1. **Call to Order:** The meeting was called to order by President Beth Kunkel at 2:36 p.m.

2. **Approval of Minutes:** The Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes dated December 12, 2006 were approved as written.

3. **“Free Speech”:** None

4. **Committees:**
   a. **Senate Committees**
      1) **Finance Committee** – Dan Warner, Chair, reported that the Committee met on December 14, 2006 and discussed many topics, but no action was taken.
      2) **Welfare Committee** – Chair Nancy Porter stated that this Committee will meet on January 16, 2007 and will discuss a parking/transportation update; spousal hiring; child care center, the Schaffer Service Award; per diem rates; and a waiver of Fike fees for faculty. President Kunkel reported that she attended a recent Parking and Transportation Master Plan meeting. The next Welfare Committee meeting will be on January 16 at 2:30 p.m. in 205 Cooper Library.
      3) **Scholastic Policies Committee** – Chair Mark Smotherman reported that the Committee is in the process of scheduling a meeting with Deans Jan Murdoch and Bruce Raefert to discuss the academic grievance process for both undergraduates and graduates.
      4) **Research Committee** – No report.
      5) **Policy Committee** – Bryan Simmons, Chair, submitted and explained the Committee’s Report dated December 19, 2006 (Attachment A).
   b. **Other University Committee/Commissions:** None

5. **President’s Report:** President Kunkel:
   a. submitted her President’s Report dated December, 2006 (Attachment B);
   b. thanked those who participated in the Great Class of 1939 events during the past two days;
c. informed the Senate that they will soon receive an email from Vice President Chris Przirembel regarding a research initiative and a national competition in areas that do not get external funding;

d. Financial Aid will post the top questions received regarding the Life and Palmetto scholarships for faculty and student access; and

e. a performance salary study will be conducted by the Provost (further explanation by the Provost included that it will be a compression and inversion study because of new faculty influence).

6. Old Business: None

7. New Business:
   a. Senator Simmons submitted and explained the proposed Faculty Manual change, Summer Reading Program Advisory Committee, for approval. There was no discussion. Vote was taken and passed unanimously with required two-thirds vote (Attachment C).

   b. President Kunkel submitted for approval the Resolution of Congratulations upon the Establishment of a Phi Beta Kappa Chapter at Clemson University. There was no discussion. Vote to approve resolution was taken and passed unanimously (FS07-1-1 P) (Attachment D). Those people who were responsible for this milestone were recognized and applauded.

   c. Grievance Board elections were held by secret ballot. Those elected include: Bill Surver, Biological Sciences; Daryl Guffey, Accountancy; Dan Warner, Mathematical Sciences; Chuck Linnell, Teacher Education; Antonis Katsiyannis, Teacher Education; and Chris Colthorpe, Library.

8. Announcements:
   a. President Kunkel announced that Holley Ulbrich will retire as Faculty Manual Editorial Consultant at the end of June, 2007.

   b. Faculty displays celebrating the 50th Anniversary of the Faculty Senate at Clemson University are located in the FirstSun Connector between the Martin Inn and the Madren Center and in the alcove of the Thurmond Institute. Many thanks to Susan Hiott of the Clemson Libraries for creating both displays.

   c. Nominations for the Alan Schaffer Faculty Senate Service Award are due to the Faculty Senate Office on February 15, 2007.

   d. The 50th Anniversary of the Faculty Senate February Forum will be held on February 19, 2007. Invitation forthcoming.
9. **Adjournment**: 3:19 p.m.

Desmond R. Layne, Secretary

Cathy Toth Sturkie, Program Assistant

Absent: G. Birrenkott (H. Liu for), D. Detrich (J. Erdman for), F. Edwards, J. Meriwether (W. Sarasua for), R. Figliola, B. Meyers
Faculty Senate Policy Committee

(Minutes of the Tuesday December 19, 2006 Policy Committee meeting)

The Policy Committee met on Tuesday December 19, 2006 at 2:00 PM in room 205 of the library.

Policy Agenda:

1. Final revisions to the Draft Grievance procedure were discussed at length. Final vote on the procedure by the full senate will be appropriate only after the Executive / Advisory committee review on January 30.

2. The draft policy statement regarding the summer reading committee was discussed. This draft was submitted by the Scholastic Policy Committee.

3. Discussion of the separation of the university Naming Committee and the Honorary Award Committee. The two committees were somehow joined several years ago. At the request of the university administration we began researching ways to separate them again.

Next scheduled Policy Committee meeting: Tuesday January 16, 2007 at 2:00 PM in room 205 of the library.
Report of the Faculty Senate  
December, 2006

Your Faculty Senate was very busy this fall and has plans for an equally busy spring. We are each appreciative of the opportunity to serve you in this way and of the support being provided by the administration and the Board of Trustees!

The Policy Committee, chaired by Bryan Simmons, has proposed revisions in nepotism policy, date of annual publication of the Faculty Manual, definition of confidentiality, consistency in the probationary period and composition of several university committees. They are continuing to work on a complete overhaul of the grievance process and additional committee composition alterations. They have been ably assisted by our Faculty Manual Editorial Consultant, Holley Ulbrich. The 2006-2007 Faculty Manual includes a Table of Contents for the first time and a re-ordering of the chapters and the appendices, in addition to the revisions passed last year.

The Welfare committee, chaired by Nancy Porter, is working on parking, spousal hiring, housing, and day care issues. The day care center for children of university employees is expected to open in fall, 2007—although perhaps with a limited age range for children. They completed working with Human Resources on making a 12-month pay option available for faculty. They are requesting nominations for the second Alan Schaffer Service Award to be awarded in April.

The Scholastic Policies Committee, chaired by Mark Smotherman, has worked on revisions to the final exam schedule, impact of incomplete grades on overall GPRs, institutionalizing the Freshman Summer Reading Program committee, review of the proposed statement of core values, and implementation of a central advising center.

The Research Committee, chaired by Dennis Smith, is working on revision of selected research policies, technology transfer, compliance issues, and research support in the humanities.

The Finance Committee, chaired by Dan Warner, is working on per diem issues; policies related to indirect fund returns, land sales, start-up packages, and endowments; and the total compensation report.

We have select committees that are working on specific issues, such as rights and privileges of emeriti faculty, faculty titles, faculty evaluation and development, and grievance procedures. Additionally, 2006-2007 is the 50th anniversary of the Faculty Senate. As part of our celebration, we hosted the Board of Trustees for dinner and were honored by them with a resolution of appreciation; we also celebrated the collaboration between athletics and academics at halftime of the Maryland football game. There are displays of Senate activities are at the Madren Center and the Strom Thurmond Institute.

We are taking part in discussions on the changing roles of faculty members as Clemson’s national reputation continues to grow and as new faculty with fresh ideas and energies join us. We would welcome your input on how we balance tradition and change, how we integrate new faculty into the “Clemson family,” and how we value the contributions of each person here at Clemson.

Please feel free to contact me or any of the committee chairs if you have questions or input on any of these issues. Thank you for the privilege of serving as your Faculty Senate President!!

Beth Kunkel
VII.C.5. Summer Reading Advisory Committee

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 services 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. The student and faculty representatives serve one-year renewable terms.

**Rationale:** If the faculty are to be held publicly accountable for the book selection they need to have a formal channel of input into that choice.
RESOLUTION OF CONGRATULATIONS UPON THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A PHI BETA KAPPA CHAPTER AT CLEMSON UNIVERSITY

Whereas, The will of Thomas Green Clemson established Clemson University as "a high seminary of learning";

Whereas, The Phi Beta Kappa Society is the nation's oldest and best-known honor society, recognizing excellence in the liberal arts and sciences and devotion to freedom of inquiry and expression;

Whereas, Phi Beta Kappa Chapters are only granted to faculty at institutions that have demonstrated "standards that encourage excellence, a system of governance that promotes academic freedom and vigor, a scholarly faculty, a promising student body, a library and other educational facilities serving and complementing the course offerings and an adequate and dependable income sufficient to maintain academic excellence" and such institutions constitute only about 10% of the institutions of higher education in the United States;

Whereas, The Phi Beta Kappa faculty at Clemson University have been recently awarded a Chapter of Phi Beta Kappa; and

Whereas, This new Chapter is the direct result of the vision and hard work of many members of the Clemson Family, including:

George and Helen Fant, who established the Fant Endowment to fund the application for and founding of Clemson University’s Phi Beta Kappa Chapter;
Jens Holley, Chair of the Phi Beta Kappa Application Committee;
Members of the Phi Beta Kappa Application Committee: Tony W. Cawthon, Martha J. Duke, Lane Glaze, C. Alan Grubb, Michael Horvath, Eleanor (Lea) Jenkins, Philip McGee, Jan Murdoch, Cynthia Pury, Michael Silvestri, Summer Smith Taylor, and Jamie Williams;
President Jim Barker and Provost Dori Helms, who envisioned a Phi Beta Kappa Chapter as a Top-20 goal;
Dr. Debra Jackson and Ms. Teresa Henry, who coordinated the site visit;
And numerous other faculty and staff who provided information both in writing and to the site visitors.

RESOLVED, that the Faculty Senate of Clemson University congratulates the Phi Beta Kappa faculty members of Clemson University on being awarded a Chapter of Phi Beta Kappa and extends our gratitude for bringing this recognition to our University.
MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE
FEBRUARY 13, 2007

1. Call to Order: The meeting was called to order by President Beth Kunkel at 2:34 p.m.

2. Approval of Minutes: The Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes dated January 9, 2007 were approved as written, as were the General Faculty and Staff Meeting Minutes dated December 20, 2006.

3. "Free Speech": None

4. Special Orders of the Day: Terry Don Phillips, Athletic Director, provided information regarding student athletes' graduation rates and also mentioned that the student athlete GPAs are increasing. In response to the recent athletic/admissions discussion, he stated that he and the Athletic Department will work to have academic integrity in the process of admissions. Larry LaForge, Faculty Athletic Representative, presented a landscape for change in intercollegiate athletics noting that the NCAA governance structure has changed, recommendations have been made for greater campus involvement in governance of athletic programs, and that an academic reform process is presently transpiring. He noted that to succeed, there must be sound academic practices, effective academic support services and leadership and support from colleges. In response to the discussion regarding athletics and academics, Dr. LaForge stated that the AARC must have an effective process and that, therefore, we need to revisit the student athletic admissions policies to be sure things are in place. (Attachment A). Questions and answers were then exchanged.

5. Slate of Officers: The Slate of Officers was presented by the Advisory Committee to the Faculty Senate.

   Vice President/President-Elect:
   Des Layne
   Nancy Porter
   Bryan Simmons

   Secretary:
   Grant Cunningham
   Deborah Thomason

6. Committees:
   a. Senate Committees
1) **Finance Committee** – Dan Warner, Chair, reported that the Committee will meet on February 15, 2007 to discuss per diem rates for travel.

2) **Welfare Committee** – Chair Nancy Porter stated that this Committee will meet on March 6, 2007 and submitted and briefly explained the Report dated January 16, 2007 (Attachment B).

3) **Scholastic Policies Committee** – Chair Mark Smotherman submitted the Committee Report dated January 11, 2007 (Attachment C) and noted that the Committee will meet on February 15, 2007.

4) **Research Committee** – Senator Christina Wells submitted and briefly explained the Research Committee Report of February 6, 2007 (Attachment D).

5) **Policy Committee** – Bryan Simmons, Chair, submitted and explained the Committee’s Report dated January 16, 2007 (Attachment E).

b. **Other University Committee/Commissions:**
   1) The Grievance I and II Procedure Activity Reports from January, 2006 through January, 2007 were submitted and explained by President Kunkel and Grievance Board Chair Daryl Guffey, respectively (Attachment F).

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

8. **Old Business:** None

9. **New Business:**
   a. Senator Smotherman submitted for support the Undergraduate Academic Grievance Process and Professor Dave Barrett explained the revisions to the Senate. Following discussion, vote to support proposed revisions was taken and passed (Attachment H).

   b. Senator Simmons submitted and explained the proposed *Faculty Manual* change, Part V. Grievance Procedures, for approval. There was no discussion. Vote was taken and passed unanimously with required two-thirds vote (Attachment I).

   c. Senator Simmons submitted and explained the proposed *Faculty Manual* change, III.G. Emeritus/Retired Faculty, for approval. There was no discussion. Vote was taken and passed with required two-thirds vote (Attachment J).
10. **Announcements:**
   a. Faculty displays celebrating the 50th Anniversary of the Faculty Senate at Clemson University are located in the FirstSun Connector between the Martin Inn and the Madren Center and in the alcove of the Strom Thurmond Institute. Many thanks to Susan Hiott of the Clemson Libraries for creating both displays.

   b. Nominations for the Alan Schaffer Faculty Senate Service Award are due to the Faculty Senate Office on February 15, 2007.

   c. The 50th Anniversary of the Faculty Senate February Forum will be held on February 19, 2007 at the Madren Center.

   d. The 50th Anniversary Spring Reception will be held on April 10, 2007 at the Owen Pavillion of the Madren Center – invitations forthcoming.

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

    [Signature]

    Desmond R. Layne, Secretary

    [Signature]

    Cathy Toth Sturkie, Program Assistant

Absent: B. Bauerle, C. White (H. Liu for), G. Birrenkott, A. Bennett, F. Edwards, J. Meriwether, R. Figliola (W. Sarasua for), D. Smith
What is the AARC and why do we have it?

Every NCAA Division I school with admission standards that are higher than the NCAA minimum requirements must have a process in place that explains the admission of student-athletes who meet the NCAA minimum requirements but not the normal admission standards for the school. The process must involve an assessment of the likelihood that the student-athlete can be successful in the academic environment of the school, and it must show that the school understands and can provide the academic support services necessary for the individual to be successful. The final admissions decision based on these assessments must be made by the same University officials who make admissions decisions for all students.

Clemson initiated the AARC in its current form as a result of its 2001-02 NCAA Certification review. Prior to that time, Clemson admitted student-athletes based on minimum NCAA requirements, and accurately reported so in its 2001-02 NCAA Certification Self Study. The NCAA Committee on Certification ruled that the process of using NCAA minimum standards resulted in student-athletes being admitted to Clemson as a group without regard to each individual's potential for success and special needs for academic support services. The NCAA Certification Committee withheld Clemson's certification until we developed the required process for our campus. (If an NCAA institution fails to retain its certification, it loses the right to participate in NCAA championship post-season events.)

Clemson academic and athletic officials worked together to develop the AARC, which makes a recommendation to the Director of Admissions only in cases where the prospective student-athlete is in the lower half of his/her graduation class in high school. Every Clemson coach has a written document that describes the process and outlines the responsibilities of the coaching staff and the responsibilities of the AARC in the recruiting of prospective student-athletes.
How does the AARC operate?

Four levels of review are potentially involved for each prospective student-athlete who is in the lower half of his/her high school graduating class. The initial review conducted by the AARC involves an examination of transcripts, SAT and/or ACT test scores, and high school performance. As with all Clemson admissions, the quality of the high school is considered in assessing the prospect’s high school record as it relates to potential success at Clemson.

If the first AARC review does not yield a positive admission recommendation, the recruiting coach may appeal the decision by informing the AARC that he or she wishes a second review. The second review requires the coach to meet with the committee and discuss the prospect and why he/she believes that the prospect will be successful at Clemson. The second review requires the coach to arrange for outside recommendations from the prospect’s current English and math teachers, as well as the school guidance counselor, and it allows the coach to present recommendations from any other persons he/she believes can speak to the issues. This process mirrors the admissions exceptions review conducted for any Clemson student who does not receive a positive admission decision. At this stage, the AARC frequently consults with learning specialists in Vickery Hall for guidance about the special academic support needs of the prospective student-athlete and our ability to provide services to address those needs.

If the first and second AARC reviews do not yield a positive admission recommendation, the Athletic Director may appeal to the Provost to admit the student. This is the third level of review. The appeal should address the key operating principle of potential academic success at Clemson. The Provost consults with the Director of Admissions in processing these appeals. There is no limit to the number of appeals that the Athletic Director may make.

Since the President has final authority in all University matters, a potential fourth level of review occurs in cases in which the President is asked to review the decision.

The time frame for these reviews and appeals is critical. Coaches initiate the process by submission of academic information for their recruits. The AARC has established a meeting schedule that allows early review of candidates well before signing dates, and it holds special meetings as necessary to accommodate events in the recruiting
process. In all first review and second review cases in this academic year, the AARC has responded to the coaches with its decision within 24 hours of its meeting.

Why is an academic review necessary prior to sending a prospect a national letter of intent (NLI)?

The academic review is conducted prior to sending the NLI to ensure that recruited and signed student-athletes can be admitted to the University. This is important since admissions decisions can only be made by University administrative officials charged with that responsibility. The review helps coaches focus their recruiting on prospects who are admissible and likely to be successful and eligible, and it helps prospective student-athletes by ensuring that their college choice is a good fit for them. These benefits depend on timely reviews conducted early in the recruiting process. AARC guidelines state that it is the responsibility of the coaches to submit academic credentials of their prospects early in the recruiting process, and it is the responsibility of the AARC to provide its assessments in timely fashion so that coaches can modify recruiting plans if necessary. The practice of conducting an academic review prior to signing prospects is in the best interests of the coaches, the University, and the prospective student-athletes. It allows prospects who will not be admitted a chance to select another school prior to signing day.

Why don’t we sign prospects who cannot be admitted and send them to prep school or junior college to improve their academic credentials?

A prospective student-athlete who signs a letter of intent and is subsequently turned down for admission is no longer committed to the school that signed him or her. Therefore, we cannot “send” the prospect to prep school or junior college. The prospect may choose to attend prep school or junior college to improve his/her academic credentials and preparation. In cases where there is significant academic improvement at an accredited institution, this should be viewed positively if the prospect is re-recruited by Clemson and brought before the AARC again. However, admissions commitments to
these student-athletes can only come from University admissions officials who make those decisions for all students.

If a coach has a proven record of high graduation rates, why don’t we admit any student-athlete in that sport who meets the NCAA minimum requirements? Our current graduation rates and academic progress rates (APR) are a source of pride in many of our sports. High graduation rates are the product of three things: (1) appropriate admission practices, (2) effective academic support services, and (3) leadership of coaches in supporting academic matters. We have all three elements in place at Clemson for all our sports, and that explains why we have fared well thus far in both athletic competition and in the academic performance reporting now required by the NCAA. Our graduation rates serve as validation that our process that relies on admissions, academic support, and coaching leadership is working.

How is it possible that a prospect who is denied admission to Clemson subsequently signs a letter of intent with a prestigious institution of higher education? Every Division I school is dealing with the same issues that we face at Clemson. A key issue relevant to this question is the requirement that every school must provide the necessary academic support services to accepted student-athletes whose academic preparation places them at a disadvantage relative to other students at that school. This means that we must know our capabilities in Vickery Hall. Similarly, other schools must understand their situation with regard to the ability to support this population of student-athletes on their campus. The size of this population is determined by the number of at-risk student-athletes being recruited by the coaches and the number that are admitted. Some schools may limit their recruiting to a small number of student-athletes in this category, and subsequently they may have a high acceptance rate for them. Other schools may have a much larger pool of student-athlete prospects that will need extensive support services, and they must make difficult decisions in admissions so that they can provide...
the needed services and maintain the integrity of their promise to give every student-athlete a reasonable opportunity to graduate.

**Are these academic reviews putting Clemson athletics at a competitive disadvantage?**

No. The academic review process conducted by the AARC considers the athletics goals of the University and has resulted in positive admission recommendations for numerous prospective student-athletes with academic backgrounds that differ from the typical Clemson student. The academic reviews help ensure that recruited student-athletes have the potential to retain their eligibility and achieve graduation. Coaches and fans are not well served if athletic teams are disrupted by academic casualties and lost eligibility. New NCAA rules penalize schools with reduced scholarships if student-athletes do not make satisfactory academic progress.
I.B. MISSION-RELATED ADMISSION OF SCHOLARSHIP STUDENT-ATHLETES

Procedures described below for the admission of scholarship student-athletes are intended to recognize and support published University goals for a successful athletics program, while fulfilling the NCAA Operating Principles of Academic Integrity. These operating principles require that the institution admit only student-athletes who have a reasonable expectation of earning an academic degree, and that the institution has the capability to provide adequate academic support services to meet the needs of the student-athletes it admits.

Many scholarship student-athletes at Clemson meet regular admission criteria and are admitted through the normal admissions process. For scholarship athletes not meeting regular admission criteria, the admissions process parallels the University procedure outlined in the previous section for mission-related admissions in general.

Prospective scholarship athletes who have performed well academically in high school, as evidenced by ranking in the upper half of their class, are admitted at the discretion of the Director of Admissions under the mission-related admissions process described in the previous section. These prospective student-athletes help the University achieve its mission and have demonstrated the ability to perform well academically, even though they may not meet the regular admission criteria.

Prospective student-athletes whose academic record in high school places them in the lower half of their class are subject to review to ensure that they have the academic preparation and skills necessary to be successful at Clemson, and that the institution understands and can provide the academic support services they will need if admitted. These cases are referred to the Athletic Admissions Review Committee (AARC) for review and recommendation to the Director of Admissions. Final authority for these and all other admissions resides with the Director of Admissions under the supervision of the Provost.

As with the overall University policy for admissions, the AARC procedures described below involve a review of the academic credentials of prospective students by qualified University officials, timely reporting of the results of the review, and opportunities for appeal.

I.C. ATHLETIC ADMISSIONS REVIEW COMMITTEE (AARC)

Purpose

The AARC reviews the academic credentials of prospective scholarship student-athletes who do not meet the normal University criteria for admissions and do not have a strong record of academic performance. These reviews take place prior to the issue of a National Letter of Intent (NLI) or an official offer of athletics aid. The AARC makes a recommendation to the Director of Admissions regarding the admission of each prospect.
Scope

The AARC must review academic credentials for all the following student-athlete prospects who are to receive athletics aid if admitted:

1. First-time student-athlete prospects who are in the bottom half of their high school class, as identified in the academic profile developed by Compliance Services.
2. Transfer student-athletes whose previous college record indicates academic deficiencies, as determined by the Director of Admissions.
3. International student-athlete prospects, both first-time and transfers, as identified in the academic profile developed by Compliance Services.
4. Student-athlete prospects whose academic record contains inconsistencies or unusual circumstances, as determined by the Director of Admissions or the Director of Compliance Services.

Committee Membership and Roles

The AARC has five members who review and vote on all applications referred to the committee. In addition to the voting members, the Director of Admissions or his designee attends all AARC meetings and serves as an ex officio member of the committee.

Specific responsibilities of the AARC members are as follows:

- **Faculty Athletics Representative.** Voting member. Chairs committee meetings, and represents the committee to the Provost and Director of Athletics.
- **Registrar or designee.** Voting member. Provides forecast on NCAA eligibility for transfers.
- **Athletic Council chair.** Voting member. This faculty member serves as AARC chair when the faculty athletics representative is absent.
- **At-large member.** Voting member. Appointed by the Provost. Must be a non-athletics faculty or staff member.
- **Director of Vickery Hall.** Voting member. Prepares and distributes materials to committee members. Coordinates the attendance of coaches at meetings. Maintains data on committee decisions. Consults with learning specialists prior to committee meetings concerning prospects' credentials. Reports results of committee actions to sports supervisors, coaches, and appropriate administrators.
- **Director of Admissions or designee.** Ex officio, nonvoting member. Provides information on prospects’ high schools and previously-attended colleges.

Meetings

The AARC meeting schedule will be established early in the academic term, and will be designed to accommodate recruiting cycles in the various sports. All AARC meeting times will be announced to sports supervisors, coaches, and compliance services.

A quorum of four AARC members plus the Director of Admissions or his designee is required for the committee to review a prospect’s record. At least three voting committee members must approve any action taken on the review of a prospect.
Outcomes

The outcome of each AARC review of a prospect will be recorded on an “AARC Report of Action” form. This form (see Appendix) indicates the action taken by AARC, the options available for appealing the AARC decision, and the information needed for an appeal. Committee decisions will be provided to coaches, sport supervisors and compliance services within 48 hours of the meeting.

Procedures

The AARC will establish a meeting schedule that allows timely review of prospects prior to NLI signing dates. It is the responsibility of the AARC to adjust its meeting schedule as necessary to accommodate timetables and events in the recruiting cycle.

The recruiting coach will submit information about each prospect as early as possible in the recruiting cycle and prior to issuance of an NLI. The initial review of a prospect requires the information listed below. It is the responsibility of the recruiting coach to ensure that all the following items are available for the initial AARC review:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First-Time Students</th>
<th>Transfer Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Copy of transcript(s)</td>
<td>1. Copy of transcript(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Intended major at Clemson</td>
<td>2. Intended major at Clemson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. High school attendance history</td>
<td>4. Transfer credit evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. SAT/ACT scores</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the AARC does not recommend admission on the first review, the recruiting coach may appeal to the AARC for a second review. Also, a second review may be required if the AARC determines in the first review that there is insufficient information to ensure that the prospect will have a reasonable opportunity to be successful in the academic environment at Clemson. The following additional items are needed if a second review is conducted:

1. Presentation by the recruiting coach that includes reasons for believing the candidate can be successful in the academic environment at Clemson.
2. Outside recommendation forms completed by the guidance counselor and current or most recent math and English teachers. (For first-time students in U.S. high schools. See Appendix for external recommendation form.)
3. Explanation of any unusual aspects of academic history such as multiple high schools, use of summer school, nontraditional or correspondence courses.
4. Any other items cited by the AARC in its first review.
Athletic Director's Appeal to the Provost

A negative recommendation by AARC on the second review may be appealed by the Director of Athletics to the Provost, with a copy to the Faculty Athletics Representative. An appeal from the AD to the Provost must address how admission of this prospective student-athlete will serve the mission of the University, and how this admission is consistent with Clemson’s commitment to be in full compliance with the following NCAA Operating Principles of Academic Integrity:

1. *The institution admits only student-athletes who have reasonable expectations of obtaining academic degrees.*

2. *Adequate academic support services are available for student-athletes.*

Upon notice of an appeal by the AD, the Faculty Athletics Representative will forward to the Provost the recommendation forms received from the prospect’s most recent math and English teachers. Failure of the recruiting coach to arrange for recommendations from the most recent math and English teachers to be submitted to the AARC will result in an incomplete file for the appeal, which would not be viewed favorably in assessing the case. In those situations where the input of learning specialists in Vickery Hall was a factor in the AARC recommendation, the Faculty Athletics Representative must also include a written report from the learning specialist(s).

AARC Recommendation and Issuance of NLI

The AARC review is linked to permission to issue an NLI so that athletic recruiting decisions and academic admissions decisions are coordinated as much as possible. The following rules guide the issuance of an NLI to a prospect reviewed by the AARC.

**IF**

| The prospect is recommended for admission by AARC in the first review OR the second review. | THEN |
| The prospect is not recommended for admission by AARC in the first review, and the recruiting coach does not appeal the first-review recommendation. | The prospect may not be sent an NLI. |
| The prospect is not recommended for admission by AARC in the first review, the recruiting coach appeals the first-review recommendation, and the prospect is not recommended by AARC in the second review. | The prospect may not be sent an NLI unless a successful appeal is made by the AD to the Provost. |
| The prospect requires a second review but AARC determines that it does not have sufficient information to complete the second review prior to the NLI signing date. | The prospect may be sent an NLI. The NLI must be accompanied by a letter from the Director of Admissions to the prospect describing the application procedures, admissions criteria, and review process that will be used to make the admissions decision. |

The NLI Administrator is responsible for ensuring that the above rules are followed with regard to issuing the NLI to a prospect.

The entire AARC review process is summarized in Figure 1 on the following page.
The recruiting coach submits required academic information about the prospect to the AARC through the NLI Administrator and Compliance Services. Materials must be submitted prior to issuing an NLI or offer of financial aid.

**FIRST REVIEW.**

The AARC reviews the academic information and makes 1 of 3 recommendations regarding admission of the prospect.

- **Admission is not recommended**
- **Admission is recommended**

**Does the recruiting coach appeal the recommendation to the AARC?**

- **NO**
- **YES**

**SECOND REVIEW.**

A 2nd review is conducted by the AARC after the recruiting coach provides required, additional information. The 2nd review requires the coach to meet with the committee. AARC makes 1 of 2 recommendations in the 2nd review.

- **Admission is not recommended**
- **Admission is recommended**

**Does the AD appeal the AARC recommendation to the Provost?**

- **NO**
- **YES**

**Does the Provost approve admission of the prospect?**

- **NO**
- **YES**

The prospect is recommended for admission pending submission of all required admissions application materials and, if the prospect is a first-time student, final certification by the NCAA IEC.

**RULES FOR ISSUING NLI:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IF</th>
<th>THEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The prospect is recommended for admission by AARC in the first review OR the second review.</td>
<td>The prospect may be sent an NLI at the appropriate time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The prospect is not recommended for admission by AARC in the first review, and the recruiting coach does not appeal the first-review recommendation.</td>
<td>The prospect may not be sent an NLI.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The prospect is not recommended for admission by AARC in the first review, the recruiting coach appeals the first-review recommendation, and the prospect is not recommended by AARC in the second review.</td>
<td>The prospect may not be sent an NLI unless a successful appeal is made by the AD to the Provost.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The prospect requires a second review but AARC determines that it does not have sufficient information to complete the second review prior to the NLI signing date.</td>
<td>The prospect may be sent an NLI. The NLI must be accompanied by a letter from the Director of Admissions to the prospect describing the application procedures, admissions criteria, and review process that will be used to make the admissions decision.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I.D. APPENDICES – FORMS

AARC Report of Action Form for Review of a Prospect
(To be completed by the Faculty Athletics Representative after each review of a prospect.)

Evaluation of Prospective Student-Athlete Form (for outside reference)
(To be sent by the recruiting coach to outside references in cases where a second review of a high school prospect in the U.S. is required. The completed form is to be mailed by the reference directly to the Associate Athletic Director for Academic Services.)
ATHLETIC ADMISSIONS REVIEW COMMITTEE (AARC)

REPORT OF ACTION FOR THE REVIEW OF A PROSPECT

Prospect’s Name ___________________________ Date of Review ______________

FIRST REVIEW RECOMMENDATION:

Admission is recommended.
No further AARC action is needed. For first-time students, the admission recommendation is contingent upon certification by the NCAA Initial Eligibility Clearinghouse.

An admission recommendation cannot be made until a second review is conducted.
Continued recruiting of the prospect is appropriate, but the AARC has concerns about the prospect’s academic record and academic preparation. A second review is needed to make an admission recommendation. See Second Review Requirements below.

Admission is not recommended.
The AARC believes that there is strong evidence that the prospect does not possess the academic background necessary to have a reasonable chance to earn a degree from Clemson, and it does not support continued recruiting or admission of the prospect or the issuance of an NLI or offer of financial aid. The recruiting coach may appeal this recommendation to the AARC and request a second review of the prospect. See Second Review Requirements below.

