US universities that have been found in recent years. Any detection suggesting a possible issue of plagiarism in any proposal examined with this program would be reviewed carefully to ensure that the program execution was accurate in finding proposal passages that duplicate published material. An example of a “false detection” that might occur would be a case in which the PI cites material from one of his/her research papers without sufficient documentation as to the source. In any such instance, the PI would be requested to provide an explanation. Should the explanation be found lacking credibility, an inquiry involving the research integrity officer would take place. Thus, the use of the iThenticate computer program provides an important safeguard that enhances the research integrity of research proposals submitted by Clemson University.
The Policy Committee met on November 18.

The Committee met on the following items:

1. Changes to the Faculty Manual regarding Ombuds Office.

   New language will be presented at our next meeting and then brought forward for approval. There is now agreement between the General Counsel and the Ombuds office regarding confidentiality that will be written into the new proposal.

2. A plan for making recommendations on Ranks and Titles. Committee members will review all proposals regarding Ranks and Titles and make recommendations at the February meetings of the Executive/Advisory Committee and the Faculty Senate. This is a TOP priority of the committee.

3. The Policy Committee was asked to consider a proposal to address the solicitation and number of outside reviewers for tenure and/or promotion. All departments do not have the same procedures. The Committee rejected placing guidelines in the Faculty Manual.

Our next meeting will be on January 20.
Assignment and Sale of Textbooks and Other Course Materials to Students
FACULTY SENATE SCHOLASTIC POLICIES COMMITTEE
MONTHLY MEETING MINUTES
ANTONIS KATSIIANNIS, CHAIR
December 9, 2008 (Madren Center)

Present- Goddard, Shelburne, Weisenmiller, Lawson, Willoughby, Katsiyannis
Guests: Erin Swann, Bill Surver

SC Ethics Act and faculty assigning own textbooks...

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: ________________________________
The Faculty Senate Research Committee met on 4 December with Ms. Roberta Elrod, who is the Director of Sponsored Programs Accounting and Administration (Post-Award). Also present were Ms. JoAnne Williams, Interim Director of the Office of Sponsored Programs (OPA) and Ms. Nalinee Patin, database administrator in OPA. Ms. Elrod provided a briefing regarding the details of an online tutorial concerning the rules and regulations that govern the administration of research awards. A rollout of this web-based PowerPoint training tutorial will take place in January 2009. Beginning next March all Clemson University principal investigators (PI) and co-PIs must take this tutorial prior to the submission of any proposal from Clemson University to a funding agency. The purpose of this one hour tutorial is to make sure that all PIs and co-PIs at Clemson University are aware of the constraints regarding the administration of funded research, especially in connection with purchasing and hiring of students and associates. Once a PI or co-PI has taken this tutorial, a refresher tutorial would be scheduled every three years. The tutorial is made up of audio-visual modules pertaining to separate aspects of the research award administration. A pilot program involving a small number of Clemson University PIs has been conducted with favorable comments rendered. The time required is nominally one hour.

Ms. Tracey Arwood, the Director of the Office of Research Compliance, presented details regarding a pilot study concerning the use of a computer program called iThenticate that may eventually be applied to all research proposals submitted to funding agencies. The initiation of this study would take place in January, 2009. This program is intended to detect instances in which passages included within a PI proposal are found to be similar or identical with published material. The use of this screening tool is meant largely to assure funding agencies that due diligence is being exercised within the Office of Sponsored Programs to avoid possible cases of plagiarism that might intentionally or accidentally be committed in submitted proposals. Its use will be transparent to the PI and will not delay the submission of the proposal to the research agency. The decision to use this screening device at Clemson University is a response to the increased number of examples of plagiarism in research proposals submitted by US universities that have been found in recent years. Any detection suggesting a possible issue of plagiarism in any proposal examined with this program would be reviewed carefully to ensure that the program execution was accurate in finding proposal passages that duplicate published material. An example of a “false detection” that might occur would be a case in which the PI cites material from one of his/her research papers without sufficient documentation as to the source. In any such instance, the PI would be requested to provide an explanation. Should the explanation be found lacking credibility, an inquiry involving the research integrity officer would take place. Thus, the use of the iThenticate computer program provides an important safeguard that enhances the research integrity of research proposals submitted by Clemson University.
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 November 18.

The Committee met on the following items:

1. Changes to the Faculty Manual regarding Ombuds Office.

   New language will be presented at our next meeting and then brought forward for approval. There is now agreement between the General Counsel and the Ombuds office regarding confidentiality that will be written into the new proposal.

2. A plan for making recommendations on Ranks and Titles. Committee members will review all proposals regarding Ranks and Titles and make recommendations at the February meetings of the Executive/Advisory Committee and the Faculty Senate. This is a TOP priority of the committee.

3. The Policy Committee was asked to consider a proposal to address the solicitation and number of outside reviewers for tenure and/or promotion. All departments do not have the same procedures. The Committee rejected placing guidelines in the Faculty Manual

Our next meeting will be on January 20.