SECOND REVIEW REQUIREMENTS:

The second review requires the recruiting coach to attend the AARC meeting to discuss the prospect’s record with the committee. The coach may present any information considered relevant, but must be prepared to discuss the following:

Second Review Requirements for First Time-Students from U.S. high schools: Current transcript(s), all SAT/ACT test scores, current class standing, senior-year class schedule, senior-year grades as available, intended major, financial aid offer, and completed Evaluation of Prospective Student-Athlete form to be sent by mail directly to the Associate AD for Academic Services from the prospect’s current or most recent English and math teachers, the high school counselor, and other external references as appropriate.

Second Review Requirements for Other Prospects (international & transfer): Current transcript(s), test scores if first-time student, transfer credit evaluation if transfer student, intended major, and financial aid offer.

SECOND REVIEW RECOMMENDATION:

Admission is recommended.
No further AARC action is needed. For first-time students, the admission recommendation is contingent upon certification by the NCAA Initial Eligibility Clearinghouse

Admission is not recommended.
An appeal of this recommendation may be made by the Director of Athletics to the Provost.

Committee Comments

NLI Permission

(One item below to be checked by AARC)

| Issue NLI | Do Not Issue NLI | Issue NLI with letter from Director of Admissions |

Cc: Robert Barkley, Director of Admissions
    Jan Murdoch, Dean of Undergraduate Studies
    Terry Don Phillips, Director of Athletics
    Stephanie Ellison, Director of Compliance Services
    Barbara Kennedy-Dixon, NLI Administrator

Faculty Athletics Representative
Evaluation of Prospective Student-Athlete
(To be Completed by Outside Reference)

Prospect:

Name ____________________________________________

Home Address: _______________________________________________

Note:

*Because of federal legislation giving students access to educational records, Clemson University cannot guarantee the confidentiality of your evaluations.*

1. Knowledge of the Applicant

   Approximately how long have you known the applicant?  Years ______
   
   How well do you know this student?
   
   Casually _____ Well _____ Very Well _____
   
   How do you know this student?
   
   Teacher in One Class _____ Teacher in More Than One Class _____
   
   Other (Explain) ____________________________________________

Rating of Skills/Abilities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Unable to Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skills in oral communication as</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>compared to other seniors in your</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills in written communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as compared to other seniors in your</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematical ability as compared to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other seniors in your school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsiveness to guidance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General character</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison of overall academic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ability to that of other students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from your school who have been</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>successful at Clemson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood of academic success at an</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>institution of higher education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please place an x at the appropriate point on each scale provided below.
2. In your opinion, is the student's academic record an accurate indicator of his/her ability?
   Yes _____ No _____ If no, please explain.

3. Do you have any information related to character and temperament or to any personal characteristics of this student that should be considered by the admissions committee?

4. Please offer any additional comments related to academic skills or learning traits that you think will be helpful in evaluating and/or providing appropriate academic support services to this student. Use the back of this form if you wish.

Signature
Name
School
Position
Teaching Area (If Applicable)
Date

For Guidance Counselors:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Absences</th>
<th>Tardies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Return this recommendation form in the envelope provided to the following address:
Rebecca Bowman
Associate Athlete Director for Academic Services
PO Box 347115
Clemson, SC 29634-7115
Priority Issues
Parking and Transportation - update from Nancy Porter – check out web site at http://stuaff.clemson.edu/parking/masterplan/ and provide input.

Child Care Center for Clemson University – Provost Helms has indicated that the original modular buildings that would have allowed Clemson to have a daycare up and running this fall would cost about $300 per sq.ft., more than creating a research facility. Thus, they are going back to the drawing board with a new design. The Provost submitted the A-1 in time for information to go to the Budget and Control Board in May. She is now looking into perhaps offering infant care up to one year in an alternative location this fall while the new facility is being built for occupancy in January 2008. She again indicated that she would probably send out a survey to identify just how many people would use the daycare after the alternative location is finalized.

Alan Schaffer Faculty Senate Service Award – Grant Cunningham reported that nominations are being submitted. The deadline is February 15, 2007.

Spousal/Partner Hiring – Alan Grubb will provide a summary of this benefit for the Welfare Committee’s year end report in April.

Continuing Issues for Discussion
Per Diem Rates
FACT: According to the American Express Global Business Travel Forecast, the cost of the average domestic business trip is expected to rise 4.5%, or $46, in 2007.

FACT: In July 2006 the General Appropriations Act was amended to state: “...all employees of the State of South Carolina or any agency thereof including employees and members of the governing bodies of each technical college while traveling on the business of the State shall, upon presentation of a paid receipt, be allowed reimbursement for actual expenses incurred for lodging, not to exceed the current maximum lodging rates, excluding taxes, established by the U.S. General Services Administration.”

THEREFORE: The Welfare Committee wishes to support a joint recommendation with the Finance Committee to pursue complete adoption of the approved federal per diem rates beyond just the limitation of lodging costs that are reimbursable to include the approved rates for meals and incidental expenses (M&IE) listed in CONUS which generally exceed the current state approved per diem rates for meals for faculty paying for travel out of fund 10 state appropriations.

New Issues Discussed
Performance Salary Survey – The Welfare Committee supports Provost Helms’ Performance Salary Survey and eagerly awaits information that is gained through this effort.
Future Issues That May Need to be Addressed by 2007-2008 Welfare Committee

Governor Sanford’s 2007-08 Executive Budget information and proposal to improve “Financial Health” SC Retirement System

- From FY 1998-99 to FY 2005-06, the retirement system’s debt increased from $178 million to over $9 billion, an increase of 4,952 percent. In FY 1998-99, it would have taken the state only two years to amortize that debt; today it will take 30 years to pay off the debt. The constitutional limit is 30 years. “This means the system is fiscally unsound.”
- Proposes legislation expanding the current Optional Retirement Program and advocates that this be the only state plan extended to new state employees.

In another area relative to faculty, Governor Sanford:

- Proposes re-hiring of prior employees enrolled in TERI program only in extreme cases and if rehired, those employees only receive 75% of previous salary.

The next meeting of the Welfare Committee is scheduled for 2:30 PM on February 6, 2007 in room B-211 of the Poole Agricultural Center.
Minutes of the January 11, 2007, Scholastic Policies Committee meeting

Members present: A. Girgis, M. Smotherman, D. Willoughby

The committee met with Dr. Frankie Felder to discuss the revisions she is investigating for the academic grievance and academic integrity policies of the graduate school.

1. Regarding academic integrity, Dr. Felder has surveyed several groups at Clemson on the relative seriousness of different acts of academic dishonesty. She has also studied the policies at several other schools, including a policy at Rutgers that defines four levels of academic dishonesty and suggests four different levels of responses (see http://cat.rutgers.edu/integrity/policy.html).

2. Dr. Felder agrees that the President and Provost should be taken out of the appeal procedures and that the Dean of the Graduate School should make the final decision on academic grievance and integrity cases for graduate students.

3. Dr. Felder is open to the idea of appeal procedures within the graduate school that provide both faculty member(s) and student(s) the opportunity to talk with the dean before the dean renders a final decision on an appeal. She is also very firm that the faculty member should be informed of the outcome of a successful appeal by a student and the reasoning behind it.

4. Dr. Felder sees the need for the dean's designee to continue to serve as a nonvoting facilitator during academic grievance and integrity hearings and deliberations.

5. Dr. Felder is considering ways in which instruction about plagiarism and its consequences can be incorporated into the Clemson experience for graduate students. It may be a part of professional development seminars for graduate students that will start next year, or departments can offer special seminars that are tailored to their particular field. Another idea is to have students submit their papers to services like TurnItIn.com and see the results before submitting for grading.

6. Dr. Felder is open to the idea that the graduate school academic integrity policy would allow minor violations to be handled by the instructor, with appropriate limitations on penalties.

Dr. Felder will ask the committee for comments on the draft policy revisions when they are ready.

Next meeting: Thursday, February 15, 10:00 am
Research Committee of the Faculty Senate
06 February 2007 Report
Submitted by: Dennis Smith, Chair (dwsmith@clemson.edu)

The Faculty Senate Research Committee met on Feb. 2, 2007 at 3PM in Hunter Labs. Present were Sens. Smith, Martin, and Wells. Our next meeting is TBA.

1. Conversation with Compliance (Lead: Wells/Meriwether). Naomi Kelly and Traci Arwood have provided a detailed and valuable response to questions solicited from the faculty. Sen. Wells will summarize for dissemination to senate and department chairs (next report).

2. Technology Transfer & Entrepreneurship (Lead: Smith/Figliola/Schleifer). Suggested changes to the faculty manual are being addressed concerning the IP policy. The committee extends appreciation to Prof. Joe Kolis for his presentation in December. Joe's slides are available upon request from Cathy in the Senate office. The VP of Research has released a report on our technology transfer operation (Tornatzky Report) in addition to the CURF Bylaws and Clemson/CURF agreement. These documents are now available upon request from Cathy in the Senate office.

3. Research and The Humanities (Lead: Martin). No discussion on this topic.

4. New topic: Research Professor Title (Lead: Smith). A conversation has been initiated based on questions from several faculty concerning the definition of "research faculty" in the Faculty Manual. Upon investigation, the committee has determined that some changes should be made. The title of "Research Professor" should be separated from "Extension Professor" and the following changes are hereby submitted to the Policy Committee. A "tracked change" version is attached.

Research Faculty. The title of research professor, research associate professor, and research assistant professor (depending upon professional qualifications) may be granted to persons engaged in full time research. The position is typically in connection with externally funded research projects for which they may serve as, and expected to seek, principal investigator status. Such appointments will be treated as regular faculty and must be initiated by the host department(s) in accordance with departmental bylaws and approved by the dean and the Provost. These positions are not tenurable, nor shall time spent in such a position typically count toward tenure. Individuals holding these positions will be subject to annual review utilizing the faculty activity system for faculty continuance.
Research Faculty. The title of research professor, research associate professor, and research assistant professor (depending upon professional qualifications) may be granted to persons engaged in full time research. The position is typically in connection with externally funded research projects for which they may serve as, and expected to seek principal investigator status. Such appointments will be treated as regular faculty and must be initiated by the host department(s) in accordance with departmental bylaws and approved by the dean and the Provost. These positions are not tenurable, nor shall time spent in such a position typically count toward tenure. Individuals holding these positions will be subject to annual review utilizing the faculty activity system for faculty continuance.
Faculty Senate Policy Committee

(Minutes of the Tuesday January 16, 2007 Policy Committee meeting)

The Policy Committee met on Tuesday January 16 at 2:00 PM in Room 205 of the Cooper Library.

Policy Agenda:

1. Discussed current wording in the nepotism section of the manual.

2. Connie Lee presented information regarding a request to address the issue of non-sectarian prayer.

3. Discussed whether or not the promotion and tenure clock can be reset for relatively long periods of time due to protracted illnesses.

4. Discussed and approved proposed wording for the Teacher and Employee Retention Incentive (TERI) section of the manual.

5. Discussed potential candidates for the upcoming senate officer elections.

The next scheduled Policy Committee meeting is on Tuesday February 20, 2007 at 2:00 PM in room 205 of the library.
CLEMSON UNIVERSITY GRIEVANCE BOARD
GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE ACTIVITY

GRIEVANCE I PROCEDURE PETITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Grievances</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grievances Found Non-Grievable by Grievance Board</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grievances Found to be Grievable by Grievance Board</td>
<td>2</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>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing Panel Grievance Recommendations Supported By Provost/President</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grievances Appealed to President</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presidential Decisions Supporting Petitioner</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grievances Appealed to Board of Trustees</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1</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>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Total Number of Grievances 7
Grievances Found Non-Grievable 5
Grievances Found to be Grievable 2
Not Yet Determined Grievable Or Non-Grievable 0
Grievances In Process 1
Suspended Grievances 0
Withdrawn Grievances 0
Petitions Supported by Hearing Panel 0
Petitions Partially Supported by Hearing Panel 1
Petitions Not Supported by Hearing Panel 0
Hearing Panel Grievance Recommendations Supported By Provost or President 1
Grievances Appealed to President 0
Presidential Decisions Supporting Petitioner 0
Male 6
Female 1

GRIEVANCE ACTIVITY BY COLLEGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AAH</th>
<th>AFLS</th>
<th>BBS</th>
<th>E&amp;S</th>
<th>HEHD</th>
<th>LIBRARY</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Faculty Senate was very busy this fall and is working on several issues this spring. We appreciate the support provided by the administration and the Board of Trustees!

The Policy Committee, chaired by Bryan Simmons, made revisions in the nepotism policy, date of publication of the Faculty Manual, definition of confidentiality, consistency in the probationary period and composition of several university committees. They are finalizing revisions to the grievance process and additional committee composition alterations. They have been ably assisted by our Faculty Manual Editorial Consultant, Holley Ulbrich. Dr. Ulbrich is retiring from this position in July after 3 years of distinguished service.

The Welfare committee, chaired by Nancy Porter, is working on parking, spousal hiring, housing, and day care issues. The day care center for children of university employees is expected to open in fall, 2007. They completed working with Human Resources on making a 12-month pay option available for faculty and on selecting the recipient of the second Alan Schaffer Service Award.

The Scholastic Policies Committee, chaired by Mark Smotherman, has worked on revisions to the final exam schedule, impact of incomplete grades on overall GPRs, institutionalizing the Summer Reading Program Advisory committee, review of the proposed statement of core values, implementation of a central advising center, and revisions in academic grievance procedures.

The Research Committee, chaired by Dennis Smith, is working on revision of selected research policies, technology transfer and compliance issues, and research support in the humanities.

The Finance Committee, chaired by Dan Warner, is working on total compensation reports; per diem issues; and policies on indirect returns, land sales, start-up packages, and endowments.

Select committees are working on rights and privileges of emeriti faculty, faculty titles, faculty evaluation and development, and grievance training.

The celebration of our 50th anniversary continues. The highlight of that celebration was dinner at your fall meeting and your extremely gracious resolution of appreciation. We also celebrated collaboration between athletics and academics at halftime of the Maryland game. Our celebration continues with the February Faculty Forum, “Shared Governance and the Legacy of Thomas Green Clemson.” It concludes April 10 with a reception following the Faculty Senate meeting.

The Class of ’39 Award of Excellence was presented to Don McKale, Professor of History and 1941 Memorial Professor of Humanities. Dr. McKale was honored at a ceremony at the Bell Tower in the Carillion Gardens and at a reception honoring all members of the Great Class of ’39. We value the continuing special and unique bond between the Class of ’39 and the faculty.

We are taking part in discussions on the changing roles of faculty members as Clemson’s national reputation continues to grow and as new faculty with fresh ideas and energies join us. We are seeking input from faculty on how to balance tradition and change and integrate new faculty into the “Clemson family.”

Thank you for the privilege of serving as Faculty Senate President for 2006-2007!

Beth Kunkel
Proposal to Revise the Undergraduate Academic Grievance Processes

The revisions consist of:

* An Academic Grievance Panel should screen grievances, and those grievances judged to have merit would then be heard by the Academic Grievance Committee.

* The types of grievances that should be heard by the Academic Grievance Committee will be limited to a final grade that was determined in such a way that (a) was in violation of the means stated in the instructor's syllabus, or (b) was in violation of a department, college, or university guideline.

* The order in which a student meets with faculty and administrators should change so that all necessary signatures are obtained prior to the student formally filing the grievance with the Associate Dean for Curriculum. The Associate Dean will provide a checklist to guide the student through the signature process.

* The Dean of Undergraduate Studies should make the final decision in those cases where the student does not accept the resolution proposed by the Academic Grievance Committee.

The Scholastic Policies Committee voted unanimously to approve the proposed revisions and the proposal has been approved by the Executive/Advisory Committee.
ACADEMIC GRIEVANCE BOARD

I. Purpose

Clemson University is dedicated to the fair and impartial review of grievances by students against faculty and staff. The Academic Grievance Board is responsible for reviewing and adjudicating allegations by undergraduate students of unfairness or inequity in the assigning of final grades. Only grievances that contest a final grade are considered by the Academic Grievance Board.

II. Definitions

The Academic Grievance Board comprises two separate entities: a 7-person Academic Grievance Panel and a 25-person Academic Grievance Committee.

The Academic Grievance Panel is responsible for the initial review of grievances and for determining which grievances will go forward to the Academic Grievance Committee (see section IV.4. below). There are five faculty representatives to the Academic Grievance Panel, one from each of the five colleges. The members of the Academic Grievance Panel are appointed by the Dean of Undergraduate Studies for three-year terms. In addition, there are two undergraduate student representatives to the panel, appointed for a two-year term. Undergraduate student representatives are selected on a rotating basis from each of the five colleges. The student representative is appointed to the Academic Grievance Panel by the President of the Student Senate. The Academic Grievance Panel will elect a chair each year, chosen from among the faculty members on the Academic Grievance Panel.

The Academic Grievance Committee is responsible for hearing student grievances, proposing resolutions to grievances, and, in the case of appeals, forwarding recommendations to the Dean of Undergraduate Studies. Grievances are heard by 3-person subcommittees, appointed by the Chair of the Academic Grievance Committee. The Academic Grievance Committee may hear a grievance only if a recommendation for a hearing is made by the Academic Grievance Panel. The Academic Grievance Committee consists of 15 faculty representatives, 3 from each College, and 10 student representatives, 2 from each College. Faculty representatives are elected by their colleges and serve three-year terms. Student representatives are appointed by the President of the Student Senate and serve two-year terms. The Chair of the Academic Grievance Committee is appointed by the Dean of Undergraduate Studies.

III. Grounds for Academic Grievances

The Academic Grievance Board provides for hearings on academic grievances that are based on either or both of the following claims:
a. The method used for arriving at a student’s final grade was in clear violation of the method described in the instructor’s course syllabus.

b. The method used for arriving at a student’s final grade was in clear violation of departmental, college or university policy.

The Academic Grievance Board will not attempt to substitute its judgment for an instructor’s in such matters as a) quality of the instructor’s teaching, b) quality of the student’s work or c) quality of course content.

IV. Rules and Procedures for Academic Grievances

1. Any student filing a grievance must first attempt to resolve it by consulting with the involved faculty member. In the event that the student and faculty member cannot arrive at a resolution, the student shall consult with the department chair of the faculty member and the dean of the college of the faculty member, respectively. The department chair and dean shall make every effort to help the student and the faculty member arrive at a resolution to the problem. At any time during this process the student may consult with the Undergraduate Student Ombudsman.

2. If the grievance remains unresolved, the student may bring the grievance before the Academic Grievance Board. The student must first meet with the Associate Dean for Curriculum in the Office of Undergraduate Studies. The Associate Dean for Curriculum will describe the grievance process to the student. If the student wishes to proceed with the grievance, the student will provide a written statement detailing the grievance to the Associate Dean for Curriculum. The written statement must specify the specific syllabus, departmental, college or university policy that the student alleges to have been violated. In addition, the student will secure, from the Office of Undergraduate Studies, a grievance checklist form. On this form, identified by complaint number, the student will document the following: (a) the dates of those consultations described in procedure IV.1 above, (b) the names of those persons consulted, and (c) the signature of the collegiate dean attesting that no resolution could be reached. The completed checklist form will then be returned to the Associate Dean for Curriculum for signature. Both the written statement and the completed checklist form must be delivered to the Office of Undergraduate Studies within 90 calendar days (exclusive of summer vacation) of the date of the last exam for the term in which the student alleges to have been aggrieved. The failure of a student to file a grievance within the 90-day period will cause him/her to forfeit his/her right to file a grievance under this procedure.

3. When all procedures described in item IV.2 have been completed, the Office of Undergraduate Studies will forward a copy of the grievance to the chair of the Academic Grievance Panel. The chair of the Academic Grievance Panel shall, upon receipt of the grievance, convene the Academic Grievance Panel to review
4. The Academic Grievance Panel will review the grievance, and ascertain whether the complaint meets the criteria for “Grounds for Academic Grievances” (III. above). The Academic Grievance Panel will handle each case in a confidential manner.

5. Following the complaint review, the Academic Grievance Panel will (a) make a written recommendation to the Associate Dean for Curriculum to dismiss the grievance, with the grievance identified by complaint number or (b) make a written recommendation to the Academic Grievance Committee to hear the grievance and arrive at a recommendation. In the case that the Academic Grievance Panel recommends that the grievance be heard by the Academic Grievance Committee, a copy of the recommendation, identified by complaint number, will be forwarded to the Office of Undergraduate Studies.

6. If the Academic Grievance Panel recommends dismissal of the case, the Associate Dean for Curriculum will notify the student, the involved faculty member, the department chair of the involved faculty member, and the involved collegiate dean.

7. If the Academic Grievance Panel recommends a hearing, the Chair of the Academic Grievance Committee shall, upon receipt of the recommendation from the Academic Grievance Panel and all relevant documents, appoint a 3-person subcommittee to hold a hearing on the grievance. The subcommittee will be selected from among the members of the Academic Grievance Committee. The subcommittee will consist of a faculty member assigned to serve as the subcommittee chairperson, another faculty member, and a student representative to the subcommittee. The Chair of the Academic Grievance Committee may serve as one of the two faculty representatives to the subcommittee. If possible, the subcommittee shall include members who are not in the same college as the grievant or the faculty member against whom the grievance has been filed.

8. Prior to chairing a hearing (see item 9 below) the chairperson of the subcommittee will contact the student who has filed the grievance as well as the faculty member against whom the grievance has been filed. The chairperson of the subcommittee will provide copies of the grievance to both parties, answer any procedural questions that the parties have, and also ask each party if they have anything to add to the written record prior to the hearing. If additional written materials are submitted prior to the hearing, the chairperson of the subcommittee will distribute copies to all subcommittee members and to all parties to the grievance. The chairperson of the subcommittee will, to the extent possible, handle each case in a confidential manner.

9. The hearing on the grievance will be informal and shall be closed to the public. The chairperson shall take whatever action is necessary to ensure an equitable, orderly and expeditious hearing. All parties to the grievance shall be given an
opportunity to be heard. In addition, the chairperson may request the presence of any other person who can supply information pertinent to the grievance. Witnesses shall not be present during the hearing proceedings except when they are called to speak before the committee. The parties shall be permitted to question all individuals who are heard by the committee. If any witness is unable to be present at the hearing, the chairperson may, at his/her discretion, accept a written statement from that witness to be presented at the hearing. The parties shall be accorded the right to assistance of counsel of their own choice; however, counsel shall not be permitted to participate actively in the proceedings.

10. Upon conclusion of the hearing, the subcommittee shall reach, by majority vote, a posed solution to the grievance. The subcommittee chairperson shall then formulate the findings in writing and seek to obtain from the parties involved in the grievance signed acceptance of the recommended solution to the grievance. If all parties to the grievance accept the solution posed by the subcommittee, the matter of the grievance will be considered closed when the solution has been implemented. Copies of the written findings and recommended solution will be forwarded by the subcommittee chairperson to both parties to the grievance for acceptance via return receipted certified mail. Each party will be asked to indicate acceptance of the posed solution by signing and returning the letter within 14 calendar days of its date. Failure to respond within 14 calendar days will constitute acceptance. Proper notification of the solution arrived at by the subcommittee will then be mailed by the subcommittee chairperson to the involved faculty member, the department chair of the faculty member, the involved collegiate dean, the Chair of the Academic Grievance Committee, and the Associate Dean for Curriculum. In the event that both parties agree to a change in grade, the Chair of the Academic Grievance Committee will also notify the Office of Records and Registration of the decision.

11. If, after the conclusion of the hearing on the grievance, the chairperson cannot secure acceptance of the posed solution, the grievance shall be referred, by the subcommittee chairperson, to the Dean of Undergraduate Studies. The subcommittee chairperson shall submit the subcommittee's recommended solution to the grievance along with all supporting evidence previously submitted to the subcommittee. When grievances are referred in this manner, the Dean of Undergraduate Studies, on behalf of the University, shall make the final decision on the solution to the grievance and will then notify the student, the involved faculty member, the department chair of the involved faculty member, the involved collegiate dean, the Chair of the Academic Grievance Committee and the Associate Dean for Curriculum of the University's final decision. In the event that the Dean of Undergraduate Studies decides in favor of a change in grade, the Dean of Undergraduate Studies will also notify the Office of Records and Registration of the University's decision.
12. To the extent permitted by law, the Associate Dean for Curriculum shall keep in confidence all records pertinent to grievances. Records shall be available to succeeding chairpersons of the Academic Grievance Committee.

13. The Academic Grievance Committee shall make every reasonable effort to resolve each grievance by the end of the semester that follows the semester in which the student received the grade that is being contested (summers not included).

14. These procedures can be changed by the Academic Council. Such changes shall not affect any case under consideration at the time of the change. Notification of any changes to the procedure shall be given to the Dean of Undergraduate Studies of the University via the Academic Council.
PART V

GRIEVANCE PROCEDURE

A. Overview

A formal grievance procedure is available to faculty members to facilitate the redress of alleged injustices. Any person holding a faculty appointment (see Part III, Sections D and E) at Clemson University, including academic administrators, may file a grievance under the procedure described in this section. Category I grievances address such matters as dismissal, termination, or unlawful discrimination. Category II grievances address unfair or improper application of administrative authority or allegations of lack of civility and/or lack of professional responsibility. In all cases the burden of proof rests on the faculty member who has filed the petition, which includes faculty members holding administrative rank.

All parties to a grievance, including witnesses, are expected to adhere to the highest standard of honesty and professional responsibility expected of all faculty members at all times. Each faculty member and any other person involved in grievance procedures shall be free from any or all improper restraint, interference, coercion, or reprisal on the part of associates or administrators in filing a grievance, in accompanying a faculty member filing a grievance, in appearing as a witness, or in seeking information in accordance with the procedures described herein. These principles apply with equal force after a grievance has been adjudicated. Should these principles be violated, the violations should be brought to the attention of the Provost or the President of the University, if necessary, for appropriate remedial action. Should the faculty member not receive satisfaction from the remedial action taken by the Provost, an appeal may be made to the President, and subsequently (if necessary) to the Board of Trustees.

Guidelines related to all aspects of the grievance procedure may be obtained from the Faculty Senate Office or the Faculty Senate web site (www.lib.Clemson.edu/fs) prior to filing any grievance. A descriptive flow chart in Appendix J explains the sequence and time frame for the various steps in the grievance process. Weekdays, for purposes of the grievance process, are defined as Monday-Friday, excepting University holidays.

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

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

---

1 This single procedure replaces the two different procedures formerly in effect.
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, respectively.

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. This sub-committee of the Faculty Senate Executive/Advisory Committee shall be composed of the immediate past president and the president of the Faculty Senate; 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.

C. Assistance in dealing with complaints: Grievance Counselors

For persons seeking assistance in understanding grievance procedures, the Faculty Senate provides the services of grievance counselors. A counselor offers advice on which of the grievance categories to cite prior to filing a grievance petition. At the request of the petitioner, the grievance counselor will review the petition before it is submitted to assist in clarifying the grievable allegations. The counselor, however, does not render any decision on the merits or substance of the petition. Administrators may also seek advice of counselors on grievance matters. Information about general procedures followed in grievance hearings helpful to the respondent can be obtained from grievance counselors and/or the Faculty Senate Office. Grievance counselors do not advise faculty members or administrators from their own colleges, do not act for both parties to the same case, and do not accompany petitioners or respondents to hearings or testify in a case for which they have been consulted as counselor(s). Individual counselors may seek advice from fellow counselors and may refer their clients to other counselors to expedite the grievance process.

Seven counselors will usually be in office at the same time, serving three-year staggered terms. Two counselors (and any additional persons needed to fill unexpired terms) are nominated annually by the Faculty Senate Advisory Committee from the ranks of tenured Associate Professors and above who have a thorough knowledge of the Faculty Manual and the grievance processes. The Faculty Senate Advisory Committee will attempt to provide minority representation whenever possible. New counselors are elected by the Faculty Senate at its January meeting. The seventh counselor, appointed by the Provost, must be an academic administrator. Grievance counselors are accorded the same protection afforded faculty members involved in grievance procedures. The names of the counselors are available from the Faculty Senate Office, the President of the Faculty Senate or the Provost.

D. Grievance Procedure
1. **Bases for Grievances: Category I.** Category I grievances may be based on any of the following grounds:

   a. Dismissal from employment with the university. A dismissal is the "removal or discharge of a faculty member from a tenured position, or from an untenured position before the end of the specified appointment, for cause." Adequate cause for dismissal must be related directly and substantively to the fitness of the faculty member in his/her professional capacity. (See Section IV.K.)

   b. Termination from appointment by the university of a faculty member with tenure, or of an untenured faculty member before the end of a specified term of appointment. Termination means "the removal or discharge of a faculty member with tenure, or of an untenured faculty member before the end of the specified term of the appointment because of institutional exigencies." (See Section IV.K.)

   c. Allegations of discrimination in compensation, promotion, and/or work assignments. A Category I grievance may be filed alleging discrimination based on age, gender, disability, race, religion, national origin or sexual orientation, or status as a disabled veteran or a veteran of the Vietnam era, or discrimination prohibited by federal or state law or regulation.

   d. Violation of academic freedom. Any non-tenured faculty member who alleges that violations of academic freedom significantly contributed to a decision to cease, in any manner, his/her appointment with the university, may file a Category I grievance. (For a definition of academic freedom, see Section III.B.)

2. **Bases for Grievances: Category II.** Category II grievances include allegations of improper or unfair actions or procedures by administrators and others in positions of responsibility, lack of civility or professional responsibility, or other matters that the Grievance Board and/or the Provost may agree are grievable. Other Category II matters may be grievable based on a determination by the Grievance Board (or the Provost if the petitioner elects to have the case reviewed outside the Grievance Board). Minor complaints are not grievable. What constitutes a "minor complaint" is left to the discretion of the Grievance Board (or the Provost, as indicated above). Complaints arising out of the authorized exercise of faculty and administrative judgment are usually not grievable.

   a. A Category II grievance may be based on an allegation that a person or persons in appropriate position of authority or responsibility have failed to properly implement departmental, college or university policies or procedures so as to adversely affect the complainant. Category II grievances include allegations of improper or unfair actions in such matters as

   - application of recognized criteria or guidelines used in formal review processes
   - assignment of professional duties by an administrator
   - appraisal (by an administrator) of the complainant's performance
   - denial (by an administrator) of the complainant's access to departmental, college, or university resources
   - determination (by an administrator) of the complainant's salary increment.

   b. A Category II grievance may also be based on allegations of a serious, aggravated lack of civility and/or lack of professional responsibility, that is, actions, activities or behaviors which seriously disrupt the normal workday or educational mission. Such allegations must be related directly and substantively to the professional responsibilities of the faculty member in his/her professional capacity as a teacher or researcher and member of the University community. Before such an allegation is filed, every effort shall be made and documented that the involved parties have exhausted all other administrative avenues and
processes to mediate and resolve the dispute. In addition, using the services of the Faculty Professional Ombudsman is strongly encouraged.

Allegations that may be considered in this general class include, but are not limited to: disrespect for the free inquiry of colleagues; disrespect for the opinion of others; lack of equitable treatment of all personnel; creation of the impression that a faculty member speaks or acts for the University; lack of cooperation and civil interaction with colleagues; personal attacks against colleagues; intolerance or intimidation of colleagues; failure to follow University policies established to eliminate violence, discrimination and harassment. Allegations must be based on actions of a serious and disruptive nature. Sanctions imposed by the Provost may include, but are not limited to oral or written warnings, oral or written reprimands, suspension without pay, or dismissal. [A more detailed discussion of professional responsibility can be found in Section IX.G.]

E. Attempts to resolve matters without filing a grievance

1. A faculty member with a grievance shall first meet with the department chair for a discussion of the matter. This discussion must take place within 30 weekdays of the matter's occurrence. (See Section V.A. for a definition of weekdays.) Extensions may be granted by the Provost as needed during the summer period. Both parties shall meet in good faith and shall make every attempt to resolve the matter in an equitable and professional manner.

2. If the matter cannot be resolved at the level of the academic department, the faculty member shall meet with the dean for a discussion of the matter. The faculty member must request this interview within fifteen weekdays of the discussion of the matter with the department chair. The dean shall confer with the faculty member within ten weekdays upon receiving the request. Again, the resolution of the matter in an equitable and professional manner shall be the primary goal of those involved.

3. In the case of non-reappointment, denial of tenure or denial of promotion, termination or dismissal the requirement to meet with the department chair and the dean does not apply.

F. Filing a petition

1. A faculty member who desires to file a grievance must submit a written petition within 20 weekdays after the date of the alleged grievance, or after the completion of the meetings specified above. (As an example of the time limits, if notification is given that a faculty member will be dismissed for cause, the time period begins with the date of receipt of the letter in which the faculty member was notified. The time period does not begin with the effective date of dismissal.) The procedure that begins with a petition and ends with a decision is described in a flow chart in Appendix J of the Faculty Manual. The petition is submitted to the Provost's Office, which will forward the original petition and supporting documents to the Faculty Senate Office. After twenty weekdays have passed, the faculty member forfeits the right to petition and any actions taken with respect to the faculty member shall become final.

2. The grievance petition must state the specific individual(s) against whom the grievance is filed, the dates upon which the alleged grievable matter occurred, the specific basis or bases on which the grievance is filed (see Sections V.D. 1 and 2, above), a list of the supporting documents appended to the petition and the specific relief sought by the petitioner. Sufficient supporting evidence should be provided for the Grievance Board to determine probable cause that a grievable matter has occurred. See Appendix J for a grievance petition form.

G. The Grievance Board
1. The Grievance Board consists of members elected by the members of the Faculty Senate from a pool of nominees named by the Executive and Advisory Committees of the Faculty Senate in a joint meeting, and from nominations made from the floor at the Senate election meeting. The Senate shall hold an election each January to replace Grievance Board members whose terms have expired and to fill positions that have become vacant during the previous calendar year. If necessary, the Faculty Senate Advisory Committee may make interim appointments to ensure a sufficient number of members on the Grievance Board. The Faculty Senate Advisory Committee shall appoint the Chair of the Grievance Board.

2. Members of the Grievance Board must be tenured regular faculty at the time of their election, and shall be members, alternates, or former members of the Faculty Senate. These Grievance Board members shall consist of a representative from the Library and two representatives from each college with two-year terms of service. Training for Grievance Board members as well as grievance counselors will be offered annually and both groups are strongly encouraged to participate. The Board, through selected hearing panels, hears grievances brought to it in accordance with the faculty grievance procedure.

3. Once each academic year, the Chair of the Grievance Board will give the Faculty Senate a summary report concerning grievance activities.

H. Determination of grievability

1. Grievance petitions are submitted to the Provost, who forwards the originals to the Faculty Senate Office to be reviewed by the Grievance Board. The Grievance Board determines whether the allegations in the petition are grievable according to the criteria in sections V.D.1 and/or 2. At least five members of the Board must be present in order to make a determination. The Board shall render its decision on grievability within ten weekdays of receipt of the petition, and notify all named parties.

2. If the petition is filed during one of the long semesters of the regular academic year, the Grievance Board shall call a special meeting within ten weekdays of receipt of a properly submitted petition. If the petition is filed at any other time, it will be reviewed no later than ten weekdays after the first day of classes of the next long semester. A quorum for this meeting shall consist of five members of the Grievance Board. If the petition is deemed grievable, the chair of the Board shall send copies of the petition to those against whom the grievance is brought.

3. The petitioner may request that the matter be addressed by the Provost rather than the Grievance Board. If the matter is not to be considered by the Grievance Board, the Provost shall review the case and request any additional information from any person involved, as needed. If the Provost determines the matter to be grievable, the Provost shall render a final decision within 22 weekdays of receipt of the petition. If the Provost determines the matter to be non-grievable, the Provost shall notify all parties within ten weekdays of receipt of the petition. The written decision will be transmitted to the named parties and the Faculty Senate Office, which will notify the Grievance Board.

4. The Grievance Board or the Provost shall determine to which of the person(s) named in the petition copies of the petitions or relevant portions thereof shall be sent. Respondents to the petition may file a response with the Provost or the Grievance Board. Any such responses must be filed within 15 weekdays of receiving the petition. This response is not to exceed ten pages excluding supporting documents which may be submitted as an appendix to the response.

5. If the person filing the grievance has since left the employ of the University, the Grievance Board may at its discretion decide not to proceed further at any point in the process.

I. Grievance Hearings

1. The Grievance Board shall create a hearing panel of five members for each Category I grievance and a panel of three members for each Category II grievance from among the members of the Board. The Board will, within 20 weekdays after reaching the decision to hear the petition, set a date for the initial hearing, which will be a single hearing for Category I and one or more hearings as needed for Category II. For a Category I hearing, the chair shall give each party to the grievance 20 weekdays written notice of the
hearing. Notification of the hearing date will include: i) the time, place and nature of the hearing; ii) the procedure to be followed during the hearing; iii) a statement of the basis or bases on which the petition is to be heard; and iv) references to pertinent university statutes and portions of the Faculty Manual. For Category II, the initial hearing will be scheduled within 20 weekdays of the Board’s determination of grievability.

2. The hearing shall be held during one of the long semesters of the regular academic year, unless the Provost deems the matter of sufficient urgency, and requests that the hearing take place at a time outside the normal academic year. In this case those members of the Grievance Board who have nine-month appointments will be compensated at a rate equal to that of their normal salary for any day or fraction thereof.

3. Members of the Grievance Board must recuse themselves from serving on the hearing panel if they deem themselves disqualified for reasons of bias or conflict of interest, and shall not serve if they are from the same college as the petitioner or any respondent(s). The named parties shall each have a maximum of two challenges without stated cause. If such removals and challenges reduce the membership of the hearing panel below five for Category I and below three for Category II, the President of the Faculty Senate shall make additional appointments from the Senate to ensure a hearing panel composed of the required number of members.

4. All named parties shall be permitted in all proceedings to have and be accompanied by an advisor of their choice, other than their grievance counselors. The advisor shall be permitted to advise only, and not speak on behalf of any named party. All matters pertaining to the grievance shall be kept confidential to the extent permitted by law. The hearing shall be closed to the public. For Category I grievances, a verbatim record of the hearing shall be taken and made a part of the record.

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

6. In Category I hearings, the hearing panel may at its discretion grant adjournment to either party to investigate evidence concerning which a valid claim of surprise is made. Both parties may ask questions of witnesses and each named party. Members of the panel may ask questions of any party or witness at any time during the hearing. Members of the panel are expected to keep all discussions confidential to the extent permitted by law.

7. In Category I hearings, findings of fact and recommendations of the hearing panel must be based solely on the hearing record and shall be submitted to the Provost. In Category II hearings, findings are based on hearings and written evidence. In petitions alleging unfairness in applying university procedures, it is important that the hearing panel not substitute its judgment for that of the faculty or administrator who made the decision at issue. The merits of the decision, per se, are not at issue. Rather, the issues are whether or not procedures were followed or whether some unfair or improper influence so colored or affected the judgment of the faculty or administrator that the decision reached would have been different had no such improper or unfair influence existed. Thus, so long as the appropriate policies and procedures were followed the only issues are the existence of improper or unfair influences and the extent of their influence upon the decision involved. The petitioner has the burden of proof in establishing that such influence existed and that its presence dictated the nature of the decision reached.
8. In cases of complaints alleging lack of civility and/or lack of professional responsibility, the findings of fact and recommendations of the hearing panel must specify the impact of the actions, activities, or behaviors on the mission of the department, school, other relevant unit and explicitly address the issue of culpability so that the Provost may impose sanction(s), if deemed appropriate.

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

10. The Provost or the President shall review the findings and recommendations and the record of the hearing (for Category I grievances, the audiotape or transcript of the hearing) and shall render a written decision within 22 weekdays of receipt of the hearing panel’s report. The decision shall include findings of fact and recommendations, separately stated. Copies of the decision, including the hearing panel’s findings and recommendations, shall be sent to the petitioner by certified mail. The Provost will also provide copies to all named parties, the hearing panel, and the Faculty Senate Office.

J. Appeals

1. The petitioner may appeal the Provost's decision to the President. A written appeal must be submitted to the Office of the President within ten weekdays after receipt of the Provost's decision. If an appeal is made, the President shall review the hearing record and the decision of the Provost and shall render a written decision within 20 weekdays of receipt of the request for the review. The decision shall include findings of fact and recommendations. Copies of the decision of the President shall be sent to all parties, the Provost, the Faculty Senate office, and the hearing panel.

2. In the case of a Category I grievance, the Petitioner may appeal the decision of the President to the Board of Trustees. A written appeal must be submitted to the Executive Secretary of the Board of Trustees within ten weekdays after the receipt of the President's decision. Receipt by the Executive Secretary shall be deemed receipt by the Board. If an appeal is made, the Board of Trustees, or a committee of Board members appointed by the Chair, shall review the record of the hearing and the decisions of the President and the Provost, and shall render a final decision on behalf of the university. The decision shall be in writing and shall include findings of fact and recommendations. Copies of the decision shall be sent to all parties, the President, the Provost, and the hearing panel.

K. Protection of Petitioners

1. If a grievance has been filed in a timely manner, any action taken against the faculty member that forms the basis for the grievance shall not become final until the appeals process is exhausted and a final decision is rendered on behalf of the university. If the faculty member does not appeal any step of the procedure within the time limits prescribed herein, the last decision rendered shall become the final decision of the university.

2. If the action which forms the basis for the grievance filed by the faculty member could eventually involve any type of discontinuance of appointment with the university as stated above, the faculty member shall not be removed from his/her university duties until a final decision is rendered under this grievance procedure. The exception to this principle would be that, prior to the final decision being rendered, the faculty member may be relieved of all duties or assigned to other duties if the risk of adverse consequences to himself/herself, to others, or to the institution is heightened by continuance in the affected individual's normal assignment. Before taking such action the administration shall consult with the Faculty Senate Advisory Committee. The salary of the faculty member shall always continue until a final decision is rendered by the university.
III.G. Emeritus and Retired 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. TERIed faculty enjoy the rights, privileges and responsibilities of regular faculty. Upon exiting the TERI program, faculty members who have sufficient years of service at Clemson University may become emeriti faculty. Additional information about the TERI program is located on the website of Clemson’s Office of Human Resources (www.clemson.edu/humanres/Payroll_Benefits/TERI_faq.htm).

Rationale: There is considerable confusion about the status of TERIed faculty. This addition should answer some of the most common questions while at the same time providing referral for further details.
MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE
MARCH 13, 2007

1. Call to Order: The meeting was called to order by President Beth Kunkel at 2:35 p.m.

2. Approval of Minutes: The Faculty Senate meeting minutes dated February 13, 2007 were approved as distributed.

3. “Free Speech”: None

The Faculty Senate expressed great appreciation to Holley Ulbrich, former Senator and Faculty Senate President (second female president) and Alumni Distinguished Professor of Economics, for her service as Faculty Manual Editorial Consultant for the past three years. President Kunkel announced that Fran McGuire, former Senator and Faculty Senate President and Alumni Distinguished Professor of Parks, Recreation and Tourism Management will succeed Dr. Ulbrich in this position.

4. Election of Faculty Senate Officers for 2007-2008: There being no nominations from the floor for either office, elections of Faculty Senate Officers, Vice President/President-Elect and Secretary were held by secret ballot. Bryan Simmons (BBS) was elected Vice President/President-Elect and Deborah Thomason (HEHD) was elected Secretary.

5. Committees:
   a. Senate Committees
      2) Welfare Committee – Senator Deborah Thomason for Chair Nancy Porter submitted and explained this Committee Report dated March 6, 2007 (Attachment B). She also noted that faculty were asked to respond to Senator Porter with any insurance concerns or issues. Responses have been received and responded to by Senator Porter. Collected responses will be forwarded to the State Budget and Control Board.
      3) Scholastic Policies Committee – Chair Mark Smotherman stated that the Committee will meet soon to discuss academic integrity and teaching evaluations.
      4) Research Committee – Chair Dennis Smith submitted and briefly explained the Research Committee Report of March 13, 2007 (Attachment C).
5) Policy Committee – Bryan Simmons, Chair, submitted and explained the Committee’s Report dated February 20, 2007 (Attachment D) and noted that numerous items will be addressed under New Business.

President Kunkel reminded Standing Committee Chairs to provide an end-of-the-year report in writing prior to the April meeting.

b. Other University Committee/Commissions: None

6. President’s Report: President Kunkel:
   a. provided a copy of the Policy Regarding Use of University Facilities and Grounds for information to all Senators (Attachment E).

   b. announced that Pat Smart, Professor of Nursing, former Senator and Faculty Senate President has been awarded the Alan Schaffer Faculty Senate Service Award.

7. Old Business: None

8. New Business:
   a. Senator Simmons submitted and explained several proposed Faculty Manual changes for approval:
      1) Nepotism Policy – a friendly amendment was offered and accepted. There was no discussion. Vote was taken and passed unanimously with required two-thirds vote (Attachment F).
      2) Separating Campus Names and Honorary Degrees Committees - There was no discussion. Vote was taken and passed unanimously with required two-thirds vote (Attachment G).
      3) Allowing Faculty Response in PRT - There was brief discussion. Vote was taken and passed unanimously with required two-thirds vote (Attachment H).
      4) Explain and Relocate Statements in Section X - There was no discussion. Vote was taken and passed unanimously with required two-thirds vote (Attachment I).
      5) Tenure and Promotion Guidelines - There was much discussion during which motion was made to amend proposed policy. Vote on motion was taken and failed. Call to Question was stated. Vote to accept call to question was taken and passed. Vote on original proposed change was taken and passed (with slight word change) (Attachment J).
      6) Undergraduate Academic Grievance Board - There was no discussion. Vote was taken and passed unanimously with required two-thirds vote (Attachment K).

Motion was made to postpone indefinitely the remaining proposed changes: Research and Extension Faculty; Vice President for Computing and
Information Technology and Chief Information Officer; Academic Computing Advisory Committee; Emeritus Faculty and the Emeritus College and the (Graduate) Academic Grievance Board. Motion was seconded. Vote to postpone was taken and passed unanimously.

b. Provost Dori Helms provided an update on the proposed day care center to possibly include infants and children up to age one year at another location already in existence and with our own facility for children up to age four. Clemson’s daycare will have an early education component to it and monies have been identified for this use for the benefit of faculty and staff.

Provost Helms asked for the Senate’s support and explained a reorganization of the Provost’s Office due to the demand for President Barker to spend more time away from campus during the Capital Campaign effort and the Provost inheriting much of the presidential responsibilities. The major change would be a change of title for the Undergraduate Studies Dean and for the Graduate School Dean to Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies and Vice Provost for Graduate Studies, respectively. An additional position regarding developmental and research collaboration was mentioned as a possible internal search position. The Provost was reminded that the Faculty Manual be updated to reflect these changes. Motion was made to postpone this item until the Faculty Manual Editorial Consultant creates a proposed Manual change for consideration by the full Senate in April. Motion was seconded. Vote was taken and passed unanimously.

9. Announcements:
   a. Faculty displays celebrating the 50th Anniversary of the Faculty Senate at Clemson University are located in the FirstSun Connector between the Martin Inn and the Madren Center and in the alcove of the Strom Thurmond Institute. Again and finally, many thanks to Susan Hiott of the Clemson Libraries for creating both displays.

   b. The 50th Anniversary Spring Reception will be held on April 10, 2007 at the Owen Pavillion of the Madren Center – invitations forthcoming.

10. Adjournment: 4:13 p.m.

Desmond R. Layne, Secretary

Cathy Toth Sturkie, Program Assistant

Absent: B. Bauerle, G. Birrenkott, A. Bennett, D. Detrich, M. Martin (J. Erdman for), F. Edwards, B. Meyer (W. Sarasua for), D. Willoughby (C. Dye for), N. Porter (S. Rosenblith for)
Faculty Senate Finance Committee
Minutes from February 15, 2007

The Faculty Senate Finance Committee met on Thursday, February 15, 2007. Present were Graciela Tissera and Dan Warner. David Detrich, Robert Campbell, Bill Bauerle, and Bill Bowerman were unable to attend.

The committee examined and approved the draft of the letter regarding per diem rates that will be sent to our Legislative representative. Electronic reviews were subsequently requested from the other committee members as well as other parties. Nancy Porter sent additional information regarding the new regulation concerning the use of the Federal per diem rates for hotel reimbursement. This was incorporated into the final version.

The next meeting is being scheduled.
Welfare Committee Minutes  
March 6, 2007

Parking and Transportation - update provided by Nancy Porter – The number of comments entered as Community Concerns on the web site at http://stuaff.clemson.edu/parking/masterplan/ have increased to 38. Porter will attend a meeting on March 29 to review the Parking Transportation Master Plan.

Child Care Center for Clemson University – Deborah Thomason will seek information on the status of the plan for child care to be included in the Welfare Committee Annual Report to be presented on April 10.

Alan Schaffer Faculty Senate Service Award – Four nominations have been submitted and reviewed. The selection committee is scheduled to meet on March 8.

Spousal/Partner Hiring – Alan Grubb reported that it makes sense to request money for a permanent line for the Michelin Career Center to handle these matters. He will submit a report to be included in the Welfare Committee Annual Report to be presented on April 10.

Waiver of Fike Fee for Faculty – Alan Grubb will draft a letter for review by the committee on April 3.

Per Diem Rates - Worked with Finance Committee Chair, Dan Warner, to draft a letter to B. R. Skelton requesting consideration of an increase in per diem rates to adjust for inflation.

Coastal Carolina University Communication – Reviewed “Preliminary Research Findings on Implementing a Spousal and Dependent’s Tuition Benefit for Faculty at Coastal Carolina University.”

The next meeting of the Welfare Committee is scheduled for 2:30 PM on April 3, 2007 in room B-211 of the Poole Agricultural Center.
Research Committee of the Faculty Senate
13 March 2007 Report
Submitted by: Dennis Smith, Chair (dwsmith@clemson.edu)

The Faculty Senate Research Committee met on March 9, 2007 at 3PM in Hunter Labs. Present were Sens. Smith and Meriwether. Our next meeting is TBA.

1. Conversation with Compliance (Lead: Wells/Meriwether). Naomi Kelly and Traci Arwood have provided a detailed and valuable response to questions solicited from the faculty. A summary will be available to the senate in the future.

2. Technology Transfer & Entrepreneurship (Lead: Smith/Figliola/Schleifer). No discussion on this topic. We remind senators that Dr. Kolis' slides and other reports, including the CURF bylaws and operating agreement with Clemson are available upon request from Cathy in the Senate office.

3. Research and The Humanities (Lead: Martin). No discussion on this topic.

4. Research Professor Title (Lead: Smith). Changes to the faculty manual have been proposed to the policy committee in our last report.

5. Department Chair Authority to Regulate PI Summer Pay from Grants (Lead: Meriwether). The committee has been asked to review the policy of one department chair who is currently regulating the use of grant funds budgeted for PI salary. When not regulated by the grantor, the PI is typically granted the freedom to fund his/her academic release time and/or summer salary. In this case, the chair is requiring faculty to "buy out" at least one month academic release time before the budgeted grant salary for three summer months is approved. After preliminary discussions with pertinent faculty and the chair in question, committee members have found that the policy is at least atypical and possibly an infringement on PI rights under contract rules. The committee is currently investigating: 1) precedence for chair authority and policies of this kind, 2) potential faculty manual conflicts or justification, 3) potential contract rules violation or justification in the office of sponsored programs and beyond.
Faculty Senate Policy Committee

(Minutes of the Tuesday February 20, 2007 Policy Committee meeting)

Policy Agenda:

1. Peter Cohen presented the views of the Campus Ministerial Association regarding the issue of non-sectarian prayer

2. Discussed wording in the nepotism section of the manual.

3. Separated Honorary and Campus Naming Committees

4. Discussed adding wording to the manual regarding giving the candidate an opportunity to respond to an evaluation/recommendation.

5. Discussed moving some sections from IX to X and adding a disclaimer.

6. Discussed timing of promotion.

7. Discussed of which/when guidelines apply for tenure and promotion.

8. Discussed of structure for student academic grievance committee.

9. Proposed change in wording of Research Faculty.

The next scheduled Policy Committee meeting is on Tuesday March 27 at 12:30 PM in room 205 of the library.
POLICY REGARDING USE OF UNIVERSITY FACILITIES AND GROUNDS

Clemson University Administrative Policy
Office of Primary Responsibility: Office of Student Affairs
Adopted: 
Revised: N/A

1.0 Purpose: The primary use of any Clemson University facility shall be for purposes related to the University's missions. The instructional, research and service needs of the University shall take precedence over any other prospective use of University facilities. The purpose of this policy is to set forth the conditions under which Clemson University facilities may be used by persons or organizations for purposes other than their primary function. There may be additional policies specific to certain facilities or for specific events and they may include more restrictive provisions than this policy. Persons or organizations seeking to use any University facility are advised to inquire about the existence of any such additional policies at the time they reserve its use.

2.0 Applies to: This policy applies to any and all facilities owned, leased or under the authority of Clemson University, including all facilities located on the main campus, as well as all facilities located at other locations. “Facilities” shall include all buildings and structures, grounds, sidewalks, recreation areas, and streets considered to be part of the campus of the University. University facilities are divided into two general categories: publicly available facilities and instructional facilities.

2.1 Publicly Available Facilities are those facilities which the University makes available for use by individuals and groups that are not otherwise affiliated with Clemson University. A list of these facilities may be viewed at Appendix A. Any individual or group, including Clemson students, faculty and staff, may reserve and use these facilities for any lawful purpose. There is a fee associated with the use of any publicly available facility. Information regarding fees and reservations for these facilities can be obtained by contacting the individual at the address and number listed in Appendix A. Please note that many of these facilities have specific restrictions as to occupancy, hours of use, etc. and may not be available or suitable for every requested use. Use of alcohol at any event at a publicly available facility is subject to University policies, as stated below in Section 10.0 of this Policy.

2.2 Instructional Facilities are those facilities of the University which are not publicly available and are only available to Clemson University students, faculty, and staff and officially recognized University organizations. Use of these facilities shall be restricted to activities related to the education, research and service missions of the University.

2.3 Procedure for the Use of Clemson University Facilities: Requests for the use of the facilities of Clemson University are to be submitted to the Authorized Designee for that facility. A list of Authorized Designees for University facilities is attached as Appendix A. The Authorized Designee for any facility not included in Appendix A shall be the Vice President for Business Operations. All requests should be in writing on the Use of Clemson University Facilities Form, shown in Appendix B. Additional approvals are required for use of facilities that will entail Sales and Solicitation (see Appendix C) or Events with Alcohol (see Appendix D). As noted in Section 1.0, above, certain facilities have additional registration or use requirements. Please check with the
Authorized Designee when making reservations for a specific facility to ensure all requirements are met.

The completed Use of Clemson University Facilities Form (Appendix B) should be submitted to the Authorized Designee no later than seventy-two (72) hours prior to the anticipated use. Submission of the Form does not guarantee permission for use of the facilities requested. Generally, competing requests for use of a facility will be resolved on a "first come, first served" basis; however, exceptions may be made at the discretion of the Authorized Designee.

2.4 "Fronting" by University Organizations: Instructional Facilities as defined in section 2.2 above are limited for use by Clemson University faculty, students, staff and officially recognized University organizations for activities related to the University's education, research and service missions. Clemson University faculty, students, staff and organizations may not reserve an instructional facility on behalf of or for the use of an outside organization. Clemson University faculty, students, staff and organizations also may not reserve publicly available facilities on behalf of or for the use of an outside organization so the outside organization can use the facility at a reduced rate. This conduct constitutes "fronting" and is prohibited. The Authorized Designee of the University for an instructional facility may deny or rescind permission to use that facility if it is determined that the use is not primarily for the benefit of the faculty, student, staff or officially-recognized organization making the reservation. The Authorized Designee of the University for a publicly available facility may apply the public rate for use of the facility if it is determined that the use is not primarily for the benefit of the faculty, student, staff or officially-recognized organization making the reservation. The University shall not be liable or responsible for financial or other damages incurred by an individual or organization whose permission to use a facility is denied, rescinded or modified (including a rate change), pursuant to this Fronting policy.

3.0 Use of facilities for Speech and Assembly

3.1 Speech and Assembly for University Students, Staff, Faculty, and Affiliated Groups: Clemson University supports the right of individuals (students, faculty, and staff) and groups that are affiliated with Clemson University to discuss, express, advocate or examine issues or ideas within constitutionally valid limitations. Expressive activities and inquiry are fundamental to the academic endeavor. However, with this right to free expression comes a responsibility to consider and accommodate the rights of other members of the campus community. Therefore, Clemson University affiliated individuals and groups may conduct orderly demonstrations or protests if they do not disrupt the normal or previously scheduled activities of the University or University affiliated entities, violate the free speech, assembly or movement of other individuals or organizations, damage property, or create an unsafe situation for any individual, group or organization. The use of public address systems or loudspeakers must comply with the requirements of section 7.0 below.

Although prior registration of demonstrations and protests by students, faculty, or staff or affiliated groups is not mandatory, it is strongly recommended. Prior registration and planning ensures that the desired space will be available on the appropriate date and time. Prior registration should be handled in accordance with the provisions set forth in section 2.3 above.

Nothing in this policy is intended to infringe upon any legal rights regarding freedom of speech. Application of the policy shall not be arbitrary or capricious and shall not be based upon the content of the proposed speech and nothing in this policy shall be interpreted in such a way as to discriminate on the basis of political, religious, social or other content.

3.2 Speech and Assembly for Non-Affiliated Individuals and Groups: The freedom to engage in free speech is protected by federal law, state law and University policy. Clemson enforces its right to place reasonable restrictions on the time, place and manner that free speech activities shall occur on its facilities. The University has designated two areas on campus for free speech activities by non-affiliated individuals and groups: Hendrix Plaza and Cox Plaza. Non-affiliated Individuals or
groups wishing to engage in free speech activities in these areas must submit a reservation form (Appendix B) to the University Union at least 72 hours in advance of the activity to reserve these spaces. Reservations will be approved on a space available basis. Priority will be given to Clemson University affiliated individuals and groups including departments, recognized student organizations, students, faculty and staff that submit requests to reserve these locations. The University reserves the right to have appropriate security present to preserve order and protect the safety of its students, employees and property. Speech and assembly shall be confined to the designated area and must not disrupt the normal or previously scheduled activities of the University or University affiliated entities, violate the free speech, assembly or movement of other individuals or organizations, damage property or create an unsafe situation for any individual, group or organization. The use of public address systems or loudspeakers must comply with the requirements of section 7.0 below.

Violations of section 3.2 of this policy could result in revocation of an approved reservation and the non-affiliated individual or group may be required to leave the campus.

Nothing in this policy is intended to infringe upon any legal rights regarding freedom of speech. Application of the policy shall not be arbitrary or capricious and shall not be based upon the content of the proposed speech and nothing in this policy shall be interpreted in such a way as to discriminate on the basis of political, religious, social or other content.

4.0 Sales and Solicitations: All commercial sales, solicitations, advertising or other commercial activity on University facilities is strictly prohibited without prior authorization from the University. "Commercial sales, solicitations, advertising or other commercial activity" shall mean any activity whose purpose is to inform, induce or encourage individuals or groups to purchase, rent, lease, or use (or not purchase, rent, lease or use) any goods or services. Individuals or groups wishing to engage in sales and solicitations must submit a Sales and Solicitations form (Appendix C) to the University Union no later than 72 hours in advance of the requested event. All authorized sales and solicitations shall be subject to applicable local, state and federal laws. No sales and solicitation shall interfere or conflict with the normal conduct of the activities and missions of the University and its students and employees.

The University has designated certain facilities and areas for authorized sales and solicitations. Activities may be further restricted to specific times and dates as determined by the University. Failure to comply with any such restrictions shall subject the individual or group to immediate revocation of authorization to engage in the activity and may further result in disciplinary action, including criminal prosecution for trespass.

Door-to-door solicitation and sales is strictly forbidden on any University facility, for any reason. Sales and solicitation in any student residential facility and any classroom or work area is prohibited unless such sales and solicitation is requested by a resident (in the case of student residential facilities) or employee (in the case of a classroom or office area) and the resident or employee must sign the Sales and Solicitations form (Appendix C). In such cases, approval shall generally be restricted to that resident or employee’s room or work area.

4.1 Athletic Events. Commercial sales and solicitations, advertising or other commercial activity on the day of an on-campus athletic event are not permitted within 100 feet of the venue of the athletic event or in the area described as the area east of Lake Hartwell, south of highway 93, and west and north of Silas Pearman Boulevard (Perimeter Road). Exceptions to these limitations may be granted by the Athletic Department and requests for an exception should be submitted on a Sales and Solicitations form (Appendix C) and submitted to the Athletic Department no later than 72 hours before the proposed event.

5.0 Bulletin Boards and Other Postings: The University prohibits posting of bills, advertisements or other materials on any University property other than in designated areas. Only students, faculty, staff and recognized University organizations can post on University facilities. Commercial posting by individuals or groups is prohibited unless sponsored by a recognized University organization or unit. A list of designated
areas for postings (Appendix E) is available for Individuals or groups who wish to post materials at one or more designated bulletin boards on campus. Individuals or groups are responsible for providing copies of the materials and placing them on the designated boards. Additionally, individuals or groups may be required to remove postings not in compliance with this policy.

Posted materials may not jeopardize campus safety. Alcoholic beverage consumption may not be the primary message of any posted materials. Materials must clearly promote the activity or event publicized. Postings whose primary purpose is the promotion of commercial goods or services will not be allowed and the name, logo or mark of a commercial entity may not appear as the primary message in any posting.

The maximum size for postings is 11 x 17 and the layout should be vertical. No material should be placed over existing, approved materials. Individuals and groups posting are responsible for removing their own postings. All postings shall be with tacks; adhesive affixtures are not permitted. The use of chalk for on University facilities is not permitted. The expiration date of all posted materials shall be a maximum of two weeks from the date of approval.

Banners may be approved for display with permission of the Student Union. Banners shall only be allowed in those locations approved by the University and the University may impose restrictions on the size, location and duration of any banner displayed.

Postings or solicitations (commercial and non-commercial) on motor vehicles parked on Clemson property are not allowed.

6.0 Use of Instructional Facilities for Religious Purposes. As a public entity, Clemson University is governed by State and Federal laws prohibiting both the establishment of any religion and discrimination against any individual or organization on the basis of religion. In accordance with these legal principles, Clemson does not allow the use of its instructional facilities for any religious event or by any religious organization not officially recognized by the University. "Religious organizations" include traditional religious organizations of all denominations, as well as any organization recognized as a charitable religious organization by the U.S. Internal Revenue Service, including organizations which advocate atheism.

This restriction does not apply to any faculty or student organization recognized by the University and which organization has a religious affiliation. These organizations may use any University instructional facility in accordance with the terms and conditions of this Policy. Publicly available facilities may be used by religious groups, including University recognized organizations, subject only to the terms of this policy and any additional restrictions particular to that facility.

7.0 Amplified Sound and Visual Aids. Amplified sound or any visual aids may only be used at any campus facility with prior authorization of the University. Use of these devices is restricted to specific areas. Any use of sound at University facilities during the hours of 8:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m. on Mondays through Thursdays, and during the hours of 8:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. on Fridays must not exceed 60 decibels at a distance of fifty (50) feet from the speaker. Additional decibel limits may be imposed on the use of amplified sound at events outside of these days and times. Any event exceeding any specified sound limit will be first asked to turn the sound down. If the problem persists, the University reserves the right to immediately terminate the event.

8.0 Use of Alcohol.

Publicly Available Facilities: The use of alcohol at publicly available facilities is allowed on a case-by-case basis. Use of alcohol is prohibited at certain publicly available facilities. Individuals or groups who wish to consume alcohol at an event at a publicly available facility must complete and submit a Registration for Events with Alcohol form, Appendix D, and submit it at least 14 days in advance of the requested use. All registrations must be approved by the Authorized Designee, the University Police Department and the Vice President for the area where the event will be held. There may be an additional fee for use of a publicly available facility where alcohol will be consumed. The University Police Department shall determine the
appropriate level of security and any additional costs to the University associated with providing security at the event will be the responsibility of the person or group requesting the facility.

**Instructional Facilities:** The use of alcohol at instructional facilities of the University is not allowed except upon the prior approval of the President. Violations of this policy may result in disciplinary action.

9.0 Smoking and Use of Tobacco

No smoking or other use of tobacco products will be permitted in the indoor areas of any University building, facility or vehicle at any time. Smoking is not permitted within fifteen (15) feet of any entrance to a University building or covered walkway. Smoking and use of tobacco products is allowed in the following University areas: (1) those locations where food and/or alcoholic beverages are commercially sold, provided the location has a separate ventilation system installed for the smoking area; (2) hotel rooms; (3) private residences; and (4) private living areas of student residence halls where authorized by the Authorized Designee.
APPENDIX A
Clemson University Facilities Available for Use by Individuals
and Groups not Affiliated with Clemson University

Set forth below is a list of facilities owned, leased or under the authority of Clemson
University that may be used by individuals and groups that are not affiliated with
Clemson University in accordance with the Clemson University Policy Regarding Use of
University Facilities. Please note that each facility has its own rules and regulations,
total costs and other requirements. To obtain these details, you must contact the
Authorized Designee for the facility noted below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACILITY</th>
<th>AUTHORIZED DESIGNEE</th>
<th>PHONE NO.</th>
<th>E-MAIL ADDRESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ATHLETIC FACILITIES:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball Porch</td>
<td>Van Hilderbrand</td>
<td>656-0910</td>
<td>hilderv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball Stadium</td>
<td>Van Hilderbrand</td>
<td>656-0910</td>
<td>hilderv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football Practice Fields</td>
<td>Van Hilderbrand</td>
<td>656-0910</td>
<td>hilderv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf Practice Range</td>
<td>Van Hilderbrand</td>
<td>656-0910</td>
<td>hilderv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huckabee Annex-LJC</td>
<td>Van Hilderbrand</td>
<td>656-0910</td>
<td>hilderv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Practice Facility</td>
<td>Van Hilderbrand</td>
<td>656-0910</td>
<td>hilderv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Track</td>
<td>Van Hilderbrand</td>
<td>656-0910</td>
<td>hilderv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jervey Gym</td>
<td>Van Hilderbrand</td>
<td>656-0910</td>
<td>hilderv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jervey Meadows</td>
<td>Van Hilderbrand</td>
<td>656-0910</td>
<td>hilderv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Littlejohn Coliseum</td>
<td>Holly Hardin</td>
<td>656-1412</td>
<td>hardin2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorial Stadium</td>
<td>Van Hilderbrand</td>
<td>656-0910</td>
<td>hilderv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Track</td>
<td>Van Hilderbrand</td>
<td>656-0910</td>
<td>hilderv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President's Box</td>
<td>Van Hilderbrand</td>
<td>656-0910</td>
<td>hilderv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press Box</td>
<td>Van Hilderbrand</td>
<td>656-0910</td>
<td>hilderv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riggs Field</td>
<td>Van Hilderbrand</td>
<td>656-0910</td>
<td>hilderv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rugby Field</td>
<td>Van Hilderbrand</td>
<td>656-0910</td>
<td>hilderv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sloan Tennis Center</td>
<td>Van Hilderbrand</td>
<td>656-0910</td>
<td>hilderv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer Practice Fields</td>
<td>Van Hilderbrand</td>
<td>656-0910</td>
<td>hilderv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiger Den</td>
<td>Van Hilderbrand</td>
<td>656-0910</td>
<td>hilderv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fike Recreation Center</td>
<td>Tony Franklin</td>
<td>656-0556</td>
<td>af</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McHugh Natatorium</td>
<td>Tony Franklin</td>
<td>656-0556</td>
<td>af</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Tennis Courts</td>
<td>Tony Franklin</td>
<td>656-0556</td>
<td>af</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intramural and Club</td>
<td>Tony Franklin</td>
<td>656-0556</td>
<td>af</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Contact Name</td>
<td>Phone Number</td>
<td>Extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport Fields</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fike Sun Deck</td>
<td>Tony Franklin</td>
<td>656-0556</td>
<td>af</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Tennis Center</td>
<td>Tony Franklin</td>
<td>656-0556</td>
<td>af</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fike Park</td>
<td>Tony Franklin</td>
<td>656-0556</td>
<td>af</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climbing Wall</td>
<td>Robert Taylor</td>
<td>656-2353</td>
<td>rtylo4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOTANICAL GARDENS:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carriage House</td>
<td>Judith Gardner</td>
<td>656-3405</td>
<td>judithg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fran Hansen Discovery Center</td>
<td>Judith Gardner</td>
<td>656-3405</td>
<td>judithg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayden Conference Center</td>
<td>Judith Gardner</td>
<td>656-3405</td>
<td>judithg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BROOKS CENTER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLEMSON HOUSE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONFERENCES CENTER AND INN:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madren Conference Center</td>
<td>Group Sales</td>
<td>656-7155 or 1-888-656-9020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Inn</td>
<td>Reservations</td>
<td>654-9020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker Golf Course</td>
<td>Brent Jessup</td>
<td>656-7516</td>
<td>bjessup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GARRISON ARENA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HENDRIX CENTER:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almeda Jacks Ballroom A</td>
<td>Jessica Griggs</td>
<td>656-6118</td>
<td>jcgrigg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almeda Jacks Ballroom B</td>
<td>Jessica Griggs</td>
<td>656-6118</td>
<td>jcgrigg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arcade: Space 1-6</td>
<td>Jessica Griggs</td>
<td>656-6118</td>
<td>jcgrigg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atrium: Space 1-6</td>
<td>Jessica Griggs</td>
<td>656-6118</td>
<td>jcgrigg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breezeway: Space 1-6</td>
<td>Jessica Griggs</td>
<td>656-6118</td>
<td>jcgrigg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Room</td>
<td>Jessica Griggs</td>
<td>656-6118</td>
<td>jcgrigg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKissick Theater</td>
<td>Jessica Griggs</td>
<td>656-6118</td>
<td>jcgrigg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Use Room</td>
<td>Jessica Griggs</td>
<td>656-6118</td>
<td>jcgrigg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plaza: Upper or Lower</td>
<td>Jessica Griggs</td>
<td>656-6118</td>
<td>jcgrigg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OFF CAMPUS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATIONS:</th>
<th>Letitia Baskett</th>
<th>(803) 788-5700</th>
<th>lbasket</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sandhill Rec - Lake House</td>
<td>Letitia Baskett</td>
<td>(803) 788-5700</td>
<td>lbasket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandhill Rec - Small Conference Room</td>
<td>Letitia Baskett</td>
<td>(803) 788-5700</td>
<td>lbasket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandhill Rec - Large Conference Room</td>
<td>Letitia Baskett</td>
<td>(803) 788-5700</td>
<td>lbasket</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OTHER OUTDOOR SPACES:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amphitheater</td>
<td>Jessica Griggs</td>
<td>656-5118</td>
<td>jegrigg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carillon Gardens</td>
<td>Jessica Griggs</td>
<td>656-6118</td>
<td>jegrigg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUTDOOR LAB</td>
<td>Deron McFarland</td>
<td>646-7502</td>
<td>dmcfarl</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| STROM THURMOND INSTITUTE:           |                                     |                |         |
| Self Auditorium                     | Jean Martin                         | 656-0208       | j@strom.clemson.edu |

| UNION - EDGAR A. BROWN:             |                                     |                |         |
| Cox Plaza: 1-6                      | Jessica Griggs                      | 656-6118       | jegrigg |
| Military Heritage Plaza             | Jessica Griggs                      | 656-6118       |         |
| Palmetto Ballroom                   | Jessica Griggs                      | 656-6118       | jegrigg |
| Room 800 A & B                      | Jessica Griggs                      | 656-6118       | jegrigg |
| Room 809                            | Jessica Griggs                      | 656-6118       | jegrigg |
| Student Senate                      | Jessica Griggs                      | 656-6118       | jegrigg |
| Tillman Auditorium                  | Jessica Griggs                      | 656-6118       | jegrigg |
| Union Courtyard                     | Jessica Griggs                      | 656-6118       | jegrigg |
| Union Plaza                         | Jessica Griggs                      | 656-6118       | jegrigg |
| Union Sidewalk: 1-6                 | Jessica Griggs                      | 656-6118       | jegrigg |
| Union Underground and Edgar's       | Jessica Griggs                      | 656-6118       | jegrigg |

| YOUTH LEARNING INSTITUTE:          |                                     |                |         |
| Headquarters and Education Center   | Brad Cuttino                        | (864) 878-1103 | bcuttin |
| Robert M. Cooper 4-H Leadership Center | Carla Rickenbaker                  | (803) 478-2015   | cricken |
# Clemson University Facility Use Request Form

## Contact Information
- **Sponsoring Department/Organization/Company:**
- **Contact Person:**
- **Mailing Address:**
- **E-Mail Address:**
- **City:**
- **State:**
- **Zip:**
- **Phone#:**
- **Fax#:**

## Event Information
- **Event Description:**
- **Date(s) of Event:**
- **Event Start Time:**
- **End Time:**
- **Sound Check Time:**
- **Access to facility:**

*Please note the building hours on the back of this form.*

## Attendants Include
- **CU Students**
- **CU Faculty/Staff**
- **Other**

## Estimated Attendance
- **Tickets/Admission Charged**
- **Yes**
- **No**

## Catering
- **Yes**
- **No**

*Aramark is the only approved catering for these facilities.*

## Linens
- **Yes**
- **No**

*Aramark must be contacted directly to request linen service.*

## Sales & Solicitation
- **Yes**
- **No**

*SALES & SOLICITATION POLICY:*

- **Alcohol:**
  - **Will alcohol be served?**
  - **Yes**
  - **No**

## Facility Information
- **1st Choice:**
- **2nd Choice:**
- **3rd Choice:**

*(See Attachment A for facility names and contact information. Any questions regarding Technical Services or set up should be directed to the contact person for the particular facility you are using.)*

## Set-Up Information
- **Chairs**
- **6' Tables**
- **8' Tables**
- **Round Tables**
- **Seminar Tables**
- **TV/VCR/DVD**
- **LCD Projector**
- **Slide Projector**
- **Easels**
- **Overhead Projector**
- **Screen**
- **Microphone**
- **Floor Lectern**
- **Table Lectern**
- **Piano (Brooks Ctr./Tillman only)**
- **Flip Chart**
- **Dry/Erase Board**
- **Plants**
- **Phone Line**
- **AV Cart**
- **Small Dance Floor (HSC only)**
- **35mm Movie (McKissick only)**
- **Dressing Room (Brooks Ctr./Tillman only)**
- **4'x8' Stage Deck (HSC only)**
- **Snow Fence (Union Courtyard only)**
- **Video (Tillman/McKissick only)**
- **Spotlight (Brooks Ctr./Tillman only)**
- **Music Sound System**
- **Table Lectern**
- **Music Sound System**

## Additional Notes
Signatures

1. ALCOHOL: Do you plan to serve alcohol at this event? _______Yes _______No
If alcohol will be served, you must also complete the Registration for Event with Alcohol form and obtain all necessary signatures at least one week prior to the scheduled date of the event.

2. CUPD: Attach the "Security Request for Events" form if your event:
   a.) is open to the public   b.) charges admission   c.) is expecting more than 200 people   d.) extends building hours
   Date____________________

3. Signature of Authorized Designee for the Facility (required for all events):
   _____________________________  Date____________________

I CERTIFY THAT I HAVE READ THE ENTIRE CLEMSON UNIVERSITY POLICY REGARDING USE OF UNIVERSITY FACILITIES AS WELL AS ANY OTHER REQUIREMENTS FOR THE PARTICULAR FACILITY I AM RESERVING AND ASSUME RESPONSIBILITY FOR MY ORGANIZATION WHILE USING THE FACILITY.

4. Customer Signature_________________________  Date____________________

This reservation is not final until all necessary signatures are obtained. PLEASE NOTE THAT SOME FACILITIES HAVE SEPARATE FORMS /CONTRACTS THAT MUST ALSO BE COMPLETED IN ORDER TO FINALIZE A RESERVATION. CHECK WITH THE CONTACT ON APPENDIX A.
APPENDIX C
Sales & Solicitation Form

CONTACT INFORMATION

Sponsoring Department, Organization or Company: _________________________________________________

Contact Person: ___________________________ Advisor Name: ________________________________

Mailing Address: __________________________________________ City: ___________ State: ______ ZIP: ______

E-mail Address: __________________________________________ Phone: ___________ Fax: ___________

EVENT INFORMATION

☐ Social Event (must get CUPD signature)

☐ Event with food (must get ARAMARK signature)

☐ T-Shirt Sales (copy of shirt design must be attached for Central Spirit approval)

☐ Event on Grass (must get Landscape’s signature)

Describe Event: __________________________________________________________________________

Date(s) of Event: ___________________________ Time _______________________________ to __________

Time _______________________________ to __________

Who will be attending this event (circle all that apply): CU students  CU faculty/staff  Other

Estimated Attendance: ___________________________ Admission Charged: Yes  No

AREAS NEEDED

☐ Amphitheater  ☐ Bowman Field by Sikes  ☐ Bowman Field by Holtzendorff  ☐ Carillon Gardens

☐ Cox Plaza/Hendrix Plaza  ☐ Other Area(s)

Signatures required for event confirmation and registration

Area Approval __________________________________________ Date: ___________

Area Approval __________________________________________ Date: ___________

APPROVED by the HSC Desk (required) ___________________________ Date: ___________

CUPD Signature __________________________________________ Date: ___________

APPROVED BY FMO Landscape (required if on a landscaped surface) ___________________________ Date: ___________

APPROVED BY ARAMARK (required if food is served) ___________________________ Date: ___________

Central Spirit Approval (tshirt sales only) ___________________________ Date: ___________

I have read and understand the Sales and Solicitation Policy, Regulations and Statement of Equity and agree to comply with these guidelines:

________________________________________  __________________________
Signature  Phone
## APPENDIX D

**Registration for Events with Alcohol**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Group:</th>
<th>Contact Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Email:</th>
<th>Phone No.:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Event:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date(s) of Event:</th>
<th>Time of Event:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location:</th>
<th>Expected Attendance:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This form is required for registration of all events at Clemson University facilities where alcohol is present.

Events must be registered with the host facility and approved by campus police, unless the area is permanently licensed to sell alcohol. Tentative confirmation of the facility reservation will be made when the event is registered. This form does not ensure availability or registration of the area you intend to reserve. Reservation of the space must be done separately.

- All events where alcohol is served are subject to having security present as required by CUPD at the expense of the reserving group. All requests for CUPD services must be made 14 days in advance of the event.

- All alcohol sales and service will be administered by ARAMARK and will end no later than 12:00 am. Event times are regulated by building hours, although no event may extend later than 2:00 am. Permanent licensed facilities that sell alcohol will operate during regular business hours as usual.

- The approval of the sale and serving of alcohol at any event must be approved by the University Vice President of the group hosting the event, or his/her designee if applicable, and the University Vice President or his/her designee for the area in which the event is held.

- Any violation of this policy will be referred to the appropriate disciplinary body.

- The General Membership of an organization or office requesting an event where alcohol is present is encouraged to be educated about alcohol annually in coordination with the Office of Heath Education.

- A completed copy of this form must be turned in to the Hendrix Center Reservation Office at least 14 business days prior to the date of the event.

*I certify that I have read completely the social policy, the regulations for reservations and that I assume responsibility for my organization during this event:*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For Facility Use Only:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CUPD Signature:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group VP Signature:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility VP Signature:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E

General Posting/Publicity Locations

1. **Designated General Posting Boards:**
   
   It is the responsibility of the group receiving approval to post their own materials on designated boards in academic buildings. Fliers may not exceed 11” x 17”. No materials should be placed over existing, approved materials. Groups should not remove posted materials if the posting boards are full. Groups are responsible in making efforts to remove their dated fliers and posters.

   **WEST CAMPUS**
   
   Brackett Hall | Front Entrance, right side
   Tillman Hall  | Ground Floor, near G11
   Godfrey Hall  | 2nd floor atrium, under clock
   Hunter Hall   | 1) Front Entrance
   McAdams Hall  | Outside Mail Room
   Lee Hall      | End of Hallway left of gallery
   Olin Hall     | Stairwell landing between 1& 2

   **EAST CAMPUS**
   
   Brooks Center | Wall Outside Rm.206
   Daniel Hall   | Across from Rm. 209
   Jordan Hall   | 1st floor near Long Hall
   Lehotsky Hall | Hallway outside Rm.135
   Martin Hall   | Hallway outside of M-305
   Rhodes Res.   | Center Ground floor
   Strode Tower  | 1st floor, near elevator

2. **The Union Designated Bulletin Boards:** Fliers may not exceed 11” x 17”. No materials should be placed over existed, approved materials. Groups should not remove posted materials if the posting boards are full. Posting boards are located in the following locations:
   
   **Edgar A. Brown Union:** stairwells, Loggia, and outside of Palmetto Ballroom
   **Hendrix Student Center:** beside Reservation Desk, Student Lounge, outside of the McKissick Theater, outside of the Michelin Career Center

3. **Banner Alley:** Banners must be approved at the Union Information Desk. All banners will be placed in banner sleeves and hung on a first come, first serve basis. Inquire about the posting schedule at the Union Information Desk. Banners for the Library can be a maximum of 25” tall x 54” wide. Banners for the HSC can be a maximum of 48” long and 54” wide. The Union will post the banners approved for the Library and HSC banner alley.

4. **University Housing:** Only recognized student organizations can post in the residence halls and groups must receive approval from Housing prior to posting materials in residence facilities. Flier distribution is as follows:
   
   a. **EAST CAMPUS HOUSING** (Mauldin Hall) 64 total fliers
   b. **WEST CAMPUS HOUSING** (707 Union) 120 total fliers
   c. **FRATERNITY RES. AREA** (707 Union) 18 total fliers

5. **Other Bulletin Boards:** Most other bulletin boards in buildings are reserved for specific department use. In order to put your materials on their boards, you must secure their approval.

6. **Light Pole Banners:** Contact University Facilities at 656-4940 to hang professional banners.

7. **Advertising Options:**
   
   a. **The Tiger Newspaper:** Contact 656-2167, or come by the Hendrix Center.
   b. **Clemson Cable Network (CCN):** Contact 656-1CCN or come by the Hendrix Center.

8. **Student Digest:** Recognized student organizations and campus departments may use the Student Digest for important announcements of broad interest or recruiting. All enrolled students receive a weekly email directing them to the Student Digest. Please visit [http://digest.clemson.edu](http://digest.clemson.edu) for more information on how to submit messages.

9. **Table Tents:** For information on how to distribute tables to the dining facilities, please contact ARAMARK at 864-656-2007.

For further information about the posting policy or mass e-mail, please contact the Union Information Desk at 656-HELP (4357).
Proposed Faculty Manual Change X.A.3.
Holley Ulbrich, Faculty Manual Editorial Consultant

Current wording:
X.A.3. Nepotism policy. Nepotism refers to certain situations related to the simultaneous employment of two or more members of the same family. The policy is defined by state law. Human Resources Regulations Sections 19-700 through 19-720 of the South Carolina Code of Laws.

Proposed wording:
X.A.3. Nepotism policy. “...public employee may make, participate in making, or in any way attempt to use his...office to influence a governmental decision in which he, a member of his immediate family, an individual with whom he is associated, or a business in which he is associated has an economic interest. A...public employee who, in the discharge of his official responsibilities, is required to take an action or make a decision which affects an economic interest of himself, a member of his immediate family, an individual with which he is associated, shall prepare a written statement describing the matter requiring action or decisions and the nature of his potential conflict of interest with respect to the action or decision; ...if he is a public employee, he shall furnish a copy of the statement to his superior, if any, who shall assign the matter to another employee who does not have a potential conflict of interest.” (excerpt from state law)

Family member means an individual who is the employee’s spouse, parent, brother, sister, child, mother-in-law, father-in-law, daughter-in-law, son-in-law, grandchild, a child residing in the employee’s household, or an individual claimed by the employee or the employee’s spouse as a dependent for income tax purposes.

[See Human Resources Regulations Sections 19-700 through 19-720 of the South Carolina Code of Laws.]

Rationale: Last year we replaced the nepotism policy with a general statement and a referral to state law. Inserting the actual wording of the law as it applies to public employees may provide clearer and more direct guidance.
Proposed Faculty Manual Change VII.C.4.
Honorary Degree and Naming Committee(s)
Holley Ulbrich, Faculty Manual Editorial Consultant

Present wording:

VII.C. 4. Honorary Degree and Naming Committee. This committee consists of the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost (chair); the President of the Faculty Senate (secretary); the most recent past president of the Faculty Senate currently in the employ of Clemson University; the most senior (in years of service) Alumni Distinguished Professor; and the most senior (in years of service) holder of an endowed chair/titled professorship. When functioning to select candidates for an honorary degree, the chair of the institutional advancement committee of the Board of Trustees and the chair of the Board of Trustees will be added.

When the committee functions to name candidates for an honorary degree, it evaluates a candidate's credentials and submits a recommendation for the awarding of an honorary degree to the President of the University. The President will forward a recommendation to the Board of Trustees for approval. When serving as a naming committee, this body recommends appropriate names for university lands and facilities to the university President for approval by the Board of Trustees.

Proposed wording:

VII.C. 4. Honorary Degree and Naming Committee. This committee consists of the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost (chair); the President of the Faculty Senate (secretary); the chair of the institutional advancement committee of the Board of Trustees; the chair of the Board of Trustees; the most recent past president of the Faculty Senate currently in the employ of Clemson University; the most senior (in years of service) Alumni Distinguished Professor; and the most senior (in years of service) holder of an endowed chair/titled professorship. The committee suggests candidates, evaluates candidates' credentials and submits a recommendation for the awarding of an honorary degree to the President of the University. The President will forward a recommendation to the Board of Trustees for approval.

VII.C.5. Campus Names Committee. This committee consists of the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost (chair); the President of the Faculty Senate (secretary); the most recent past president of the Faculty Senate currently in the employ of Clemson University; the most senior (in years of service) Alumni Distinguished Professor; and the most senior (in years of service) holder of an endowed chair/titled professorship. This committee recommends appropriate names for university lands and facilities to the university President for approval by the Board of Trustees.
Proposed Faculty Manual Change
IV.D. Procedures for Renewal of Appointment, Tenure and Promotion
Holley Ulbrich, Faculty Manual Editorial Consultant

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

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. In cases of promotion or early tenure consideration, the candidate may withdraw from further consideration at this point...

The dean reviews the complete file, makes a separate recommendation on the "Request for Personnel Action" form, and writes a report which includes a rationale for supporting or opposing the recommendations of the peer committee and department chair. The dean may establish committees within the college to provide assistance and advice in such reviews. The dean shall promptly inform the candidate in writing of his or her recommendation and its rationale. If the dean's recommendation differs from those of the peer committee and/or the department chair, the differences shall be discussed with them prior to informing the candidate.

Rationale: This change may forestall possible grievances by starting the dialogue earlier in the process.
Insert the following statement at the beginning of Part X, Summary of Selected Campus University and State Policies:

1. The material in this section is provided for information only. These policies are part of the Faculty’s contractual relationship with Clemson University and with the State of South Carolina, but the Senate cannot initiate changes as they can in most other sections of the Faculty Manual. The Faculty Senate does choose what kinds of information to include in this section based on requests from faculty or administrators, or based on the recommendations of the Policy Committee and the Executive/Advisory Committee.

2. Move the following sections from IX to X:
   K. Dual Employment and Overload Compensation
   L. Private Outside Employment
   N. Other leave and holidays
   P. Professional travel

Rationale: Most of the policies in these four sections and in Section X are state policies that the faculty have no power to change. Some of them are policies defined by federal law. The Faculty can still comment on them or recommend changes in some cases, but they are qualitatively different from most of the rest of the Faculty Manual where Faculty Senate can initiate change.
IV. D. Procedures for Renewal of Appointment, Tenure, and Promotion

Because the faculty of a department or equivalent academic unit is the primary judge of the qualifications of its members, peer evaluation is essential in recommendations for appointment, renewal of appointment, tenure, and promotion. All peer recommendations regarding any individual holding faculty rank in a department shall, therefore, originate within the faculty of that department. Individual departments at Clemson University establish written guidelines that include the procedures, criteria, and committee structures for in order to facilitate peer evaluation. These written procedures guidelines must incorporate attention to “Best Practices for a Performance Review System for Faculty.” (Appendix G, numbers 1-11.) Evaluations of candidates for tenure and promotion must be based on those guidelines (see Section VII.J.)

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

VII.J. Faculty Participation in Departmental Governance

The faculty of a department or equivalent unit also constitutes the primary judge of the qualifications of its members; thus peer evaluation is an essential element in the appointment, reappointment, promotion, and tenure of department members (see Part III., sections G-L). Each department or equivalent unit shall have written tenure and promotion guidelines that specify the procedures, criteria and committee structures. These guidelines must be approved by the regular faculty. Copies of the departmental bylaws and the tenure and promotion guidelines shall be provided to new tenured and/or tenure-track faculty at the time of their appointment.

Candidates for tenure will be evaluated under the tenure guidelines in effect at the time they are hired. If promotion guidelines are changed by a vote of the regular faculty, persons already on the faculty who are to be considered for promotion will be reviewed under the prior guidelines for the first three years after the guidelines have been changed, after which they will be subject to the new guidelines. Newly hired faculty will be evaluated for reappointment under the most recently approved guidelines at the time of their appointment.

Rationale: Rules are suddenly changed on short notice, disfavoring candidates who were hired under a different set of expectations. This is particularly true for promotion, which may come many years after one is hired. Tenure has a sufficiently short “lifespan” so that it seems reasonable to evaluate a candidate within a maximum of six years based on the guidelines and criteria at the time of hire, but promotion guidelines simply need a “running in” period for those who were close to consideration at the time the rules were changed.
Proposed Faculty Manual Change VII.B.1.h.
(Undergraduate) Academic Grievance Committee
Holley H. Ulbrich, Faculty Manual Editorial Consultant

Present Wording
VII.B.1.h. Academic Grievance Committee hears cases concerning possible
discrimination in academics brought by an undergraduate student against a
member of the faculty or a staff member of the university. The committee is also
empowered to hear cases concerning grievances of a personal or professional
nature involving an individual undergraduate student and a faculty member. A
full description of the committee and its procedures are in the current
Undergraduate Announcements.
The committee is composed of three faculty members from each college
appointed by the respective collegiate dean, twelve undergraduates nominated by
the student body president, approved by the Student Senate, and appointed by the
Provost, and the dean of student life or his/her designee. Faculty serve three year
terms; students serve one year terms, all commencing with fall semester late
registration. The senior vice-provost for undergraduate studies appoints the chair
from among those faculty members who have previously served.

Proposed wording
VII.B.1.h. Academic Grievance Board
The Academic Grievance Board consists of two separate entities, the Academic
Grievance Panel and the Academic Grievance Committee. The Academic
Grievance Panel is responsible for the initial review of grievances, determining
which grievances will be forwarded to the Academic Grievance Committee.

The Academic Grievance Panel consists of five faculty members, one from each
college, appointed by the Dean of Undergraduate Studies for three-year terms;
two undergraduate students appointed in rotation among the colleges for two
years terms, appointed by the President of the Student Senate. One of the faculty
representatives will be elected chair each year.

The Academic Grievance Committee is responsible for hearing student grievances
forwarded by the Academic Grievance Panel, proposing resolution of grievances,
and in the case of appeals, making recommendations to the Dean of
Undergraduate Studies. Grievances are heard by three member subcommittees
appointed by the chair. The committee consists of 15 faculty members(three from
each college), elected by their faculties for three year terms, and 10 students,
appointed by the President of the Student Senate for two-year terms. The Dean of
Undergraduate Studies appoints the chair. Further information is available in the
Undergraduate Announcements.

Rationale: The Senate approved the concept at its February meeting.
1. **Call to Order:** The meeting was called to order by President Beth Kunkel at 2:34 p.m.

2. **Approval of Minutes:** The Faculty Senate meeting minutes dated March 13, 2007 were approved as distributed.

3. **“Free Speech”:** None

4. **Committees:**
   a. **Senate Committees**
      1) **Finance Committee** – Dan Warner, Chair, stated that the two main issues this past year were the sale (including the process) of Clemson University lands and per diems for travel. Senator Warner noted that letters regarding per diem rates were mailed to the State Employees Association, local congressmen and the University lobbyist.
      2) **Welfare Committee** – Chair Nancy Porter submitted and explained this Committee’s 2006-07 Annual Report (Attachment A).
      3) **Scholastic Policies Committee** – Chair Mark Smotherman submitted and briefly explained the Committee Report of March 15, 2007 (Attachment B) and a Labor Day Class Decision Timeline dated April 2, 2007 (Attachment C).
      4) **Research Committee** – Chair Dennis Smith submitted and explained the April 10, 2007 Committee Report (Attachment D).
      5) **Policy Committee** – Bryan submitted and explained the Policy Committee Report for the March 27, 2007 meeting and the Policy Committee Annual Report (Attachment E) and noted that items will be addressed under Old Business.
   b. **Other University Committee/Commissions:** None

5. **President’s Report:** President Kunkel submitted her Annual Report dated April, 2007 (Attachment F).
6. **Old Business:**
   
a. Senator Simmons submitted the proposed *Faculty Manual* change, Research and Extension Faculty, and explained that the Policy Committee and the Executive/Advisory Committee recommended that this proposed change be referred back to the Faculty Senate Select Committee on Faculty Ranks/Titles. Motion was made to refer to this Select Committee and was seconded. Discussion was held. Vote to refer was taken and passed unanimously (Attachment G).

   b. Senator Simmons submitted for approval and explained the proposed *Faculty Manual* change, Vice Provost for Computing and Information Technology and Chief Information Officer. There was no discussion. Vote was taken to approve proposed changed and passed unanimously. Senator Simmons then submitted for approval and explained the proposed *Faculty Manual* change, Academic Computing Advisory Committee. There was no discussion. Vote was taken to approve proposed changed and passed unanimously. (Attachment H).

   c. Senator Simmons submitted for approval and explained the proposed *Faculty Manual* change, The Vice Provosts. Following discussion, Vote was taken to approve proposed changed and passed (Attachment I).

   d. Senator Simmons submitted the proposed *Faculty Manual* change, Emeritus/Retired Faculty, and explained that the Policy Committee and the Executive/Advisory Committee recommended that this proposed change be tabled. Motion was made and seconded to table proposed change and refer to the Faculty Senate Select Committee on Emeriti. Discussion was held. Vote to table was taken and passed unanimously (Attachment J).

   e. Senator Simmons submitted for approval and explained the proposed *Faculty Manual* change, Graduate Academic Grievance. No discussion. Vote to approve was taken and passed (Attachment K).

   f. Senator Simmons submitted for approval and read aloud a Resolution to Honor Lawrence M. Gressette, Jr. There was no discussion. Vote to approve resolution was taken and passed unanimously (FS07-04-1 P) (Attachment L).

   g. Senator Simmons submitted for approval and read aloud a Resolution that Professor James D. Navratil be Granted Emeritus Status at Clemson University Upon his Retirement. There was no discussion. Vote to approve resolution was taken and passed unanimously (FS07-04-2 P) (Attachment M).

   h. Student Government and other student groups were commended by the Faculty Senate for the willingness to re-think the free speech policy and for presenting suggestions for change. This commendation and credit was echoed by the University’s Legal Counsel.
7. President Kunkel introduced Alumni Distinguished Professor Fran McGuire, as the newly-appointed Faculty Manual Editorial Consultant; presented a plaque to Dr. Pat Smart, the recipient of the Alan Schaffer Faculty Senate Service Award; distributed certificates to retiring Faculty Senators, and introduced Charles H. Gooding, as the 2007-08 Faculty Senate President.

Desmond R. Layne, Secretary

Cathy Toth Sturkie, Program Assistant

8. New Business:
   a. President Charles H. Gooding asked Senators to introduce themselves, informed the Senate that Fran McGuire will be the Senate’s parliamentarian and who the standing committee chairs will be: Finance, Mark Smotherman; Policy, Bill Surver; Research, Christina Wells; Scholastic Policies, Antonis Katsiyannis and Welfare, Bill Bowerman and introduced John Ballato, Faculty Representative to the Board of Trustees.

   b. President Gooding informed the Senate that an Orientation/Luncheon will be held on May 8th prior to the meeting and asked Senators to return their committee preference forms as quickly as possible so that the new session may proceed.

   c. President Gooding asked for and received a motion to continue three Select Committees (Faculty Ranks/Titles, Professional Development and Personnel Evaluation and Emeriti Faculty) which was seconded. Vote to continue committees was taken and passed unanimously.

9. Announcements: President Gooding
   a. encouraged Senators to notify the Senate Office with the two names of Executive/Advisory Committee members and

   b. invited the Senate to a called meeting on Wednesday, April 11 at 1:00 p.m. in 205 Cooper Library to be briefed on the Task Force Report on the Admissions of Athletes.

10. Adjournment: 3:39 p.m.
Absent: G. Birrenkott (H. Liu for), A. Bennett, G. Cunningham, F. Edwards, D. Thomason
Faculty Senate Finance Committee
Annual Report for 2006 - 2007

The Finance Committee investigated the procedure on the proposed sale of University land near Myrtle Beach. With the help of the Provost’s office, we were able to report in detail on the steps in this process. At that time, the proposal to sell the land had reached the State Budget Control Board. No further follow up on this topic was pursued.

At the request of John Meriwether, the committee began an investigation of the per diem rates. We were unable to determine precisely the last time that the per diem rates had been adjusted for inflation, but it was clear that it had been several years. Subsequently Nancy Porter drew our attention to a new regulation that required that reimbursements for lodging must be limited to the Federal per diem rates when the reimbursements are from state funds. Discussions were conducted with our local state legislators and with the representative of the SC State Employees Association. Subsequently, correspondence was sent to these individuals as well as the Clemson University lobbyist. No response has been received as this time.

We would like to point out that the Budget Accountability Committee has not met for the last two years in spite of several requests to hold a meeting, and we recommend that the Faculty Senate aggressively pursue the revitalization of this committee.

Respectfully submitted,

Faculty Senate Finance Committee
Daniel Warner, Chair
Bill Bauerle
Bill Bowerman
Robert Campbell
David Dettrich
Graciela Tissera
Committee Members: Nancy Porter (Chair), Grant Cunningham, Alan Grubb, Steve Stuart, Deborah Thomason, and Curtis White

**Accomplishments:**

**Mileage Reimbursement** – As of July 1, 2006 faculty who use personal vehicles for business travel receive $ .405 per mile (if motor pool vehicle is available) or $ .445 for all other mileage - including mileage to and from nearby airports and train depots when using a commercial carrier. Travel policies are listed in the updated Pocket Guide To Official Travel located at http://virtual.clemson.edu/groups/procurement/Travel_Brochure.pdf.

**Nine Versus Twelve Month Pay Option:** Lawrence Nichols and Kim Cassell from Human Resources presented two options for faculty. Option 1 “Pay Spread Evenly over 12 Months” would provide even distribution of income and checks received in the summer with an even distribution of insurance premiums, but would mandate 100% participation by faculty. Option 2 “Pay Withheld” allows amounts of pay to be withheld from employee’s check (after tax) through payroll deduction each pay period from August to May. Amounts would be given back in June and July. The Exec/Advisory Committee unanimously recommended implementation for the optional method for faculty (Option 2) since it was deemed that 100% participation in Option 1 could not be achieved.

**Alan Schaffer Faculty Senate Service Award:** Four nominations were received by the February 15, 2007 deadline. The committee recommends that the Call for Nominations wording under Eligibility be changed to read, “Any current or former faculty, staff, or administrator with strong preference given to individuals who have provided direct service to the Faculty Senate. Current Faculty Senate officers are ineligible.”

**Faculty Liaison for Insurance/Health Care** – Faculty Ombudsman can fill this need and faculty should be referred if concerns arise.

**TERIed Faculty:** Worked with Policy Committee and Holley Ulbrich to incorporate informational item in the Faculty Manual.

**Priority Issues that Are Continuing**

**Parking and Transportation:** The development of a Parking and Transportation Master Plan was monitored and faculty were urged to provide input through all available opportunities to have their needs considered in the plan. A draft of the plan that was created was presented on March 29, revealing that current parking demand is adequate, but will not handle the loss of parking spaces from new construction of buildings that have been funded. Five options to handle future parking and transportation demands are being considered which include different combinations of strategies including implementing a transportation demand management plan, reallocating spaces, and constructing at least one parking deck. It is hoped a decision will be made this spring.
Spousal/Partner Hiring: The status of current programs was investigated and data was gathered on past and current use of Clemson’s Michelin Career Center and referrals through the Chamber of Commerce. A letter was written to Neill Cameron seeking advice and suggestions for funding the development of a more comprehensive program.

Child Care Center for Clemson University: Progress reports from Provost Helms regarding establishing a day care facility for faculty, staff, and graduate students have been monitored. The most recent update from the Provost included possible day care option for infants in the Fall, 2007. Possible locations for construction are still under consideration. A survey on the number of infants needing care may be distributed soon.

Insurance Concerns of Faculty: An email request for input resulted in responses from 33 faculty. A summary of concerns was compiled and submitted to Lawrence Nichols.

Per Diem Rates: Worked with Finance Committee Chair, Dan Warner, to draft a letter to B. R. Skelton requesting consideration of an increase in per diem rates to adjust for inflation.

Waiver or Reduction of Fike Fee for Faculty: Data was gathered and a letter was written to Neill Cameron seeking advice and suggestions for donor funding to implement a modified Healthy Communities initiative on campus to establish healthy lifestyles as an enduring part of the Clemson Experience.

Issues Worthy of Additional Monitoring

Faculty Performance Salary Survey – The Welfare Committee supports Provost Helms’ Performance Salary Survey and eagerly awaits receiving information that is gained.

“Financial Health” SC Retirement System – monitored information from Governor Sanford’s Executive Budget and retiree COLA requests.

Issues Worthy of Continuing Support
Increase in Preventive Care Benefits Covered by Insurance
Tuition Assistance/Scholarships for Family Members of Faculty

Additional Issues Discussed
“To Do List” for New Faculty
Future Uses of Douthit Hills Property
Class Loads and Student/Teacher Ratios
iTunes U Program
Faculty/Staff Priority for Athletic Tickets and Re seating Plan
Campus Safety Walk with Student Government
Outside Noise Which is Disruptive to Classes
Recommendations for Guidelines when Acknowledging the Death of Current Faculty
Mandatory Use of ARA Food Services in On Campus Facilities
Representation on Pandemic Planning Committee
Recommendation for 2007 – 2008: The Chair of the Welfare Committee might benefit from communicating or meeting with Chairs of Welfare Committees at other institutions of higher education in the state. Perhaps larger scale efforts would be more effective in increasing faculty welfare benefits.

It is also suggested that a member of the Welfare Committee meet periodically with the President’s Commission on the Status of Women and the Black Faculty and Staff Association to monitor faculty welfare issues.

Submitted by: Nancy M. Porter, Chair
April 10, 2007
Minutes of the March 15, 2007, Scholastic Policies Committee meeting

Members present: A. Bennett, M. Smotherman
Guests present: none

The committee met with Dr. Debra Jackson to discuss the online teaching evaluations.

1. Dr. Jackson shared statistics from the evaluation process in Fall 2006, including that 87% of the lecture sections had evaluations and that 52% of the sections evaluated had a 70% or better participation rate by the student. 7% of instructors of record with sections larger than five students did not activate evaluations. Some may have forgotten or may have become confused when trying to activate multiple sections.

2. Based on student comments gathered for a class project, the students would like to know how evaluation data is being used. It would be especially helpful for students to know what changes were made by an instructor based on the last semester’s evaluations. A few Clemson instructors do a midterm evaluation using the survey tool under Blackboard and can make changes during a semester.

3. There may be some way to provide students aggregated data, e.g., department means and perhaps means within a department according to faculty rank.

4. Suggestions from the committee:
   a) Add a note to the page within Blackboard that lists courses for the student to evaluate. The note should thank the student for participating and say something to the effect that evaluations are important and used in PTR decisions.
   b) Establish a universal activation date at which time every evaluation would be activated. Instructors wishing to add questions would have to do so before this date. Instructors wishing to limit evaluation to only a certain date or time would need to manually deactivate and then reactivate at the time of their choosing.

Next meeting: TBA

---

Minutes of the April 3, 2007, Scholastic Policies Committee meeting

Members present: F. Edwards, A. Girgis, A. Katsiyannis, M. Smotherman
Guests present: B. Kunkel

1. The committee discussed moving classes from Labor Day to the second day of fall break for Fall semester 2007 because of the home football game.
a) We request Faculty Senate President Kunkel to write to President Barker and Provost Helms and ask that whenever they appoint a faculty representative to a task force involving academic issues, they inform the President of the Faculty Senate of who has been appointed.

b) We request Faculty Senate President Kunkel to write to President Barker and Provost Helms and ask that whenever a major campus event affecting class scheduling is confirmed, someone should be designated to inform the department chairs and the departmental registration coordinators about the event and specifically remind them to take the event into account when planning class schedules.

2. In light of the 1,000+ students on probation, along with a large number of undeclared freshman majors and shadow majors, the committee passed a motion to endorse the need for up to three academic advisers to work out of Dean Murdoch's office. A determination can be later made about the need for additional advisers. The committee specifically does not want to see a director/staff arrangement and the establishment of another academic unit. The committee felt that the advising model and techniques used for Vickery Hall may provide some good suggestions for a university-wide advising center, especially for students on probation.

3. The committee briefly reviewed a list of topics for the final report.

Topics covered during term

1) endorsed an increase in academic redemption hours (9 to 10)
2) heard a report on creative inquiry from Dr. Jeff Appling
3) student government proposal for a Core Values statement
4) endorsed a change in the final exam schedule to a five-day schedule
5) recommended that faculty representatives from each college and the library serve on the summer reading committee
6) recommended that incompletes not be included in the grade point calculation
7) endorsed the proposed revisions to the undergraduate Academic Grievance Policy
8) heard reports on a proposed advising center
9) discussed the graduate academic grievance and academic integrity policies with Dr. Frankie Felder
10) discussed the undergraduate academic integrity policy with Dean Jan Murdoch, Ms. Julia McBride, and Dr. Jeff Appling
11) heard a report on online teaching evaluations by Dr. Debra Jackson

Possible topics for next year's committee

1) consider attendance policy guidelines (based on a suggestion that some faculty had guidelines that had unreasonable consequences for absences)
2) request log policies (waiting lists) for closed classes
3) determination of eligibility for faculty awards to undergraduates graduating with a 4.0 (currently 75% of courses must be from Clemson)
4) cell phone / laptop usage in classes

The next meeting will be set up by the next chair.
Labor Day Class Decision Timeline  (prepared by Mark Smotherman 4/2/07)

Fall 2006

preliminary discussion between President Barker and ACC of the possibility of a Labor Day game

Spring 2006

January 19 - ACC announces 2007 football schedules; President Barker sends email to all faculty and states he will appoint a task force

Jan./Feb. - Dean Murdoch appointed to represent faculty and talks with Ric Garcia, Melanie Cooper, Rick Jarvis, and others
- Dean Murdoch reports back to Joy Smith
- HR, Parking, and Public Safety also provide input

March 12 - Administrative Council meets and approves replacing classes on Monday, Sept. 3, with classes on Tuesday, Oct. 16

March 21 - Inside Clemson announces replacement day

March 26 - Academic Council meets and decides not to adjust class schedules to mitigate loss of Monday classes and labs

Class Day Counts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Normal Fall</th>
<th>Normal Spring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fall 2007

| 13 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 |

Impact Survey

139 surveys sent by email to department registration coordinators
32 responses, some from faculty who had been forwarded the survey

not every question was answered by every respondent, so the numbers below don't add to 32

aware of possible cancellation of classes and labs on Labor Day: 5
unaware: 14

no problem: 5
inconvenience: 1
impact on classes: 15 (estimates sum to approximately 3800 students affected)
The Faculty Senate Research Committee last met on March 9, 2007. Our next meeting is TBA.

1. Conversation with Compliance (Lead: Wells/Meriwether). Naomi Kelly and Traci Arwood have provided a detailed and valuable response to questions solicited from the faculty. A compilation of the questions and responses is now available from the senate office.

2. Technology Transfer & Entrepreneurship (Lead: Smith/Figliola/Schleifer). No discussion on this topic. We remind senators that Dr. Kolis' slides and other reports, including the CURF bylaws and operating agreement with Clemson are available upon request from Cathy in the Senate office.

3. Research and The Humanities (Lead: Martin). No discussion on this topic.

4. Research Professor Title (Lead: Smith). Changes to the faculty manual have been proposed to the policy committee in our last report.

5. Department Chair Authority to Regulate PI Summer Pay from Grants (Lead: Meriwether). The committee has been asked to review the policy of one department chair who is currently regulating the use of grant funds budgeted for PI salary. The committee is currently investigating: 1) precedence for chair authority and policies of this kind, 2) potential faculty manual conflicts or justification, 3) potential contract rules violation or justification in the office of sponsored programs and beyond.
Faculty Senate Policy Committee

(Minutes of the Tuesday March 27, 2007 Policy Committee meeting)

Members:

Tom Boland, Chris Colthorpe, Brad Meyer, Bryan Simmons, Bill Server, Eric Weisenmiller

1. Emeritus Faculty and Emeritus College

2. Vice President for Computing and Information Technology and Chief Information Officer

3. Academic Computing Advisory Committee

4. (Graduate) Academic Grievance

5. Research and Extension Faculty

6. Provost request to add Vice Provosts

7. Recommending Emeritus status for Professor Navratil

Having reached the end of committee member terms of service no further meetings are scheduled. (WOOO HOOO!!!!!!)

Policy Committee Annual Report

1. Changed policy on Sale of Textbooks.

2. Changed policy on Post Tenure Review process. Clarified the length of the review and exclusionary period.

3. Changed policy on Reporting Violations of the Faculty Manual with regard to who is notified.

4. Changed policy on date of incorporation of the Faculty to July 1.

5. Changed policy on probationary period for nine and twelve month faculty.

6. Changed policy concerning confidentiality.

7. Changed policy on size and balance of search and screening committees.

8. Reaffirmed the policy on the issue of separate and independent review by Chair.

Continued on other side
Policy Committee Annual Report (Continued)

9. Included Vice Provost for International Affairs as a voting member of the Academic Council.

10. Reorganized the placement of three international committees in the manual.

11. Changed the composition of the Recreation Advisory Committee.

12. Changed Grievance Policy.

13. Changed policy regarding application of promotion guidelines to three years.

14. Changed policy to institute the Summer Reading Committee.

15. Separated the University Naming Committee and the Honorary Award Committees.


17. Changed policy for the inclusion of a (TERI) section of the manual.

18. Changed policy giving the candidate an opportunity to respond to an evaluation/recommendation.

19. Moved sections from IX to X and added a disclaimer.

"Thank you" to each of the Policy Committee members, along with Beth Kunkel, Cathy Sturkie, Holly Ulbrich, Pat Smart and Connie Lee for all of their input and support throughout the past year!
The 2006-2007 Faculty Senate concluded a productive year on April 10 with the induction of new officers and senators. The new Faculty Senate officers are Dr. Charles Gooding, President; Dr. Bryan Simmons, Vice-President/President-elect; and Dr. Deborah Thomason, Secretary. They are joined by Dr. Fran McGuire as the Faculty Manual Editorial Consultant, replacing retiring Editorial Consultant Dr. Holley Ulbrich. At this meeting, we also recognized the recipient of the second Alan Schaffer Faculty Senate Service Award, Dr. Pat Smart, Professor of Nursing.

Highlights of work accomplished since our last Report include sponsoring the February Faculty Forum, featuring presentations by Dr. Horace Fleming and Dr. Reginal Harrell, who each provided a historical frame of reference for faculty governance at Clemson. Those presentations were followed by round table discussions on specific aspects of faculty governance. Some recurring themes from these discussions were that the Faculty Senate plays a major role in building/maintaining trust between faculty and administration, works mainly "behind the scenes," and functions effectively as the voice of the faculty. Communicating more effectively and working more proactively were areas identified for improvement.

The committees were very active throughout the year. The Policy Committee, chaired by Dr. Bryan Simmons, led the way for a remarkable number of changes in the Faculty Manual, including our extensive revision of the grievance process, changes in the structure of several committees, and clarifications for promotion and tenure processes. The Research Committee, chaired by Dr. Dennis Smith, continued to work on technology transfer issues and on summer pay from grant funds. The Welfare Committee, chaired by Dr. Nancy Porter, worked on insurance and day care issues as well as continuing to take the lead in parking and transportation issues. The Finance Committee, chaired by Dr. Dan Warner, has continued to address issues surrounding per diems and return of indirect funds. The Scholastic Policies Committee, chaired by Dr. Mark Smootherman, addressed issues related to academic integrity, academic grievance procedures and on-line course evaluations.

The Senate Select Committee on Professional Development and Performance Evaluation, chaired by Dr. Mary Ann Taylor, is completing their work on identifying skill sets for effective faculty members. They will continue working to develop/identify mechanisms for faculty development and evaluation.

I would like to conclude by thanking each of the members of the Faculty Senate, who gave freely of their time and energy throughout the year and by thanking you for your dedication and service to the University. It has been incredibly apparent throughout the year that the faculty and the Faculty Senate at Clemson University have a unique relationship with our Board of Trustees that is the envy of many of our colleagues throughout the country. Thank you for the privilege of serving Clemson in this way!

Respectfully submitted,

Beth Kunkel
Faculty Senate President, 2006-2007
Present wording:

4. **Research or Extension Faculty.** The title of research or extension professor, research or extension associate professor, and research or extension assistant professor (depending upon professional qualifications) may be granted to persons engaged in full time research or public service who are supported exclusively (including fringe benefits) from external funds or foundation accounts. Such appointments must be initiated by the host department(s) in accordance with departmental bylaws and approved by the dean and the Provost. These positions are contingent upon the availability of external funds and adequate space; termination is automatic upon expiration of external funding. Individuals holding these positions will be subject to annual review utilizing the faculty activity system for faculty continuance. Initial appointment, reappointment, and promotion will be based on departmental bylaws and will be contingent upon plans for and contributions to the department’s undergraduate, graduate, and public service programs that interface with their research or public service activities. Examples are participation in departmental seminars, research exposure with undergraduate and graduate students, provision for funding of graduate students, service on the graduate advisory committee, and public service activities related to the department’s mission. Distribution of indirect costs or overhead generated shall follow university policy. These positions are not tenurable, nor shall time spent in such a position count toward tenure.

Proposed Wording

4. **Research or Extension Faculty.** The title of research or extension professor, research or extension associate professor, or research or extension assistant professor (depending upon professional qualifications) may be granted to persons engaged in full time research or public service who are supported exclusively (including fringe benefits) from external funds or foundation accounts. This position is typically in connection with externally funded research projects for which they may serve as, and are expected to seek, principal investigator status. Such appointments will be treated as regular faculty and must be initiated by the host department(s) in accordance with departmental bylaws and approved by the dean and the Provost. These positions are not tenurable, nor shall time spent in such a position typically count toward tenure. contingent upon the availability of external funds and adequate space; termination is automatic upon expiration of external funding. Individuals holding these positions will be subject to annual review utilizing the faculty activity system for faculty continuance. Initial appointment, reappointment, and promotion will be based on departmental bylaws and will be contingent upon plans for and contributions to the department’s undergraduate, graduate, and public service programs that interface with their research or public service activities. Examples are participation in departmental seminars, research exposure with undergraduate and graduate students, provision for funding of graduate students, service on the graduate advisory committee, and public service activities related to the department’s mission. Distribution of indirect costs or overhead generated shall follow university policy.

5. **Extension or Public Service Faculty.** The title of research or extension or public service professor, research or extension or public service associate professor, or research or extension or public service assistant professor (depending upon professional qualifications) may be granted to persons engaged in full time extension or public service activities who are supported exclusively (including fringe benefits) from external funds or foundation accounts. Such appointments must be initiated by the host department(s) in accordance with departmental bylaws and approved by the dean, and the Provost, and the Vice President for Public Service and Agriculture. These
positions are contingent upon the availability of external funds and adequate space; termination is automatic upon expiration of external funding. Individuals holding these positions will be subject to annual review utilizing the faculty activity system for faculty continuance. Initial appointment, reappointment, and promotion will be based on departmental bylaws and will be contingent upon plans for and contributions to the programs that interface with their extension research or public service activities. Distribution of indirect costs or overhead generated shall follow university policy. These positions are not tenurable, nor shall time spent in such a position count toward tenure.

Rationale: Changes in Research Professor were requested by the Research Committee. The Policy Committee recommends that the two categories be separated regardless of any decision related to the regulations governing research professors.
Current wording:
 VI.D. 1. The Vice Provost for Computing and Information Technology and Chief Information Officer is responsible for university-wide planning for information technology, and for the administration, coordination, budgeting, and planning associated with the university’s three central computing services groups: Administrative Programming Services, Information Systems Development, and the Computer Center.

VII. D.1. Computer Advisory Committee reviews and advises on policies for the Division of Computing and Information Technology. Voting membership consists of one faculty member serving a three-year term elected from each of the colleges and the library; a representative from the Faculty Senate elected annually; and a graduate student appointed by the President of Graduate Student Government. Non-voting membership includes the Vice Provost for Computing and Information Technology (chair) and a staff member from each of the following offices: student affairs, development, and finance.

Proposed wording:

VI.D. The Vice Provost for Computing and Information Technology and Chief Information Officer is responsible for university-wide planning for information technology, and for the administration, coordination, budgeting, and planning associated with the university’s central computing services groups: Administrative Programming Services, Information Systems Development, and the Computer Center. Customer Relations and Learning Technologies, Research Computing, Enterprise Applications, Computing, Systems and Operations, and Network and Telecommunications.

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

Present wording:
III. D. The Vice Provosts

There are three Vice Provosts and two non-college deans reporting to the Provost. The Vice Provosts, the Dean of Undergraduate Studies, and the Dean of the Graduate School share duties that include serving on and occasionally chairing a variety of committees, participation in program development, forming and maintaining relationships with other academic institutions and with the Commission on Higher Education, and such other responsibilities as may be assigned by the Provost.

1. The Vice Provost for Computing and Information Technology and Chief Information Officer is responsible for university-wide planning for information technology, and for the administration, coordination, budgeting, and planning associated with the university’s three central computing services groups: Administrative Programming Services, Information Systems Development, and the Computer Center.

2. The Vice Provost for Off-Campus, Continuing Education, and Distance Learning is charged with improving the university’s service, performance, and competitiveness in these three areas. The Vice Provost directs, budgets, and markets the university’s activities in the following areas: professional development, off-campus programs, continuing education, and distance learning. The Vice Provost is assisted by a Director of Off-Campus, Distance and Continuing Education programs.

3. The Vice Provost for International Affairs is the university’s chief international officer. Principle responsibilities include negotiating and approving international agreements; developing, coordinating, managing and supporting all university international programs such as study abroad, study and research exchanges, service learning and internships; and all international immigration and employment services for international students, scholars, visitors, faculty and staff. The Vice Provost chairs the International Programs Coordination Committee, the International Services Coordination Committee, and the International Studies Curriculum Committee....

E. The Dean of Undergraduate Studies

The Dean of Undergraduate Studies coordinates all undergraduate academic programs including recruiting, admitting, and enrolling new undergraduate students; retaining students; and overseeing the Honors program, the Cooperative Education program, financial aid, registration services, Student Athlete Enrichment Program, and other university-wide undergraduate academic programs. The Dean of Undergraduate Studies or designee chairs the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee.

F. The Dean of the Graduate School

The Dean of the Graduate School coordinates all graduate programs, advises the Provost on policies and regulations pertaining to graduate study, graduate admissions policies, graduate student programs, graduate tuition, graduate healthcare and health insurance, and the assessment, review, continuation of degree programs and granting of graduate degrees. The Dean of the Graduate School makes the annual allocation of Graduate Assistantship Differentials. The Dean or his/her designee chairs the Graduate Curriculum Committee and participates in other subcommittees of the Graduate Council as noted below.

Proposed wording:

III.D. The Vice-Provosts

There are four Vice-Provosts and two non-college deans reporting to the Provost. The Vice Provosts, the Dean of Undergraduate Studies, and the Dean of the Graduate School share duties that include serving on and occasionally chairing a variety of committees, participation in program development, forming and maintaining relationships with other academic institutions and with the Commission on Higher Education,
and such other responsibilities as may be assigned by the Provost.

1. The Vice-Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Studies coordinates all undergraduate academic programs including recruiting, admitting, and enrolling new undergraduate students; retaining students; and overseeing the Honors program, the Cooperative Education program, financial aid, registration services, Student Athlete Enrichment Program, and other university-wide undergraduate academic programs. The Vice-Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Studies or designee chairs the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee.

2. The Vice-Provost and Dean of the Graduate School coordinates all graduate programs, advises the Provost on policies and regulations pertaining to graduate study, graduate admissions policies, graduate student programs, graduate tuition, graduate healthcare and health insurance, and the assessment, review, continuation of degree programs and granting of graduate degrees. The Dean of the Graduate School makes the annual allocation of Graduate Assistantship Differentials. The Dean or his/her designee chairs the Graduate Curriculum Committee and participates in other subcommittees of the Graduate Council as noted below.

3. The Vice Provost for Computing and Information Technology and Chief Information Officer is responsible for university-wide planning for information technology, and for the administration, coordination, budgeting, and planning associated with the university’s three central computing services groups: Administrative Programming Services, Information Systems Development, and the Computer Center.

4. The Vice Provost for Off-Campus, Continuing Education, and Distance Learning is charged with improving the university’s service, performance, and competitiveness in these three areas. The Vice Provost directs, budgets, and markets the university’s activities in the following areas: professional development, off-campus programs, continuing education, and distance learning. The Vice Provost is assisted by a Director of Off Campus, Distance and Continuing Education programs.

4. The Vice Provost for International Affairs is the university’s chief international officer. Principle responsibilities include negotiating and approving international agreements; developing, coordinating, managing and supporting all university international programs such as study abroad, study and research exchanges, service learning and internships; and all international immigration and employment services for international students, scholars, visitors, faculty and staff. The Vice Provost chairs the International Programs Coordination Committee, the International Services Coordination Committee, and the International Studies Curriculum Committee....
Proposed changes to Section III-G of the Faculty Manual
Holley H. Ulbrich, Faculty Manual Editorial Consultant

Current wording:
III.G. Emeritus/Retired 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, which was created in 2003 and is still in the process of development.

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, retired 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.

In addition, it is the policy of the university to allow 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 Fike Field House membership, 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 or more than twelve months prior to retirement, the faculty member shall submit to the department chair a brief description of the nature and proposed level of activity. If the faculty member and chair cannot agree upon the allocation of space, the matter shall be referred to the dean of the college. If the matter cannot be reconciled at that level, it shall be adjudicated by an ad hoc committee consisting of a department chair from another college appointed by the Provost, a member of the Faculty Senate research committee appointed by the Faculty Senate President, and a chaired professor elected by the chaired professors. This committee shall conduct expeditious hearings, which shall include seeking input from faculty in the affected department, as well as from the retiree, the department chair, and the dean. The recommendation of this committee shall be final. Annually, three months prior to the anniversary of retirement, the retired faculty member shall submit to the department chair a concise report of activities in the previous year and a description of the proposed activities for the following year. Disagreements on the continuation of space assignments will be resolved in the manner described above.

Proposed wording:
III.G. Emeritus and Retired Faculty

1. 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 from the University. 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 [retired] faculty as scholars have certain rights and privileges accorded to them by Clemson University. They are members of the university faculty (see Part VIII [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 emeritus [retired] colleagues.

2. Retired Faculty
It is the policy of the university to allow retired faculty (including emeritus faculty) 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 Fike...
Recreation Center membership, 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 within their discipline 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 for which space is requested. If the faculty member and chair cannot agree upon the allocation of space, the matter shall be referred to the dean of the college. If the matter cannot be reconciled at that level, it shall be adjudicated by an ad hoc committee consisting of a department chair from another college appointed by the Provost, a member of the Faculty Senate research committee appointed by the Faculty Senate President, and a chaired professor elected by the chaired professors. This committee shall conduct expeditious hearings, which shall include seeking input from faculty in the affected department, as well as from the retiree, the department chair, and the dean. The recommendation of this committee shall be final. Space allocation will be reviewed annually. [Annually, three months prior to the anniversary of retirement, the retired faculty member shall submit to the department chair a concise report of activities in the previous year and a description of the proposed activities for the following year. Disagreements on the continuation of space assignments will be resolved in the manner described above.

3. Emeritus Society

An Emeritus Society was established in 2003. All regular university faculty who have received the title of Emeritus or Emerita are automatically members of this Society. The purpose of the Emeritus Society is to foster the continued involvement of the emeritus faculty in the Clemson University community. Such involvement, which can extend beyond the usual departmental activities, may include representing Clemson University nationally and internationally, teaching special courses, serving on University committees, and mentoring junior faculty with their professional activities. Faculty retirees from other colleges and universities may be invited to become members of the Emeritus Society if their participation serves the aims of the Society.

Rationale: main change is the description of the emeritus organization. The Policy Committee and the Executive/Advisory Committee strongly recommend that it NOT be named college because of the confusion that creates with the role of the colleges in the governance structure. This is not a college in the sense of having a dean, active faculty, degree programs, governance responsibilities, etc.
Proposed Faculty Manual Change
VII.B.2.e. Graduate Academic Grievance Committee
Holley H. Ulbrich, Faculty Manual Editorial Consultant

VII.B.2.e. Current Wording
Graduate Student Academic Grievances Committee hears all grievances involving the following: (a) grievances of a personal nature involving an individual student and a faculty member; (b) the claim by a student that the final grade in a course was inequitably awarded; (c) cases where the grievance involves graduate student employment; and (d) graduate student academic dishonesty. In cases involving academic dishonesty, the Policy on Academic Misconduct shall be applied. In all unresolved cases, the committee makes its recommendations to the President through the Provost. All proceedings of the committee are confidential. Details as to definitions and procedures may be found in Graduate School Announcements. Membership of this committee consists of the following: five faculty members involved in graduate education (one from each college elected by the collegiate faculty for three-year terms) and two graduate students appointed by the president of graduate student government; also one representative of the graduate school serving in a non-voting, advisory role. Each year the chair is elected from among the continuing faculty members. The term of appointment begins with each fall registration.

VII.B.2.e. Proposed Wording
The Graduate Academic Grievance Committee consists of 15 faculty representatives, three from each college, and five student representatives, preferably one from each college. Faculty representatives are selected by their colleges and serve three-year staggered terms. Student representatives on the committee are selected and approved by the Graduate Student Government through an application and interview process in the spring semester. Students serve one-year terms. No member of the Graduate Academic Grievance Committee may simultaneously be a member of the undergraduate academic grievance committee, nor may they be members of the undergraduate or graduate academic integrity committees. The selection of faculty and student membership on the Graduate Academic Grievance Committee will occur in April of each year as needed.

The Initial Grievance Review Board is responsible for determining which grievances will go forward to the Graduate Academic Grievance Committee. The IGRB is comprised of one faculty representative from each of the colleges, appointed for one-year terms. In addition, there is one graduate student representative on the IGRB, appointed for a one-year term. The members of the Initial Grievance Review Board are selected by and from the membership of the Graduate Academic Grievance Committee. The IGRB selects a faculty member to serve as its chair.

The Graduate Academic Grievance Committee is responsible for hearing student grievances forwarded to it by the IGRB, proposing resolutions, and, in the case of appeal, preparing the file and forwarding recommendations to the dean of the Graduate School. Grievances are heard by 5-person subcommittees, three faculty and two graduate students, appointed by the chair of the Graduate Academic Grievance Committee as cases are received from the IGRB. The Graduate Academic Grievance Committee will only hold hearings on cases referred to it by the IGRB. The chair of the Graduate Academic Grievance Committee is a faculty member selected by the membership of the committee at its first meeting.

Rationale: This change was requested by the Graduate Council and has already been approved by the Academic Council.
RESOLUTION TO HONOR

LAWRENCE M. GRESSETTE, JR.

FS07-04-1 P

Whereas, Lawrence M. Gressette, Jr. has ably served the faculty, staff, students and administration of Clemson University as a Trustee for eighteen years; and

Whereas, Mr. Gressette has been Chairman of the Board of Trustees for eight years; and

Whereas, Mr. Gressette has served Clemson University through chairing the University's first major capital campaign, membership on the Commission on the Future of Clemson University and the Research Foundation Board of Directors and in innumerable other capacities; and

Whereas, As Chairman of the Clemson University Board of Trustees, Mr. Gressette worked with various Faculty Senate Presidents to forge a sound, positive relationship based on mutual respect and trust; and

Whereas, Mr. Gressette made himself available to Faculty Senate Presidents even for private discussions; and

Whereas, Mr. Gressette embraced the concept of a faculty representative to the Board of Trustees and made the concept a reality during his tenure as Chairman of the Board;

RESOLVED, The Faculty Senate recognizes and very much appreciates Mr. Gressette's selfless dedication and service on behalf of Clemson University.

The resolution was passed unanimously by the Faculty Senate on April 10, 2007.
RESOLUTION THAT PROFESSOR JAMES D. NAVRATIL
BE GRANTED EMERITUS STATUS
AT CLEMSON UNIVERSITY
UPON HIS RETIREMENT

FS07-04-1 P

Whereas, James D. Navratil has exceeded the required number of years of service at Clemson University (5 years) but lacks the total number of normally required years in academia (15 years); and

Whereas, Professor Navratil has an international reputation relating to actinide chemistry and the control of nuclear proliferation; and

Whereas, Professor Navratil has led many Clemson students to successful participation in national design competitions and has himself won the “Lifetime Achievement Award” from the Waste management, Education and Research Consortium; and

Whereas, Professor Navratil was a member of a large team receiving a Nobel Peace Prize; and

Whereas, a majority faculty vote in the Environmental Engineering and Science Department was cast in support of Professor Navratil receiving emeritus status;

Resolved, that Professor Navratil be granted emeritus status at Clemson University.

This resolution was unanimously passed by the Faculty Senate on April 10, 2007.
MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
MAY 8, 2007

1. Call to Order: The meeting was called to order at 2:33 p.m. by President Charles H. Gooding.

2. Approval of Minutes: The Minutes of the Faculty Senate meeting of April 10, 2007 were approved as written.

3. "Free Speech": None

4. Election of Senate/Faculty Representatives to University Committees: Elections of Faculty Senators and Faculty representatives to University Committees/Commission were held by plurality and secret ballot.

5. a. Faculty Senate Select Committee Reports: None

   b. Senate Standing Committee Reports:

      1) Welfare – Bill Bowerman, Chair, stated that the Committee met last week but only one committee member was in attendance. He noted that Senator Linda Li-Bleuel will be the lead person for the childcare issue. Committee will meet next week.

      2) Scholastic Policies – No report.

      3) Research – Chair Christina Wells stated that the Committee had not yet met. A meeting will be scheduled before the end of the semester.

      4) Policy – Bill Surver, Chair, noted that Committee had met and will present an item under New Business (Attachment A).

      5) Finance – Mark Smotherman, Chair, reported he had spoken with Wickes Westcott, Director of Institutional Research, and asked that format changes be made to the salary report so it would be presented as it has been in the past. Mr. Westcott responded that the new format was based on guidelines for reporting salaries of state employees. The Committee has not yet met.

   c. University Committees/Commissions: None
7. **President's Report**: President Gooding
   a. introduced guests;
   b. noted that the Senate needed an Athletic Council representative to be designated by him and for any interested Senators to notify him;
   c. stated that he attended the Board of Trustees Committee meetings during which approval was granted for a new program in applied biology, a new Center for Chinese Studies and a National Institute of Parks;
   d. noted that there was a ten percent increase in the reduction of Life Scholarships for which the Academic Success Center was praised;
   e. stated that there was a reduction in D’s, F’s, and Withdrawal rates attributed to a new way of teaching calculus; and
   f. informed the Senate that the University will look at current campus security measures for improvement in light of the tragedy at Virginia Tech.

8. **Old Business**: None

9. **New Business**:
   a. Senator Surver submitted for approval, a Request for Authorization – Grievance Procedures Compliance with State Law, which was further explained by Renee Roux, Associate General Counsel. Following much, much discussion, motion was made to postpone indefinitely and send issue to the Policy Committee to address. Motion was seconded. Vote to postpone was taken and passed (Attachment B).

10. **Announcements**:
    a. Faculty Senate WILL meet on June 12, 2007
       Faculty Senate WILL NOT meet in July
       Faculty Senate WILL meet on August 21, 2007 in the STUDENT SENATE CHAMBERS.
    b. Senator and Secretary Deborah Thomason explained the Faculty Display in the Connector between the Martin Inn and the Madren Center and asked Senators to send her books, chapters, publications and such so that they can be displayed for visitors.

11. **Adjournment**: 3:43 p.m.

   [Signatures]

The Policy Committee has just been constituted and therefore we have not met. Our first meeting is TBA

Action Item - Senate approval for the following:

Changes in the State policy for Resolution of Discrimination / Harassment Complaints

Propose: delete current paragraph under D1 and add reference to State policy that will be inserted into Section X.B. Approval will allow this change to appear in next year's Faculty Manual.

Policy Committee Priority Items:

1. The patent policy must be updated and drastically shortened. Have to work with the Research Committee on getting that done.

2. The emeritus "entity" is still in dispute. Hopefully the ad hoc committee will get that issue resolved.

3. The research professor issue is still up for discussion. The research and extension sections will be separate in the new edition of the Manual.

4. Still hanging fire is whether we want a statement about public prayer in Section X of the Manual.

5. How do we get colleges and departments to update their bylaws?

6. How do we deal with the usual absence of a quorum at general faculty meetings--virtual meetings?

7. Policy on ranks and titles so we can get it right in the Manual.

8. Uniform policy on Adjunct appointments.

These are just to get us started!!!!!
Procedures for Resolution of Discrimination / Harassment Complaints

Office of Access and Equity

These procedures will be applied in conjunction with the following Clemson University Policies for Equitable Treatment: Affirmative Action / Equal Employment Opportunity Policy, Policy on HIV Disease and Aids, Policy for Individuals with Disabilities, Policy for Disabled and Vietnam-Era Veterans, and Harassment Policy. (These policies can be found at http://www.clemson.edu/access/ under "Policies").

The Office of Access and Equity is responsible for investigating and processing all complaints of discrimination / harassment made against any member of the Clemson University community, including faculty, staff, or students, or any vendor or contractor conducting business within the university. These procedures apply to complaints of discrimination based on age, color, disability, gender, national origin, race, religion, sexual orientation, or veteran's status. Information essential to an investigation must be provided to the Office of Access and Equity upon request.

All members of the Clemson community should contact the Office of Access & Equity if they observe or encounter conduct that may violate any of the University's Policies for Equitable Treatment. Reports of alleged violations may also be made to an immediate supervisor. Alternatively, if the immediate supervisor is the alleged harasser, complaints may be made to the next level supervisor. Students can report alleged violations to the Office of the Dean of Students (undergraduate students), the Dean of the Graduate School (graduate students), Academic Deans, Department Chairs, or directly to the Office of Access and Equity. University officials, managers, Deans, Department Chairs, and supervisors that receive a complaint of discrimination / harassment are required to notify the Office of Access and Equity in order to have complaints promptly processed under the Informal and/or the Formal Complaint process described below.

Reports of discrimination/harassment should be brought as soon as possible after the alleged conduct occurs. Prompt reporting enables the University to more effectively investigate the facts, determine if a violation of any policy has occurred, and provide an appropriate remedy or disciplinary action. Therefore, complaints investigated under this procedure must be reported as described in the previous paragraph no more than 120 days after the complaining party becomes aware of the allegedly discriminatory or harassing conduct.

Informal Complaint Process

The goal of the Informal Complaint Process is to resolve concerns at the earliest stage possible with the cooperation of the parties involved. This process includes but is not limited to discussions with the parties, mediating an agreement between the parties, referring the parties to counseling programs, conducting targeted educational and training programs, and making other recommendations for resolution. Upon notification of an informal complaint, an investigator in the
Office of Access and Equity will conduct an investigation into the allegations using the following process:

- Discussions will be conducted separately with the complainant and the accused to review the allegation(s) and develop a mutually satisfactory resolution. If deemed appropriate, the investigator may bring the parties together for a joint discussion.
- The resolution process will be confidential to the extent permitted by law. The Office of Access and Equity shall advise all parties of the confidentiality of the investigation and the strict prohibition against retaliation.
- A written record of the allegation(s) and the resolution will be provided to the parties and retained in the Office of Access and Equity.
- If the investigator, after hearing the complainant’s statement, determines that a formal investigation is necessary, the complaint will be handled under the Formal Investigation Process below.
- Resolution of complaints handled under the Informal Complaint Process shall either be completed within 30 days of receipt of the complaint by the Office of Access & Equity or referred to the Formal Complaint process within that time period. The Office of Access & Equity shall notify all parties in writing if a matter originally submitted under the Informal Complaint process is going to be handled under the Formal Complaint process.
- The Informal Complaint Process is an optional step. The complaining party or the Office of Access and Equity may decide to skip the Informal Complaint Process and proceed under the Formal Complaint Process.

**Formal Complaint Process**

The formal complaint process will be followed by the Office of Access and Equity if the informal complaint process is not successful or appropriate for addressing the allegations of the complaining party (such as when the facts are in dispute in reports of serious misconduct). The wishes of the individual making the report shall be considered but are not determinative in the decision to initiate the Formal Complaint Process. For example, the University may determine that it is obligated to proceed under the Formal Complaint Process due to the seriousness or nature of the allegations even if the complaining party would prefer to proceed under the Informal Complaint Process. Upon notification of a formal complaint, an investigator in the Office of Access and Equity will conduct an investigation into the allegations using the following process:

- The process will be confidential to the extent permitted by law. The Office of Access and Equity shall advise all parties of the confidentiality of the investigation and the strict prohibition against retaliation.
- The investigation shall include interviews with the parties, interviews with other witnesses as needed, and a review of relevant documents if appropriate. If all witnesses identified by the parties are not interviewed, the investigator will document the reason the interviews were not conducted.
- The individual(s) accused of violating any Clemson Policy for Equitable Treatment shall be given a written statement of the allegations made by the complainant.
- The investigation shall be completed as promptly as possible and in most cases within 45 days of the date the Formal Investigation Process was initiated. If the investigation cannot be completed within 45 calendar days because of valid extenuating circumstances, the complainant will be notified and given a projected time of completion. In cases where the
complaint is submitted to Access & Equity near the end of the semester, the 45-day limit can be suspended until the start of the following semester if necessary to conduct interviews of witnesses or primary parties who were unavailable during academic breaks.

- The investigation should result in a written report that includes a statement of the allegations, the positions of the parties, a summary of the findings of fact, and a determination by the Investigator as to whether University policy has been violated, and recommendations for actions to resolve the complaint if appropriate. If all witnesses identified by the parties were not interviewed, the report shall include a statement explaining why. The report shall be submitted to the University official(s) with authority to implement the actions necessary to resolve the complaint.
- The complainant and the accused shall be informed within 30 days of the conclusion of the investigation that the investigation is complete and whether any violations of policy were found. The complainant shall be informed of actions taken to resolve the complaint only if they are directly related to the complainant, such as a directive that the accused not contact the complainant. The complainant may generally be notified that the matter has been referred for disciplinary action, but shall not be informed of the details. Both parties will be notified if all witnesses they identified were not interviewed and the reason they were not interviewed.

 Appeals of the Formal Complaint Process

- The complainant or accused has a right to appeal the decision of the formal complaint process.
- Appeals must be submitted in writing to the Office of the President of the University within 7 working days (excluding weekends and University holidays) after receipt of the final report of the formal complaint process. The President will appoint a member of his Administrative Council to review and decide the appeal.
- Decisions not appealed within such time are deemed final.
- The appointed member of the Administrative Council will issue a decision on the Appeal to all parties involved within thirty (30) calendar days after receipt of the written Appeal.

 Filing with External Agencies

In addition to, or in lieu of, the procedures outlined above, a complainant may file complaints with external agencies as follows:

- Students (undergraduate or graduate) may file a complaint with the United States Department of Education, Office for Civil Rights. Complaints must be filed within 180 calendar days of the date of the most recent alleged discrimination.

- Employees may file complaints with one of two external agencies: the South Carolina Human Affairs Commission (must file within 180 calendar days of the date of the most recent discrimination), or the U. S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (must file within 300 calendar days of the most recent alleged discrimination.)
Temporarily Measures

At any point in the informal or formal complaint process, the investigator may recommend interim actions to protect parties or witnesses to the investigation including but not limited to separating the parties, reassignment, alternative work or student housing arrangements or other types of temporary measures. The University also reserves the right to issue no contact provisions to any or all parties involved in the procedures.

Retaliation Prohibited

Retaliation is conduct causing any interference, coercion, restraint or reprisal against a person filing a complaint of discrimination/harassment or assisting in any way in the investigation and resolution of a complaint. Retaliation is a violation of the University’s Harassment Policy and appropriate sanctions will be taken against anyone found to have participated in any acts of retaliation.

- Persons who feel they have been subjected to retaliation for filing a complaint of discrimination/harassment or for assisting with the resolution of a complaint should contact the Office of Access and Equity.
V. GRIEVANCE PROCEDURES

A. Overview

A formal grievance procedure is available to faculty members to facilitate the redress of alleged injustices. Any person holding a faculty appointment (see Part III, Sections D and E) at Clemson University, including academic administrators, may file a grievance under the procedure described in this section.

Category I grievances address matters such as dismissal or termination or unlawful discrimination. Category II grievances address unfair or improper application of administrative authority or allegations of lack of civility and/or lack of professional responsibility. Complaints based on discrimination or harassment will be addressed by the Office of Access and Equity in accordance with procedures described in Section X.B. of the Faculty Manual. In all cases the burden of proof rests on the faculty member who has filed the petition.

D. Grievance Procedure

1. Bases for Grievances: Category I. Category I grievances may be based on any of the following grounds:

- Discrimination in compensation, promotion, and/or work assignments. A Category I grievance may be filed alleging discrimination based on age, gender, disability, race, religion, national origin or sexual orientation, or status as a disabled veteran or a veteran of the Vietnam era, or discrimination prohibited by federal or state law or regulation.

The newly approved policy for dealing with discrimination or harassment complaints should be inserted in Section X.B. in its entirety with only changes in formatting to make it compatible with the rest of the Faculty Manual.

Rationale: These changes are necessary to comply with state law.

1 This single procedure replaces the two different procedures formerly in effect.
Proposed Changes in Grievance Procedures V. A. and D.
Holley Ulbrich, Faculty Manual Editorial Consultant

V. GRIEVANCE PROCEDURES

A. Overview

A formal grievance procedure is available to faculty members to facilitate the redress of alleged injustices. Any person holding a faculty appointment (see Part III, Sections D and E) at Clemson University, including academic administrators, may file a grievance under the procedure described in this section.

Category I grievances address such matters as dismissal or termination or unlawful discrimination. Category II grievances address unfair or improper application of administrative authority or allegations of lack of civility and/or lack of professional responsibility. Complaints based on discrimination or harassment will be addressed by the Office of Access and Equity in accordance with procedures described in Section X.B. of the Faculty Manual. In all cases the burden of proof rests on the faculty member who has filed the petition.

D. Grievance Procedure

1. Bases for Grievances: Category I. Category I grievances may be based on any of the following grounds: ...

   e. Discrimination in compensation, promotion, and/or work assignments. A Category I grievance may be filed alleging discrimination based on age, gender, disability, race, religion, national origin or sexual orientation, or status as a disabled veteran or a veteran of the Vietnam era, or discrimination prohibited by federal or state law or regulation.

The newly approved policy for dealing with discrimination or harassment complaints should be inserted in Section X.B. in its entirety with only changes in formatting to make it compatible with the rest of the Faculty Manual.

Rationale: These changes are necessary to comply with state law.

1 This single procedure replaces the two different procedures formerly in effect.
MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
JUNE 12, 2007

1. Call to Order: The Faculty Senate Meeting was called to order at 2:35 p.m. by President Charles Gooding.

2. Approval of Minutes: The Faculty Senate Minutes dated May 8, 2007 were approved as distributed. The General Faculty and Staff Minutes dated May 10, 2007 were also approved as distributed.

3. "Free Speech": None

4. Committee Reports:
   a. Senate Committees:
      
      3) Scholastic Policies - Chair Antonis Katsiyannis noted that this Committee will next week. Issues the Committee plans to address are: the academic calendar, final exam schedule, attendance policy, faculty excellence awards from students and responses from Faculty Senate regarding the admission policy for student athletes.

      4) Research Committee – For Chair Christina Wells, Senator John Meriwether submitted and explained the Research Committee Report dated June 8, 2007 (Attachment B).

      5) Policy Committee – Chair Bill Surver submitted and explained the Policy Committee Report dated June 12, 2007 (Attachment C). He informed the Senate that the issue of faculty discrimination allegations being addressed through the faculty grievance process rather than the Access & Equity Office had been approved by the Office of Civil Rights (Attachment D). He further noted that the new Grievance procedures had been already approved at the first of three state levels and notice should be received by the end of June.

      6) Finance Committee – Chair Mark Smotherman submitted and briefly explained the Committee Report dated May 23, 2007 (Attachment E).

   b. University Committees/Commissions: None

   c. Faculty Senate Select Committees: None
5. **President’s Report:** President Gooding submitted the report that he will present to the Board of Trustees in July (Attachment F).

6. **Old Business:** None

7. **New Business:**
   a. Holley Ulbrich, the Faculty Manual Editorial Consultant, informed the Senate that the 2007 *Faculty Manual* has been edited and transmitted to the Senate’s Web Manager for placement on our website on July 1, 2007. Faculty will be notified of its existence on the site.

8. **Announcements:**
   a. The Faculty Senate will not meet in July.

   b. The next Faculty Senate meeting will be on **August 21st** at 2:30 p.m. in the **Student Senate Chambers**.

9. **Adjournment:** President Gooding adjourned the meeting at 3:07 p.m.

---

**Deborah Thomason**
Deborah J. Thomason, Secretary

**Cathy Toth Sturkie**
Cathy Toth Sturkie, Program Assistant

Absent: V. Shelburne, C. Wells, B. Bauerle, C. White, Y. An, S. Clarke, L. Li-Bleuel, G. Tissera, B. Simmons (E. Muth for), E. Weisenmiller, F. Edwards, W. Sarasua, T. Boland, R. Figliola
Monthly Report

The Faculty Senate Welfare Committee held its organizational meeting on both May 3rd and May 10th. Senators Li-Bleuel, Futral, White, and Bowerman attended and Senators Edwards and An were excused due to prior engagements. We accomplished the following activities at our meetings:

- Selected Curtis White as Committee Vice-Chair to represent the committee if the chair is unable to attend.
- Established the following meeting dates for the year: August 14; September 18; October 16; November 20; December 18; January 15; February 19; and, March 18. All meetings are on a Tuesday and will be held at 2 pm in Room 113 Lehotsky Hall. The Faculty Senate Policy Committee will meet at 3 pm on the same days and place each month.
- We discussed areas that are priorities for the coming year and developed a work plan and assigned Senators who will serve as Leads for each issue, and represent our committee at appropriate meetings dealing with those topics this year.
- The Chair gave his expectations and sought input on monthly reporting to the committee and the Senate. Each Lead Senator will be responsible for reporting on activities for their issues each month and these reports will be included within the committee report to the Senate.
- The Chair also discussed a request he has made to President Gooding for appointment of a liaison between the Welfare Committee and the Classified Staff Policy and Welfare Committee. He is also seeking liaisons from other University Committees, Task Forces, and Faculty Groups that have issues that are under duties of the Welfare Committee.

Priorities for the Year

Our committee identified the following priorities for this year and these will comprise our work plan, which we will review and report on each month.

1. Issues Related to Child Care    Lead: Linda Li-Bleuel

All issues related to provision of child care benefits and the proposed child care center will be headed up by Senator Li-Bleuel. She will represent the committee on any university committee needing a representative from our committee.
2. **Issues Related to Campus Parking**  Lead: Meredith Futral

Senator Futral has agreed to head up all issues related to campus parking issues. She will represent the committee on any university committee needing a representative from our committee.

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

Senator White has agreed to head up all issues related to Spousal Hires. He will represent the committee on any university committee needing a representative from our committee.

4. **Top 20 Goal-Top 20 Compensation**  Lead: William Bowerman

Senator Bowerman will lead this initiative. All members of the committee will be assigned an area to work report on. We envision, with the concurrence of the Executive/Advisory Committee, a survey of the top-30 US News and World Report State Supported Universities, based on the 2007 List (32 total universities). The survey will be directed at identifying and quantifying, the total benefits package provided to faculty at these universities. We will not focus on salaries or cost of living indices for these universities. We will focus on a list of all benefits which will include at least the following: medical insurance; dental insurance; long-term disability insurance; reduced or free tuition for spouses or family members; parking fees; retirement contributions; use of university health care facilities; use of university exercise facilities; professional development funds; incentives to compensate for salary compression; and, any other benefits that Senators can identify.

5. **State Universities Welfare Summit**  Lead: Francie Edwards or Yanming An

Either Senator Edwards or An will lead this initiative. We envision, with the concurrence of the Executive/Advisory Committee, a Summit on Faculty and Staff benefits to be held in the spring. We suggest that all state-supported universities in South Carolina be represented and that the summit be held at the Sand Hills REC near Columbia. We seek ideas and input from Senators on this summit.

6. **General Welfare Issues**  Lead: Francie Edwards or Yanming An

Either Senator Edwards or An will lead this initiative. The nature of the issues that the Welfare Committee deals with will ultimately lead to new work on a number of issues will arise during the year that we did not identify. We will report on these issues each month under the General Welfare Issues section of our report.
The Faculty Senate Research Committee held its first meeting on June 7th from 2-3 PM in D-136 Poole Ag. Center. Senators Bauerle, Clarke, Liu, Meriwether, Stuart and Wells were in attendance. The committee accomplished the following:

- John Meriwether agreed to serve as Vice-Chair to represent the committee at meetings when the Chair cannot attend.

- We established the following meeting dates for the coming year: July 30, August 27, September 24, October 29, and Nov. 26. All meetings will be held at 4 PM in D-136 Poole Ag. Center.

- We received proposed faculty manual changes from Dr. Tracy Arwood, Director of the Office for Research Compliance. These changes reflect the correct names and functions of the committees that oversee animal subjects, human subjects, recombinant DNA, biohazards and hazardous chemicals. Following review by the Research Committee, the proposed changes were forwarded to the Policy Committee. Dr. Arwood has expressed her willingness to speak to the policy committee/full senate about the changes.

- Following up on last year’s discussion of communication between faculty and EHS/Compliance, Senator Stuart agreed to take the lead on developing a manual for new faculty that covers common questions and procedures related to the activities of these offices.

- Senator Meriwether continued to lead the effort to clarify department chairs’ authority over expenditure of research contract funds. Relevant federal policies include OMB circulars A-110 and A-21. Senator Meriwether will be meeting with Dr. Esin Gulari, Dean of the College of Engineering and Science, to discuss this issue.

- The committee brought forward several new focus areas for 2006-07:
  - Larger internal seed grants for Clemson faculty research projects: Peer institutions provide such grants in the $30-$50,000 range, whereas Clemson’s seed grants are capped at $3000. Bill Bauerle has taken the lead on researching research seed grants at peer institutions.
  - Can federal lobbying efforts for Clemson research be strengthened? Many peer institutions maintain stronger ties to federal funding agencies and important congressional committees through offices of federal relations. Senator Wells is investigating federal relations strategies at peer institutions, specifically from the standpoint of increasing competitiveness for research funding.

- The committee will solicit additional 2006-07 focus areas through emails to Senators’ home Colleges and discussions with relevant university administrators.
Policy Committee of the Faculty Senate
12 June Faculty Senate Report
Submitted by: Bill Surver (surverw@clemson.edu)

The Policy Committee met on May 15 to discuss the proposed changes in the OAE policy for Discrimination/Harassment Complaints. Several options were discussed with a final resolution requesting Renee Roux to contact OCR and request that faculty Grievance 1 cases involving discrimination and/or harassment be resolved according to the most recent Grievance Procedures approved by the Faculty Senate and which are waiting approval from State Officials. The OCR recommended wording changes to the OAE policy that would permit this. The Policy Committee and the Faculty Senate Executive/Advisory Committee approved these. We are now awaiting final approval from the OCR.

Our next meeting will be August 14 unless immediate attention is needed for policy issues.

My report submitted at the May Faculty Senate meeting listed items on our agenda for the coming year.

New Action Item

Revision of Part IX, F (10) - Policy on Sales and Other Course Materials to Students.
Procedures for Resolution of Discrimination / Harassment Complaints

Office of Access and Equity

These procedures will be applied in conjunction with the following Clemson University Policies for Equitable Treatment: Affirmative Action / Equal Employment Opportunity Policy, Policy on HIV Disease and Aids, Policy for Individuals with Disabilities, Policy for Disabled and Vietnam-Era Veterans, and Harassment Policy. (These policies can be found at http://www.clemson.edu/access/ under “Policies”.)

These procedures apply to complaints of discrimination based on age, color, disability, gender, national origin, race, religion, sexual orientation, or veteran’s status. The Office of Access and Equity is responsible for investigating and processing all such complaints of discrimination / harassment made against any member of the Clemson University community, including faculty, staff, or students, or any vendor or contractor conducting business within the university with one exception. Any grievance submitted as a Category I Faculty Grievance under the Faculty Manual will be handled in accordance with the procedures outlined in the Faculty Manual (insert web address here) even if the grievance includes allegations of discrimination. These procedures apply to complaints of discrimination based on age, color, disability, gender, national origin, race, religion, sexual orientation, or veteran’s status. Information essential to an investigation must be provided to the Office of Access and Equity upon request.

All members of the Clemson community should contact the Office of Access & Equity if they observe or encounter conduct that may violate any of the University’s Policies for Equitable Treatment. Reports of alleged violations may also be made to an immediate supervisor. Alternatively, if the immediate supervisor is the alleged harasser, complaints may be made to the next level supervisor. Students can report alleged violations to the Office of the Dean of Students (undergraduate students), the Dean of the Graduate School (graduate students), Academic Deans, Department Chairs, or directly to the Office of Access and Equity. University officials, managers, Deans, Department Chairs, and supervisors that receive a complaint of discrimination / harassment are required to notify the Office of Access and Equity in order to have complaints promptly processed under the Informal and/or the Formal Complaint process described below. Information essential to an investigation must be provided to the Office of Access and Equity upon request.

Reports of discrimination/harassment should be brought as soon as possible after the alleged conduct occurs. Prompt reporting enables the University to more effectively investigate the facts, determine if a violation of any policy has occurred, and provide an appropriate remedy or disciplinary action. Therefore, complaints investigated under this procedure must be reported as described in the previous paragraph no more than 120 days after the complaining party becomes aware of the allegedly discriminatory or harassing conduct.

Informal Complaint Process
The goal of the Informal Complaint Process is to resolve concerns at the earliest stage possible with the cooperation of the parties involved. This process includes but is not limited to discussions with the parties, mediating an agreement between the parties, referring the parties to counseling programs, conducting targeted educational and training programs, and making other recommendations for resolution. Upon notification of an informal complaint, an investigator in the Office of Access and Equity will conduct an investigation into the allegations using the following process:

- Discussions will be conducted separately with the complainant and the accused to review the allegation(s) and develop a mutually satisfactory resolution. If deemed appropriate, the investigator may bring the parties together for a joint discussion.
- The resolution process will be confidential to the extent permitted by law. The Office of Access and Equity shall advise all parties of the confidentiality of the investigation and the strict prohibition against retaliation.
- A written record of the allegation(s) and the resolution will be provided to the parties and retained in the Office of Access and Equity.
- If the investigator, after hearing the complainant’s statement, determines that a formal investigation is necessary, the complaint will be handled under the Formal Investigation Process below.
- Resolution of complaints handled under the Informal Complaint Process shall either be completed within 30 days of receipt of the complaint by the Office of Access & Equity or referred to the Formal Complaint process within that time period. The Office of Access & Equity shall notify all parties in writing if a matter originally submitted under the Informal Complaint process is going to be handled under the Formal Complaint process.
- The Informal Complaint Process is an optional step. The complaining party or the Office of Access and Equity may decide to skip the Informal Complaint Process and proceed under the Formal Complaint Process.

Formal Complaint Process

The formal complaint process will be followed by the Office of Access and Equity if the informal complaint process is not successful or appropriate for addressing the allegations of the complaining party (such as when the facts are in dispute in reports of serious misconduct). The wishes of the individual making the report shall be considered but are not determinative in the decision to initiate the Formal Complaint Process. For example, the University may determine that it is obligated to proceed under the Formal Complaint Process due to the seriousness or nature of the allegations even if the complaining party would prefer to proceed under the Informal Complaint Process. Upon notification of a formal complaint, an investigator in the Office of Access and Equity will conduct an investigation into the allegations using the following process:

- The process will be confidential to the extent permitted by law. The Office of Access and Equity shall advise all parties of the confidentiality of the investigation and the strict prohibition against retaliation.
- The investigation shall include interviews with the parties, interviews with other witnesses as needed, and a review of relevant documents if appropriate. If all witnesses identified by the parties are not interviewed, the investigator will document the reason the interviews were not conducted.
The individual(s) accused of violating any Clemson Policy for Equitable Treatment shall be given a written statement of the allegations made by the complainant.

The investigation shall be completed as promptly as possible and in most cases within 45 days of the date the Formal Investigation Process was initiated. If the investigation cannot be completed within 45 calendar days because of valid extenuating circumstances, the complainant will be notified and given a projected time of completion. In cases where the complaint is submitted to Access & Equity near the end of the semester, the 45-day limit can be suspended until the start of the following semester if necessary to conduct interviews of witnesses or primary parties who were unavailable during academic breaks.

The investigation should result in a written report that includes a statement of the allegations, the positions of the parties, a summary of the findings of fact, and a determination by the Investigator as to whether University policy has been violated, and recommendations for actions to resolve the complaint if appropriate. If all witnesses identified by the parties were not interviewed, the report shall include a statement explaining why. The report shall be submitted to the University official(s) with authority to implement the actions necessary to resolve the complaint.

The complainant and the accused shall be informed within 30 days of the conclusion of the investigation that the investigation is complete and whether any violations of policy were found. The complainant shall be informed of actions taken to resolve the complaint only if they are directly related to the complainant, such as a directive that the accused not contact the complainant. The complainant may generally be notified that the matter has been referred for disciplinary action, but shall not be informed of the details. Both parties will be notified if all witnesses they identified were not interviewed and the reason they were not interviewed.

Appeals of the Formal Complaint Process

- The complainant or accused has a right to appeal the decision of the formal complaint process. Appeals must be submitted in writing to the Office of the President of the University within 7 working days (excluding weekends and University holidays) after receipt of the final report of the formal complaint process. The President will appoint a member of his Administrative Council to review and decide the appeal.
- Decisions not appealed within such time are deemed final.
- The appointed member of the Administrative Council will issue a decision on the Appeal to all parties involved within thirty (30) calendar days after receipt of the written Appeal.

Filing with External Agencies

In addition to, or in lieu of, the procedures outlined above, a complainant may file complaints with external agencies as follows:

- Students (undergraduate or graduate) may file a complaint with the United States Department of Education, Office for Civil Rights. Complaints must be filed within 180 calendar days of the date of the most recent alleged discrimination.

- Employees may file complaints with one of two external agencies: the South Carolina Human Affairs Commission (must file within 180 calendar days of the date of the most recent
Temporary Measures

At any point in the informal or formal complaint process, the investigator may recommend interim actions to protect parties or witnesses to the investigation including but not limited to separating the parties, reassignment, alternative work or student housing arrangements or other types of temporary measures. The University also reserves the right to issue no contact provisions to any or all parties involved in the procedures.

Retaliation Prohibited

Retaliation is conduct causing any interference, coercion, restraint or reprisal against a person filing a complaint of discrimination/harassment or assisting in any way in the investigation and resolution of a complaint. Retaliation is a violation of the University’s Harassment Policy and appropriate sanctions will be taken against anyone found to have participated in any acts of retaliation.

- Persons who feel they have been subjected to retaliation for filing a complaint of discrimination/harassment or for assisting with the resolution of a complaint should contact the Office of Access and Equity.
Minutes of the May 23, 2007, Finance Committee meeting

Members present: R. Campbell, H. Liu, W. Sarasua, and M. Smotherman
Guests present: C. Gooding

1. We discussed the changes in the format of the annual employee salary report. Action items:
   a) Mark Smotherman will ask Wickes Westcott for a version of the 2006 report formatted exactly like the 2005 version and whether the reported salaries include supplements from the Foundation.
   b) Charlie Gooding will ask Provost Helms her opinion on including or not including the missing fields (dept. code, cooperative salary study category, % change).
   c) Charlie Gooding will ask the Foundation about the FOIA status of any supplements.
   d) Charlie Gooding will investigate the status of the Budget Accountability Committee and determine if it needs to be reconstituted.

2. We discussed the per diem meal allowances. Action items:
   a) Charlie Gooding will determine if there are opportunities to discuss the issue with the faculty senate presidents at other schools in South Carolina.
   b) Mark Smotherman will follow up on the offer by Lawrence Nichols to discuss the issue and will try and determine the range of possible exceptions allowed by the state and by Clemson.

3. We discussed the summer school budgeting process. Robert Campbell volunteered to look into this. Provost Helms has suggested that we contact Brett Dalton and Alan Godfrey for more information.

4. We discussed the perception that the requirement for including GAD support in grant proposals has led to a reduced number of graduate students supported by research assistantships at Clemson. Robert Campbell said he would ask Eric Muth if Eric would volunteer to look into the actual numbers.

5. We briefly discussed the list of building projects proposed by President Barker.

Next meeting: TBA
The new Senate year began April 10. Senators have been assigned to each of the five Faculty Senate standing committees and to various university committees and commissions for the 2007-2008 year. Late spring and summer Senate activities are traditionally devoted to organization and planning of work for the next academic year. Listed below are some of the issues that will be addressed in the coming months.

**Policy Committee**
- Clarify definitions of and delineations between various faculty and staff positions.
- Clarify the rights, roles, and privileges of emeritus faculty who choose to remain active in university life.
- Improve university policies and procedures to ensure that faculty performance evaluations are based on clear, equitable criteria and that faculty have appropriate opportunities for professional development.

(Note that much of the work of the Policy Committee begins elsewhere and is referred to the Policy Committee with recommendations for revisions to the Faculty Manual.)

**Welfare Committee**
- Monitor and contribute to the development of university initiatives on spousal hires, child care, and parking.
- Collect and assimilate information on total faculty compensation and benefits at current top 20 universities for correlation with Clemson’s Top 20 Goal.
- Promote coordination with other state assisted universities in South Carolina on faculty welfare issues connected to state policies.

**Scholastic Policy Committee**
- Continue work with the Student Senate and Provost on exam schedule revision.
- Work with the Provost to insure that adequate Faculty input is obtained on decisions to modify the academic calendar.
- Consider revision of criteria for faculty scholastic awards to top graduates.

**Research Committee**
- Update Faculty Manual sections and training materials on research compliance.
- Clarify the issue of authority over expenditure of research contract funds.
- Investigate strategies to strengthen Clemson’s ties with federal funding agencies and with congressional committees that have research oversight.
- Consider methods of increasing the level and impact of internal seed grants.

**Finance Committee**
- Work to upgrade per diem and travel reimbursement rates to reflect real costs.
- Examine changes in the format of annual employee salary reports.
- Investigate the status and intended role of the Budget Accountability Committee.

The Faculty Senate agenda will undoubtedly include other issues that arise during the year. We look forward to working with the university administration and the Board of Trustees for the betterment of Clemson University.

**Charles H. Gooding**
Faculty Senate President
Accident Review Board
Shima Clarke

Athletic Council
Charlie Gooding

Computer Advisory
Steve Stuart

Libraries Advisory Committee
Deborah Willoughby

Open Forum
Curtis White
Donna Winchell

Parking Advisory Committee
Wayne Sarasua

University Assessment
Adly Girgis

Administrative Disciplinary Hearing
Des Layne (3 years)
Prasad Rangaraju-Alternate (1 year)

Alcohol and Other Drug Task Force
Bill Surver
Graciela Tissera

Bookstore Advisory Committee
Dan Warner

Honors College Advisory Committee
Kelly Smith

Media Advisory Board
Graciela Tissera

Parking Review Board
Derek Wilmott

Recreation Advisory
Linda Li-Bluel

Student Health
Linda Howe

University Union Board
Robert Campbell
June 2. 2007

TO: President Jim Barker

FROM: Sydney A. Cross, Chair,
        President’s Commission on the Status of Women

RE: Year End Report

This year’s work has been very diverse. We have concerned ourselves with a number of issues from staff’s representation in the Clemson Roadmap and salary compression to providing educational experiences that advocate leadership and service.

I have listed these activities below. Please also find attached a report from Wendy Howard that summarizes the Adhoc Committee’s work on Staff advancement.

Civil Engagement: Leadership and Service Forum
Strom Thurmond Institute, February 13, 2007
Second Annual WC Forum. Lee D’Andrea, Pickens School Superintendent, Gracie Floyd, Anderson County Council, Deb Sofield, Greenville County Council, and Carol Burdette, Mayor of Pendleton made up a panel which was moderated by Kathy Woodward where productive discussions regarding how individuals get involved and contribute to local and/or regional agencies and organizations to affect a difference.

WC Survey
After collecting samples and finally constructing our own survey, Dr. Catherine Mobley, found that Institutional Research was doing a survey that was addressing a number of constituencies and issues and that it would be cost effective as well as have a better return success if we added our survey questions onto this project. We anticipate the results sometime at the end of the summer and an analysis in the Fall of the collected data.

Out Standing Women's Awards
Strom Thurmond Institute, March 13
Faculty: Dr. Patricai Layton
Staff: Martha Bridges
Graduate Student: Rupal Shah
Undergraduate Student: Cindy Burke
Distinguished Contributor: Dr. R. C. Edwards

South Carolina Women in Higher Education Conference
We have formed a subcommittee headed by Susan Pope to organize and facilitate this State wide conference to be held here at Clemson on February 29-March 1, 2008.

IN ADDITION:
We as a group grappled with many issues at our monthly meetings including, but not limited to:
- Child Care (when, where, and how will it be implemented?)
- The Alma Mater wording (Gail DiSabatino addressed this and it is still on her radar)
- The Alumni Master Teacher Award (which we are still attending to since the current recipient follows what we fear to be a Clemson ‘tradition’)
- Numerous discussions on the Staff’s place in the Clemson Family and the Roadmap (including, but not limited to, the disparities between salaries, job titles vs job descriptions, bands, and how to improve the system and what it takes to insure equity, staff compressions studies, etc)
- The members of the Women’s commission also made changes to their bylaws which are more consistent with practice and which eliminated discrepancies in procedures.

**Guests:**
- Tom Ward, staff ombudsman, gave a presentation of the duties of his new office and how it will function on campus.
- Michelle Chin, shared her experience from Douglass College, Rutgers University
- Debra Jackson, who gave a presentation on the Coach Survey
- Debra Jackson and Wickes Westcott compiled statistics to answer questions the WC had concerning gender in performance pay, staff pay, research moneys, tenure and promotion, etc.

**Members Attended:**
- Professional Development for Women conference in Ashville December 4
- SCHWE Conference in Columbia, SC, February
- Columbia College Alliance for Women, The South Carolina Commission on Women & Midlands Women in Philanthropy A Seat at the Table, Columbia, May 9

Cc: Faculty Senate, Staff Senate
Adhoc Committee on Staff Advancement Update
Given by Wendy Howard on 5/15/07

In the Fall of 2006, we in the President’s Commission on the Status of Women began inquiring as to the inclusion of staff in the University Roadmap and investigating the adverse effect the lack of advancement opportunities and performance raises for University staff (indeed, the lack of any mechanism for either) was having on Clemson University. The Women’s Commission believed a University-wide effort, including all major stakeholders, should be initiated, but felt such an effort would be most appropriately initiated through the Staff Senate. I contacted the Staff Senate President and asked about getting such an initiative underway. Other representatives from major stakeholders at the University were contacted (President’s Commission on the Status of Black Faculty and Staff and Faculty Senate) and all were in agreement some action needed to be taken and wanted to participate in the Committee. Staff Senate created an Adhoc Committee on Staff Advancement which had their first meeting on Monday, March 26, 2007. Our charge is to develop a plan that will encourage staff development and reward education, training, certifications, service, and performance. Committee members include:

- Bill Hughes, Chair, Staff Senate
- Lynn Boiter, Past President of Staff Senate
- Dan Schmeidt, President of Staff Senate
- Beth Kunkel, Past President Faculty Senate
- Wendy Howard, President’s Commission on the Status of Women
- Isaac Wallace, Chair of President’s Commission on the Status of Black Faculty and Staff
- Joyce Peebles, Library HR,
- Melissa Marcus, CU HR
- Karon Donald, Staff Senate

Others who attend the meetings (as possible) include:

- Tom Ward, Staff Ombudsman
- Robbie Nicholson, President’s Commission on the Status of Women

Fortunately, there is a comprehensive plan currently in place -- CU Library’s Career Success Program (which they worked on for several years to get approved through CU HR and the State HR). Since we don’t want to “reinvent the wheel” if we’ve got one that is working, we’re taking the Library’s plan and modifying it for the University (which we are currently calling the Staff Development Program or SDP). However, there are many more considerations for a plan to encompass the thousands of CU Staff vrs. the Library’s staff. We are meeting about every two weeks. Following is a summary of the Ad Hoc Committee’s goals, benefits, history and guiding principles for the SDP. There is currently no timeline; however, I am lobbying for us to at least set a time guideline.
Goal:
- The goal of the Clemson University SDP is to provide a framework to encourage and reward performance and professional development, and strengthen the bonds between staff, University, and community

Benefits:
- Support Clemson’s commitment to recruit and retain an outstanding workforce
- Create a positive and motivated staff with enhanced skills and knowledge
- Promote volunteerism and increased relevant community service
- Allow staff the potential to participate while being directly responsible for their success in the program

History:
Prior to the formulation of the CU Staff Senate Adhoc Committee for Staff Development in the spring of 2007, there was not a University-wide program to address key strategies to achieve the University President’s goals. These key strategies include establishing a staffing and compensation philosophy, evaluating and rewarding performance, providing relevant community service and outreach, increased volunteerism, improved customer service, and others.

Research of other top public universities for similar staff development programs revealed a number of good ideas, but found that no other university currently uses a campus-wide program meeting the goals stated above. The most common finding was the benefit of advanced education opportunities. However, none provided rewards for increased job-related skills or service to the university or community.

It must be noted that several organizations at Clemson have various plans, policies, or programs dealing with elements of the stated SDP goals. Aligned closest to the SDP goals is the CU Libraries Career Success Program. The Libraries program had been approved by Human Resources at the University and State level, and was first used beginning with the 2007 EPMS cycle. The Libraries program became the starting point for the SDP.

Guiding Principles:
- Directly supports Clemson’s stated goals and strategies
- Provides tangible benefits to the work unit, University, and community
- Rewards performance and enhancement of job-related skills and knowledge as well as relevant community service and volunteerism
- Participation is optional to all qualified staff and can be applied to all work areas
- Has well defined success criteria, evaluation, and rewards
- Success criteria are challenging, yet obtainable.
The AAUP, 92 and Ailing

Mismanagement, declining membership, and a schizophrenic mission threaten the premier faculty association

BY ROBIN WILSON

Ernst Benjamin has already retired once from the American Association of University Professors. He has a white beard and receding white hair. He just turned 70.

But these days, he is back in the general secretary's corner office, in a job he gave up more than a decade ago. He was called in late last year to help steer the association through management and financial crises that threaten its very existence.

"I didn't have anyone else to go to," says Cary Nelson, president of the AAUP.

The decision to appoint Mr. Benjamin exemplifies one of the AAUP's key problems: Its image as a stodgy faculty club—with an aging membership—that is no longer relevant to young professors, many of whom have never even heard of it.

As the chief higher-education organization representing professors nationwide, the AAUP is best known for its widely cited statements on academic freedom and tenure. But in the last generation, even as the number of professors in the country has doubled, the association's membership has taken a nosedive, from 90,000 in 1971 to 43,600 today.

On the eve of its annual meeting here this month, the AAUP faces other problems, as well:

- A $250,000 budget deficit.
- The chief financial officer was forced out last year after he failed to produce a credible audit report.
- A membership office that was without a director for two years and failed to keep track of membership renewals, including $100,000 worth that were temporarily lost by the post office last year.
- A flood of departures among its top staff members, including five who have left in the past 16 months.
- Accusations by members of the Executive Committee that Roger W. Bowen, who was hired as general secretary in 2004, failed to adequately manage the Washington office. Mr. Bowen, who is leaving at the end of this month, says the job of general secretary may be too big for one person—and several association leaders agree.

Mr. Nelson, a professor of English at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, has declared the worst of the AAUP's problems behind it. "We are moving out of our period of difficulty," he says. The association hired an outside accountant who has reconstructed financial transactions, line by line, and will present last year's missing au-
The AAUP opened its doors in 1915 to defend professors' rights to express unpopular views. It produced such documents as the 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure and a 1958 statement setting out detailed procedures that colleges should follow to dismiss a tenured professor. The statements have become ubiquitous in higher education. Portions of them can still be found in most faculty handbooks.

The AAUP's membership swelled during the 1950s and 1960s. Some say it reached 100,000 professors, although historical records have been packed up and sent to a storage unit, so Mr. Benjamin says there is no quick way to verify that. The surge in membership began during the McCarthy era, when professors' loyalty to the United States was being questioned, and the increase continued as higher education expanded in the 1960s.

But starting in 1972, when the organization entered collective bargaining on behalf of professors, membership began to decline—from 90,000 in 1971 to 75,000 in 1973. The decline didn't stop until 1989, when the rolls reached a low of 40,395. Since then the number of members has risen slightly, hovering at around 44,000. But 5,000 of those are "fee payers," who don't necessarily want to be members but are required to pay annual dues because they work on one of the AAUP's 70 collective-bargaining campuses. In a sense, they are anti-members. That puts the number of voting members in the organization at fewer than 40,000.

Most of the AAUP's chapters are at regional public universities and second-tier private liberal-arts colleges. Although the organization was founded by professors at Columbia University and the Johns Hopkins University, neither campus has an AAUP chapter today. Only a handful of major research universities do, including the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign and Indiana University at Bloomington.

Some blame the organization's recent problems on Mr. Bowen and the association's 37-member National Council, which often functions like an overgrown faculty department, with personality clashes, finger-pointing, and petty feuds. It is no secret that Mr. Bowen did not get along with Mr. Nelson, whom Mr. Bowen has accused of trying to micromanage the Washington office and of undermining him and other leaders. But the departing general secretary also became frustrated with the monumental task of righting the struggling organization.

Some council members accuse Mr. Nelson and a small group of his colleagues of keeping others out of power and, in the process, running the association into the ground. But the AAUP's problems were brewing long before either Mr. Bowen and the association's 37-member National Council, which often functions like an overgrown faculty department, with personality clashes, finger-pointing, and petty feuds. It is no secret that Mr. Bowen did not get along with Mr. Nelson, whom Mr. Bowen has accused of trying to micromanage the Washington office and of undermining him and other leaders. But the departing general secretary also became frustrated with the monumental task of righting the struggling organization. Some council members accuse Mr. Nelson and a small group of his colleagues of keeping others out of power and, in the process, running the association into the ground. But the AAUP's problems were brewing long before either Mr. Bowen and the association's 37-member National Council, which often functions like an overgrown faculty department, with personality clashes, finger-pointing, and petty feuds. It is no secret that Mr. Bowen did not get along with Mr. Nelson, whom Mr. Bowen has accused of trying to micromanage the Washington office and of undermining him and other leaders. But the departing general secretary also became frustrated with the monumental task of righting the struggling organization. Some council members accuse Mr. Nelson and a small group of his colleagues of keeping others out of power and, in the process, running the association into the ground. But the AAUP's problems were brewing long before either Mr. Bowen and the association's 37-member National Council, which often functions like an overgrown faculty department, with personality clashes, finger-pointing, and petty feuds. It is no secret that Mr. Bowen did not get along with Mr. Nelson, whom Mr. Bowen has accused of trying to micromanage the Washington office and of undermining him and other leaders. But the departing general secretary also became frustrated with the monumental task of righting the struggling organization. 

The Untapped

A surprising number of young professors are asking not what the AAUP can do for them. They're asking, What's the AAUP?

The Chronicle recently contacted about 100 professors who have received their Ph.D.'s since the late 1990s and asked them about their relationship with the association. By far the most common response from those rising academics was that they knew little or nothing about it. A typical response: "I simply have not heard of the AAUP," wrote an assistant professor of philosophy from Saint Joseph's College, in Maine. "I had to Google the acronym to verify what it stood for," wrote a young botanist at the University of Hawaii-Manoa. "The reason why I am not a member of the AAUP is simple—I never heard of it," writes a young anthropologist at the University of California at Los Angeles. "Could that be one of the reasons why the numbers are down?"

Others said they were vaguely aware of the AAUP, which, by many accounts, wrote the book on academic freedom. "I only know about the group because my grandmother talked about it," said an economist at Georgia State University, "and my mother mentions it every once in a while."
The Evangelist

For some young professors, the AAUP inspires everything it has set out to inspire.

James I. McNellis III joined the association in 1991, five years before he finished his Ph.D. He started a chapter at Wilmington College, in Ohio, when he was hired there as an assistant professor. After receiving tenure, in 2004, he started becoming more involved with the association on the state level. This fall he will become president of the Ohio conference.

Lately Mr. McNellis has started promoting the AAUP to groups of graduate students in the state. He tells them that joining the association, unlike joining the obligatory disciplinary organizations, is a good way to signal that they have begun thinking like professors.

And what does that mean? "When you become a professor, you are responsible for learning the rules," he says—meaning the rules, laws, and procedures relevant to academic freedom. "And you have to use them to protect your colleagues."

As much as he believes in the AAUP, Mr. McNellis is clear-eyed about its problems. With little hand-wringing, he touches on several disorganization in the national office, conflict between pro-union and antiunion members, slim finances, clumsy use of the Internet. Mr. McNellis seems unfazed.

"The association just has "to get a little less sleepy," he says. "It's kind of new or never." —John Gravois

Continued From Preceding Page

Bowen or Mr. Nelson took over. They have more to do with questions about the organization's mission than with who is running the show.

WHAT'S MY LINE?

Despite its many problems, the AAUP continues to do some things well. Since 2003 it has issued statements on several hot issues in academe, including preserving academic freedom in the wake of September 11; affording due process to part-time faculty members; and colleges' handling of controversial speakers. The group submitted a brief that influenced a 2006 U.S. Supreme Court case, in which the justices exempted professors from a ruling that limits the free-speech rights of public employees. "We become involved in the crucial issues of the times dealing with professors," says David M. Rabban, a professor at the University of Texas School of Law who until recently served as the AAUP's national counsel. "We make a real difference."

The association has also just released a report criticising five New Orleans universities that laid off faculty members and cut programs following Hurricane Katrina. "We're the only game in town producing these principled statements," says Mr. Nelson.

At this month's meeting, the association will consider censuring those five New Orleans institutions plus two others.

The Star

Michael Berube is an academic force of nature—an endowed professor of literature at Pennsylvania State University's main campus, an A-list academic blogger, a prominent public foe to the conservative activist David Horowitz, and a member of the AAUP's National Council. But even he has had a hard time inspiring interest in the association on his campus.

"I tried to drum up support for a local chapter," he says. "People didn't think the AAUP was terribly effective. They thought they'd get more work done through their disciplinary organizations."

Mr. Berube did manage to get a chapter going at Penn State in 2005, but it died out after about a year, he says. He has been surprised at some of the reasons people have given for avoiding the association. "I've had people—a colleague in another department—get back to me and say, 'I can't be seen talking with you. My senior colleagues have advised me to have nothing to do with the AAUP. It could jeopardize my tenure.'"

That's stunning, he says, given the AAUP's sometime reputation as a faculty organization of the old school.

"Ten to 12 years ago, when I first joined, my dominant impression was that the AAUP was a faculty club, that you might sign up and get a tweed jacket in the mail," says Mr. Berube. But in his years at Penn State, he has found, "people have the opposite impression of the AAUP—that it's the left of the Wobblies, that people were living out Norma Rae."

Both of those perceptions hurt the AAUP, says Mr. Berube, who still thinks the organization is the best academic freedom fighter around.

Censuring colleges is something the AAUP alone has done since 1930. It typically receives more than 1,000 inquiries each year from faculty members who accuse administrators of threatening their academic freedom. The association takes up only 10 percent of the cases, and an even smaller fraction result in a formal investigation that can lead to censure. Forty-three institutions are now on the censure list. Colleges can work their way off by revising their policies.

But even on a task it had cornered—actually, that it created—the AAUP is now often getting beat. It can take the AAUP more than a year to complete an investigation and issue a report. By then, faculty members who originally complained are often long gone from an institution and have little hope of winning their jobs back, regardless of what the AAUP finds. "Our fundamental focus is on the principle of academic due process," says Jonathan Knight, "even if the person is no longer there." Mr. Knight directs the AAUP's department of academic freedom, tenure, and governance.

Increasingly, professors with academic-freedom complaints have been turning to younger groups, like the Foundation for Individual Rights in Education, which has a track record of moving quickly. It does not perform lengthy investigations. It simply sends an e-mail message to reporters, publicizing a professor's problem with administrators. It uses news-media exposure to persuade colleges to change their policies. Some accuses FIRE of taking a task it had cornered—actually, that it created. "We become involved in the crucial issues of the times dealing with professors," says David M. Rabban, a professor at the University of Texas School of Law who served as the AAUP's national counsel. "We make a real difference."

The AAUP's stand on academic freedom has also taken a hit, some say, in the battle over the "academic bill of rights," a set of principles purportedly geared to making colleges more intellectually diverse. The document was written by David Horowitz, a conservative activist, who has accused liberal professors of espousing their political views in the classroom and of penalizing students who disagree. The AAUP's leaders have spent countless hours rebutting his claims. "It is pretty clear there is a problem, but the AAUP tends to stick to a specific line," says William Pannapacker, an associate profes-
professor of English at Hope College. He is not an AAUP member, primarily, he says, because he cannot afford the annual dues, which range from $155 to $185 for full-time professors. "They have been slow to assume a more moderate position," he says. "I think they might be too orthodox and absolutist."

Donald Downs, a professor of political science at the University of Wisconsin at Madison, started his own Committee for Academic Freedom and Rights 10 years ago, bypassing the AAUP. He says the association has ignored contemporary threats to academic freedom, which, he argues, come from the campus itself. "The vast majority of censorship within universities has come from the left in the era of political correctness," he says. "In my view, the AAUP has not been nearly as good on that as it was during the McCarthy era, when the threat came from outside the university and left-wing professors were being persecuted."

**LAW FAINS**

What appears to have hurt the AAUP’s image the most, however, is its role in collective bargaining. "The more that AAUP membership is dominated by trade unionists, the less likely it is that the AAUP can perform the role that made it a household name in academia," says David A. Hollinger, chairman of the history department at the University of California at Berkeley. He was not a member of the association until he was asked to be part of its Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure, in 2003.

Professors at elite research universities, he says, aren’t interested in being linked to a union. They don’t need one. Faculty members at high-profile institutions typically have powerful academic reputations and can call their own shots when it comes to job duties and salary. In their minds, says Mr. Hollinger, the AAUP’s union aspect tarnishes the organization.

Acting as union representatives has also depleted its resources, other academics argue. "When they went into collective bargaining, there was always a question of what value-added they were really bringing," says Clara M. Lovett, who was president of the American Association of Higher Education when it closed in 2003. "What does the AAUP do that the NEA or the AFT are not able to do? I’m not sure that’s ever been resolved. It may have drained the AAUP’s energy from other things they could have been doing."

Professors who are members of the collective-bargaining units says the AAUP brings its venerable reputation to the table, making it unique among the unions representing higher education. At the same time, these professors worry about whether the group has the power, expertise, and resources to bargain effectively. Some collective-bargaining chapters, including Wayne State University—one of the AAUP’s oldest—and Rutgers University—its largest—have also recently joined up with the American Federation of Teachers, while maintaining their ties to the AAUP. Charles J. Parish, a professor who leads Wayne State’s collective-bargaining chapter, says that in Detroit, in the midst of the auto industry, it only makes sense for the university to sign up with a larger, more powerful union.

Worried that such a trend might cut into its finances and reduce its influence, the AAUP has prohibited chapters from reducing their dues to the association if they add affiliations to other collective-bargaining representatives. Continued on Following Page

**The Activist**

If you want to learn the ins and outs of the AAUP, you could ask Joseph Bernt. He has joined the association three times and quit twice. All along, he says, he has looked for a more rambunctious group.

Mr. Bernt, now an associate professor of journalism at Ohio University, first joined the AAUP after receiving his Ph.D. in English in 1980. But he was quickly disillusioned when he realized two things. First: There was only one tenure-track job available in the country that year for a scholar of Renaissance poetry and Shakespeare, like himself. Second: The AAUP seemed most concerned with protecting those who already had tenure.

"It wasn’t activist enough," he says. "It wasn’t dealing with the central problems of the university—the ways that universities and the faculties of universities eat their young." So Mr. Bernt quit the AAUP. And he quit the profession to boot.

After several years working as a public-affairs officer and as a journalist, Mr. Bernt rejoined academia—and the AAUP—as a journalism professor. But while he had changed, he says, the AAUP hadn’t. "It was the same thing," he says. There were always the same four or five senior professors at every meeting, "sitting around talking about issues of tenure and due process and so forth." Eventually, he says, the Ohio chapter simply died out.

Then, about four years ago, the university moved to raise health-care costs for its employees, and Mr. Bernt and a handful of other professors picketed against the move on parents’ weekend. They got Ohio to back down.

So Mr. Bernt and his colleagues jump-started the defunct campus AAUP chapter—this time with the activist bent he had always been looking for. In the years since, the group has become a prominent voice for faculty protest against the administration.

But the AAUP may not always be the outlet for would-be faculty activists at Ohio. This year the National Education Association—one of the two largest higher-education unions in the U.S.—sent a team to the campus, drawn there by word of faculty discontent. The union convened focus groups of professors, asking for their feelings about working at the university. As a token of the union’s deep pockets, everyone who took part was paid $125.

---

**The Low Fliers**

First I fend for my career, then maybe I‘ll fend for my profession: That’s the message from many young professors when it comes to the AAUP.

Several young academics who responded to a query from The Chronicle about the association and joining the AAUP was something they might consider—once they get tenure.

"A major issue here is simply that as a pre-tenure professor (I received my Ph.D.in 2004) with a family, I have a large number of pressing concerns," writes a young historian in Iowa. "I expect I will take a more active role in the wider profession once my own career stabilizes."

Defenders of the AAUP lovingly describe it as an organization that ties professors across disciplines to an academic tradition that goes back to John Dewey and the old universities of Europe. But competition within fields has driven academics who are shooting for tenure to narrow their focus. Alongside such pressures within their disciplines, notions of academic citizenship—especially a concern for the armies of adjuncts who have lost any hope of tenure—are an afterthought. Moreover, such notions are not passed down to younger professors.

"I have only looked within my own department and discipline in terms of academic joining," writes a budding geography professor at Georgia State University. "I have heard little if anything about the activities of the AAUP in my subdisciplinary circles or at professional meetings I attend."

---

**Continued on Following Page**

---

---

---
The platform to create, buy, sell and control digital content on demand.

Lulu.com is your one-stop source for professional production and distribution of custom textbooks, supplemental learning materials, administrative manuals, course catalogs and more. As the leading self-publishing resource, Lulu.com is currently publishing over 150 colleges and universities with their publication needs.

For this educator, Lulu.com rates an A+.

When Matt Basham began teaching Cisco certification classes for St. Petersburg College in Florida, he found that the assigned textbooks left much to be desired.

So he wrote a new one—a 600-page supplemental workbook—and published and distributed it through Lulu.com, giving students the choice of an economical download or a printed book.

The results have been nothing short of remarkable:
- Over 50,000 orders
- A dramatic increase in student success rates
- No printing costs for the college

Is it any wonder Matt gives Lulu.com such high marks?

MLA Report Calls for Transformation of Foreign-Language Education

BY BURTON BOLLAG

FOREIGN-LANGUAGE teaching at American colleges and universities—typically characterized by two or three years of grammar and vocabulary taught pretty much in a vacuum, followed by more advanced courses in literature—has outlived its usefulness and needs to change, according to a new report by the Modern Language Association.

That well-established model, it says, should be replaced by interdisciplinary language programs that contain from the beginning more cultural content to make graduates better able to function in an increasingly global environment. What is needed, the report says, is a "broader and more coherent curriculum in which language, culture, and literature are taught as a continuous whole."

The 15-page report, "Foreign Languages and Higher Education: New Structures for a Changed World," was produced by a committee of seven senior language educators who spent two years studying the state of language teaching and came up with recommendations.

The approach put forward by the group has been discussed in general terms at various meetings of language educators in recent months, to widespread approval. Still, supporters expect the paper to spark controversy in language departments.

"The departments are big and large still dominated by literature specialists," said Michael H. Long, professor of the School of Languages, Literatures, and Cultures at the University of Maryland at College Park. "The recommendations of the report are going to run up against a lot of vested interests."

Nelleke Van Deuren-Scholl, director of the University of Colorado's Lusitana, Pima Language Center, said, "Those of us in foreign languages and applied linguistics are very excited" about the report's recommendations. Still, she added, for many senior foreign-language faculty members, "there is going to be a lot of discomfort. This is not going to be a welcome report."

continued from preceding page

THE FACULTY

continued from preceding page

some professors believe the association should sell off its collective-bargaining operation to a bigger union, and the AFT has been pushing to forge a formal relationship so the two groups can organize on campuses together. Mr. Nelson says that while he is not opposed to that idea, it is important that the AAUP stay in the game. The AFT, he says, "doesn't quite have the credibility on academic-freedom issues and shared-governance issues."

Maybe the solution, some AAUP members say, is to split the group into two. The association is considering a restructuring that would separate its academic freedom work from collective bargaining, creating two units under one umbrella. The change is intended to give each of the two entities more freedom to pursue its own goals. Details of how it would work are still sketchy, but members will begin talking about the separation at this month's meeting.

The AAUP is also considering hiring two people to replace Mr. Bowen: one to mind the office and one to be a traveling spokesperson for academic freedom. And it is expanding its membership into the ranks of part-time professors and graduate students, although their dues are low—most pay only about $40 a year—that the organization must sign up four of them for every full-paying professor it loses.

To bulk up its finances, the AAUP has announced its first capital campaign, with a goal of $10 million. It has raised about $1 million so far. More money certainly couldn't hurt. The AAUP's headquarters here, a spare collection of offices with dark-green indoor-outdoor carpeting and light-blue-green walls marred by black scuff marks, is outmoded.

A reminder of its once august heyday is tucked into a small room off a main corridor. Embedded in a wall are 157 wooden file-card holders filled with tens of thousands of 3-by-5 cards, each containing the name and address of a member, the date he or she joined, and a history of dues payments. Changes are marked in pencil.

One card traces Albert Einstein's membership, starting in 1925. The card was marked "deceased" in 1955, three days after his death.

All of the association's membership records are now computerized, part of the new software that the office has been struggling to work the kinks out of for six months. If a member died today, it could take months for the AAUP to notice.

U. of Colorado President Recommends Dismissal of Ward Churchill

BY RICHARD MONASTERSKY

HANK BROWN, president of the University of Colorado system, has recommended in a confidential letter that the Board of Regents fire Ward Churchill, the ethnic-studies professor at the Boulder campus who made controversial remarks equating some victims of the September 11, 2001, terrorist attack to "little Eichmanns."

"Professor Churchill is not qualified to hold a tenured faculty position at the University of Colorado and should be dismissed for repeated failures to meet minimum standards of professional integrity," according to a copy of the letter that was obtained by The Chronicle.

Mr. Churchill's lawyer, David Lane, said that "any discipline at all is simply retaliation for Mr. Churchill's case has outlived its usefulness and needs to be looked into." Mr. Lane, who in May of 2006 that Mr. Churchill had committed research misconduct, turned to dismiss Mr. Churchill, setting in motion a lengthy process of reviews and hearings.

DIVIDED ON DISMISSAL

Earlier that May, a report by the Privilege and Tenure Committee of the University's Faculty Senate "found, by clear and convincing evidence, three instances of evidentiary fabrication by ghost writing and self citation, two instances of fabrication of material, one instance of falsification, two instances of plagiarism, and one instance of failure to comply with established standards on the use of author names on publications, according to the report.

The report calls for replacing the two-tier system with more cooperative and integrated departments, and for hiring more linguists and second-language-acquisition specialists who would design higher-quality courses.

According to Bowen, the report "will have to be a welcome report."
During a time like this we realize how much our friends really mean to us...

Your expression of sympathy will always be remembered by the family of
1. **Call to Order:** The Faculty Senate Meeting was called to order at 2:33 p.m. by President Charles Gooding.

2. **Approval of Minutes:** The Faculty Senate Minutes dated June 12, 2007 were approved as distributed.

3. **"Free Speech":** None

4. **Committee Reports:**
   a. **Senate Committees:**
      1) **Welfare Committee** - Chair Bill Bowerman that this Committee had not yet met.

      2) **Scholastic Policies Committee** - Chair Antonis Katsiyannis stated that this Committee met on June 12 and August 14, 2007. Senator Katsiyannis submitted the Committee Report dated August 14, 2007 (Attachment A). The next meeting will be on September 18th. Senator Katsiyannis asked senators to forward any issues they would like addressed to him.

      3) **Research Committee** - Chair Christina Wells, noted that this Committee last met on June 7, 2007 and will meet again on August 27th at 4:00 p.m. to consider proposed changes to the *Faculty Manual* regarding changes to research compliance issues. Committee Report dated August 21, 2007 is attached (Attachment B).

      4) **Policy Committee** - Chair Bill Surver submitted and explained the Policy Committee Report dated August 21, 2007 (Attachment C).

      5) **Finance Committee** - For Chair Mark Smotherman, Senator Robert Campbell stated that the Committee has not met but that the first meeting will be held during the first week of the fall semester.

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

   c. **Faculty Senate Select Committees:** None

5. **President's Report:** President Gooding submitted and explained his Report dated August, 2007 (Attachment D).
6. **Old Business:** None

7. **New Business:** None

8. **Announcements:**
   a. The next Faculty Senate meeting will be on September 11, 2007 at 2:30 p.m. at the Madren Center (regular schedule and location).

9. **Adjournment:** President Gooding adjourned the meeting at 3:16 p.m.

   Deborah Thomason, Secretary

   Cathy Toth Sturkie, Program Assistant

Absent: H. Liu (C. Rice for), G. Tissera (J. Field for), K. Smith, F. Edwards (E. Muth for), R. Figliola, A. Girgis (P. Rangaraju for), L. Howe
FACULTY SENATE SCHOLASTIC POLICIES COMMITTEE
MONTHLY MEETING MINUTES
ANTONIS KATSIIYANNIS, CHAIR
AUGUST 14, 2007 (420 Tillman Hall)

Present: Senators Girgis, Willoughby, and Katsiyannis were in attendance.
Guests: Stan Smith, Registrar

Reevaluation of the Academic Calendar: Registrar Smith provided background information regarding the Academic Calendar. He also outlined 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... This calendar has been in place since 1965.

Issue was tabled until Academic Council (by the end of August) decides on the 5 day exam week (unanimously endorsed by the faculty senate-also allows for the weekend to serve as “reading days” and provides guidelines for exam conflicts and multiple exams.)

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

Next Meeting: September 18 at 2:30 in 420 Tillman Hall
The Faculty Senate Research Committee held its first meeting on June 7th from 2-3 PM in D-136 Poole Ag. Center. Senators Bauerle, Clarke, Liu, Meriwether, Stuart and Wells were in attendance.

The next meeting will be held on August 27 at 4 PM in D-136 Poole Ag. Center. Agenda items will include:

- Faculty manual changes suggested by Tracey Arwood, director of the Office of Research Compliance (we are tackling this issue jointly with the Policy Cmte).
- Development of a researchers’ guide to EHS and Compliance procedures at Clemson (Senator Stuart).
- Clarification of department chairs’ authority over expenditure of research contract funds (Senator Meriwether).
- Larger internal seed grants for Clemson faculty research projects (Senator Bauerle).
- Strengthening federal lobbying efforts for Clemson research (Senator Wells).
Policy Committee of the Faculty Senate
21 August Faculty Senate Report
Submitted by: Bill Surver (surverw@clemson.edu)

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Bill Surver - Biological Sciences, Chair, Tom Boland - Bioengineering,
Alan Grubb - History, Des Layne - Horticulture, Catalina Marinescu Physics/Astronomy
Brad Meyer - Physics, Lydia Schleifer - Accountancy

The First meeting of the Policy Committee was held on Tuesday, August 14.

Action Items

Emeriti Faculty - We are waiting on a report from the Emeritus College Committee. Lydia Schleifer will represent the Policy Committee.

Faculty Ranks - We are awaiting for recommendations from the Committee Ranks and Titles. Alan Grubb will represent the Policy Committee.

Policy on Adjunct Faculty - There appears to be no uniform guidelines on appointment and reappointment of Adjunct Faculty. The Faulty Manual guidelines are not being followed.

TPR Guidelines - Lead Senators have been asked to collect departmental guidelines from their College. Senate will then review for inconsistencies and report those to Pat Smart. Guidelines will then be placed on either the Provost's Web site or College Web site or both.

Research Council - Request from VP for Research and Economic Development the status of The Research Council and reasons for the inactivity of this Council.

Non-secular Prayer Policy

University Compliance Issues - We will jointly with the Research Committee to investigate faculty and department chairs concerns related to compliance.

Other Items

Ethics Policy - Teaching policy

Non-secular prayer

Faculty Manual Items

Final acceptance of Faculty Grievance Procedures - in Faculty Manual - Section X

Honorary Degrees/Campus Names Committee - Deletion from Section IVc
Faculty Senate President’s Report
August 2007
Subtitle: What I Did This Summer

1. Met with someone about each of the current Faculty Senate Select Committees.

Hap Wheeler, Chair, FSSC on Faculty Ranks and Titles (aka Pandora’s Box).
Continuing members are Bob Green (Teacher Education), Rachel Mayo (Public Health),
and Charlie Gooding. Bryan Simmons (Graphic Communications) has agreed to join the
committee and co-chair. Donna Winchell (English), Alan Grubb (History Dept. and
member of the Policy Committee), Mickey Hall from PSA, and representatives from
Math and Human Resources will round out the membership. The current status and plans
for this committee are outlined in a separate, attached summary. The goal is to address
these issues individually and send recommendations to the Policy Committee as they are
developed.

Mary Anne Taylor, Chair, Professional Development and Performance Appraisal
This committee has just completed a 38-page draft report that is being reviewed
internally. When the committee’s work is done or is at an appropriate juncture, Mary
Anne will be asked to present a synopsis at a Senate meeting.

Diane Smathers, Director, Emeritus College
I met with Diane and we discussed the need to clarify the rights, privileges, and roles of
emeritus faculty with respect to Faculty Manual provisions and status among Clemson
faculty. I asked the Emeritus Advisory Board to nominate two members to be on this
FSSC, and they chose Lucy Rollins and Dave Senn. Lydia Schleifer will chair the
committee, and Pat Smart and Deborah Thomason will also serve. The Emeritus Board is
ultimately responsible for developing their policies and agenda. The role of the FSSC
will be to consider matters that affect the Faculty Senate or Faculty Manual and, in
general, to provide input and ideas relative to informing faculty who are not retired about
the Emeritus College.

2. Attended the Board of Trustees’ summer meeting and retreat.
Faculty Rep to the BOT, John Ballato, and I enjoyed what I think was unprecedented
access and input to the Board. Karen Burg made a presentation on her experiences as an
ACE Fellow and also attended meeting and retreat sessions. The theme of the retreat was
“30 to 20,” planning Clemson’s future for the next several years. Much of what was
presented and discussed was speculative and must remain confidential for the time being.
(With privilege comes responsibility.)

Subsequent to the BOT retreat I asked John and Karen to co-chair a new FSSC on
Enhancing Clemson’s National Academic Reputation. Lamont Flowers (HEHD), Eric
Muth (BBS), Peg Tyler (Library), Christina Wells (AFLS), and Sean Williams (AAH)
have agreed to work with John and Karen. Time is of the essence; see the attached
explanation. The Ex/Ad Committee has approved the formation of this FSSC on behalf of
the Senate, and their work has begun.
3. Investigated the Coalition of Intercollegiate Athletics.
This organization, made up of faculty senates, was brought to my attention by the Senate President at South Carolina. Roughly half the Division I universities are affiliated with the COIA now. Larry Laforge, Clemson’s Faculty Athletic Representative to the NCAA, is familiar with the organization and will attend the Aug 28 Ex/Ad meeting to discuss it further. It appears to provide a framework for the Faculty Senate to complement the work of the Athletic Council and FAR in providing oversight of Clemson’s athletic programs. I expect to recommend in September that our Faculty Senate join. For more information on COIA see http://www.neuro.uoregon.edu/~tublitz/COIA

4. Discovered a possible hole in our ethics policy.
Clemson has a Policy on Research Ethics that addresses due process for faculty and others accused of misconduct in research activities. There is no such policy or procedure other than the administrative chain of command to handle allegations of faculty misconduct in other areas. A situation arose during the summer, and we handled it using the Research Ethics Policy with a broad interpretation of the word “research.” Do we need a separate policy and procedure for non-research matters? I discussed this with Holley Ulbrich, and subsequently with the Policy Committee. The Policy committee decided that the current answer is “no,” given the relative rarity of issues not handled well with existing procedures.

5. Met with the Ombudsman Subcommittee in May, June, and July.
For obvious reasons, details of what this committee discusses must remain confidential. But broad themes emerge that are ripe for Faculty Senate action. Two such matters are:

TPR Guidelines. We need to insure that all faculty, especially untenured faculty, are fully informed on and have access to current TPR guidelines that apply to them. To the extent possible, we also need to insure that all TPR guidelines are consistent with the Faculty Manual and that they strike a reasonable balance between being overly prescriptive and being vague. The latter is obviously a judgment call to be determined by each departmental faculty. To accomplish this I am going to ask the Senate delegation from each College, led by the Lead Senator, to collect the TPR guidelines and faculty bylaws from each department within its unit and conduct a review by October 31. Further details of this request will be communicated in a memo to be issued soon.

Communication on common sense.
Would you believe that Clemson people sometimes
- promise things in interviews that you can’t deliver,
- assume they will get something promised in an interview even though it was not in their offer letter,
- enter another faculty member’s office and go through things without permission,
- ask students what religion they are,
- lead sectarian prayers in public meetings,
- etc.

We can’t legislate common sense and good manners, but is there a way to better educate Clemson on things like this?
Faculty Senate Select Committee on Faculty Ranks and Titles

There are three general issues of concern. There has been much discussion about these over the past two years. This year we need to bring each of them to some kind of acceptable conclusion.

1. Categorization of staff members as lecturers.
The state recognizes the title of lecturer as a faculty position. Within Clemson there are three classifications that are distinguished by internal sub-categories: lecturers and senior lectures, who actually teach, and non-instructional lecturers, who hold administrative positions but are categorized as lecturers to allow more flexibility in their salaries. There are at least three potential problems with this arrangement.

   a. All lecturers fall under faculty ombuds and grievance procedures. The faculty ombudsman would prefer to limit his services to true faculty issues, and the faculty would prefer not to be involved with administrative grievance issues. (For example, if the Chief Human Resource Officer, who holds lecturer rank, filed a grievance against the President of the University, it would be heard under the faculty grievance procedures.)

   b. There is potential for university employees to be counted inappropriately when numbers are reported for internal purposes or reported to an external agency. (For example, non-instructional lecturers might be included in the denominator of statistical calculations that are reported on a per-faculty basis.)

   c. Non-instructional lecturers are included in the faculty salary pool. If they are granted higher than average annual raises, this is harmful to the welfare of the faculty.

2. Support of research faculty from E&G monies.
The Faculty Manual (part III, paragraph E.4.) stipulates that research faculty “are supported exclusively (including fringe benefits) from external funds or foundation accounts.” This stipulation of the source of financial support for research faculty was revised deliberately a few years ago by the Faculty Senate to correct what was deemed to be inappropriate use of E&G funds in some cases. In the minds of some, it has proven to be unnecessarily restrictive on parts of the campus. Violations are not unusual. Lapses in external support occur and E&G funds are used to fill the gap. If the policy is not working and/or is not going to be enforced strictly, it should be changed to something that will be followed.

3. Equitable and consistent treatment of non-tenure track faculty.
Numerous problems exist. For some faculty, the title of lecturer is not descriptive of the duties assigned to the individual. Some individuals are categorized as visiting faculty for several years. Some lecturers and senior lecturers get little if any consideration for annual salary increments even though their performance is exemplary. Inconsistent methods are used to determine which lecturers are retained and which are released if the total number must be reduced.
Suggested Guiding Principles to be Used in Solving Issues Pertaining to Faculty Ranks and Titles

1. Truth, accuracy, and transparency should prevail.

2. Policies and procedures should be followed or changed.

3. Administrators should be afforded flexibility with checks and balances to guard against abuse and irresponsible behavior.

4. All individuals should be treated with respect.

5. Faculty should be given opportunity for professional development and advancement whenever possible.

6. Exemplary performance should be rewarded more highly than longevity, but loyal service has merit.

7. All faculty positions should be approved by departmental faculty. (exception - non-instructional lecturers?)

And one for discussion:

8a. Tenure should be granted only to those who meet stated performance criteria with respect to research AND teaching.

or 8b. Tenure should be granted to those who meet stated performance criteria with respect to research OR teaching.
Faculty Senate Select Committee on Enhancing Clemson’s National Academic Reputation

Background
The Clemson University Board of Trustees’ 2007 Summer Retreat focused on developing plans for the future. Clemson has made remarkable progress toward its goal of being recognized as one of the nation’s top public universities. The most recent USN&WR ranking lists Clemson as 30th, based on 15 quantitative factors that account for 75% of each university’s score and one qualitative judgment that accounts for the remaining 25%. Clemson does reasonably well in the quantitative categories (e.g., SAT scores, class size, faculty compensation), and we continue to make slow, steady progress in these areas. But in the qualitative factor, academic reputation, which is based on a national survey of university presidents and provosts, Clemson currently ranks 48th among the top 50 public universities. In ten years Clemson’s score has risen only from 3.0 to 3.1 on a five-point scale despite diligent efforts by the university administration to call attention to achievements by Clemson faculty and students.

Charge to the Committee
The Faculty Senate Select Committee on Enhancing Clemson’s National Academic Reputation will develop a strategic plan to improve Clemson's academic reputation nationally. The Committee will be co-chaired by Dr. John Ballato, Faculty Representative to the Board of Trustees, and Dr. Karen Burg, Hunter Endowed Chair and Professor of Bioengineering. The Committee is encouraged to be innovative and faculty focused, to consider specific faculty actions as well as broad university initiatives, and to include as much detail as the requested schedule will permit. The Committee is asked to submit its report to the President of the Faculty Senate by October 1, 2007. The report will be presented to the Provost and President of the University and the Board of Trustees at the fall meeting of the Board.
MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE
SEPTEMBER 11, 2007

1. Call to Order: President Charles H. Gooding recognized guests and called the meeting to order at 2:34 p.m.

2. Approval of Minutes: The Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting dated August 21, 2007 were approved as written.

3. "Free Speech": None

4. a. Senate Committees:


   2) Scholastic Policies Committee - Chair Antonis Katsiyannis noted that Committee has not met since the last Faculty Senate meeting. Two issues that the Committee will address are student evaluations of faculty teaching and what kind of data is accessible and the issue of student athlete admission process. The August 14, 2007 meeting Minutes are attached (Attachment B).

   3) Research Committee - Chair Christina Wells stated that this Committee met on September 5 to begin efforts to update the Faculty Manual (in particular, the research compliance section) and submitted and explained the Committee Report dated August 29, 2007 (Attachment C). This Committee will next meet on September 24, 2007 at 4:00 p.m. in F142 P&A Building

   4) Policy Committee - Chair Bill Surver stated that the Policy Committee has not met since the last Faculty Senate meeting and submitted the Committee Report dated August 21, 2007 (Attachment D). He referred to a memorandum from President Gooding and him to Chris Przirembel, Vice President for Research and Economic Development (Attachment E). Much discussion was held regarding the administration not adhering to the Faculty Manual. Senator Surver then reminded lead senators to obtain a copy of each department's promotion, tenure and reappointment guidelines and to forward to Pat Smart.
5) **Finance Committee** - Chair Mark Smotherman submitted Report dated September 4, 2007 (Attachment F). Committee will meet on September 18 with Bruce Rafert to discuss GADs.

b. **Faculty Senate Select Committees:** None

c. **Other University Committee/Commissions:**

1) **Staff Development and Advancement** - Dan Schiemdt, President of the Staff Senate, informed the Senate of a proposed opportunity for staff to enhance their jobs and professional development with a salary performance increase when completed.

5. **President's Report:** President Gooding submitted and explained his President's Report dated September 11, 2007 (Attachment G) and a talk that he gave to the Rotary Club on the Clemson Faculty Senate dated September 7, 2007 (Attachment H).

6. **Old Business:** None

7. **New Business:** None

8. **Announcements:**

a. Cooper Library Book Sale will be held on Friday, September 28, 2007.

b. The Board of Trustees Dinner hosted by the Faculty Senate will be held on October 4, 2007 (invitations forthcoming).

c. Next Faculty Senate meeting will be on October 9, 2007.

d. Senate Alternate Michelle Martin announced that the annual Banned Book Reading will be held on October 3, 2007 from 11:00 a.m. until 1:00 p.m.

e. Class of '39 Award nominations are due to the Faculty Senate Office on October 19, 2007.

9. **Adjournment:** 3:19 p.m.

Monthly Report

The Faculty Senate Welfare Committee held its first meeting for the Fall Semester on August 29th. Senators An, Li-Bleuel, Futral, White, and Bowerman attended. Dr. Patricia Smart, Faculty Liaison to the President and Provost also attended. We report here on the activities of our committee. Each report is authored by the Lead Senator for that issue.

Progress on Priorities for the Year

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

   There was a huge response to a child care survey conducted by Pat Smart which demonstrated a definite need for a campus day care center. This survey indicated that 250 children of Clemson University faculty and staff currently require child care. The greatest demand for child care appears to be for children between the ages of 6 weeks to 2 years old and the center will focus on this need. Pat Smart, who is spearheading this project, has been communicating with builders and New Horizon, an organization that assists universities in establishing child care. According to Pat Smart, Provost Dori Helms is committed to having a campus child care center by Fall 2008.

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

   I am planning to attend a presentation of the Final Report of the Parking Transportation Master Plan in September or October. I will make sure that the Welfare Committee and Faculty Senate receive a copy of the final report. I will invite one of the Parking Transportation Master Plan Committee members to present the Final Report to the Faculty Senate.

   A task force is currently being formed among the Faculty, Staff, and Extension Senates to address parking issues. I will attend the meetings of this task force. The first meeting may take place in October.

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

   Dr. Smart outlined some of the issues related to spousal hires that are being handled in her office. I will be representing the committee on any university committee needing a representative from our committee.

4. **Top 20 Goal-Top 20 Compensation**  
   **Lead:** William Bowerman

   Cathy Sturkie has used my list of benefits office websites for the top-30 public universities (32 universities including Clemson University) and with the assistance of 2 student workers, will
provide this information to each of the committee members and the board of trustees, by 11 September. After review of these data, the committee will discuss a way forward at its next committee meeting.


This item will be discussed on September 11th in a meeting with Faculty and Staff Senators.


The following issues were assigned at the meeting:

- Collect our committee’s comments on whether our Faculty Senate should join the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics, and provide them to the Scholastic Policies Committee at the September Senate meeting.
- Our Committee needs to provide comments on the Exit Interview draft document by the September Senate meeting.

A meeting between Faculty and Staff Senators will occur on September 11th to discuss joint issues of interest including parking issues, a possible welfare summit, and any other issue that arises.
Reevaluation of the Academic Calendar: Registrar Smith provided background information regarding the Academic Calendar. He also outlined 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. This calendar has been in place since 1965.

Issue was tabled until Academic Council (by the end of August) decides on the 5 day exam week (unanimously endorsed by the faculty senate—also allows for the weekend to serve as "reading days" and provides guidelines for exam conflicts and multiple exams.)

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

Next Meeting: September 18 at 2:30 in 420 Tillman Hall
The Faculty Senate Research Committee held its first meeting on June 7th from 2-3 PM in D-136 Poole Ag. Center. Senators Bauerle, Clarke, Liu, Meriwether, Stuart and Wells were in attendance.

The next meeting will be held on August 27 at 4 PM in D-136 Poole Ag. Center. Agenda items will include:

- Faculty manual changes suggested by Tracey Arwood, director of the Office of Research Compliance (we are tackling this issue jointly with the Policy Cmte).
- Development of a researchers' guide to EHS and Compliance procedures at Clemson (Senator Stuart).
- Clarification of department chairs' authority over expenditure of research contract funds (Senator Meriwether).
- Larger internal seed grants for Clemson faculty research projects (Senator Bauerle).
- Strengthening federal lobbying efforts for Clemson research (Senator Wells).
Policy Committee of the Faculty Senate  
21 August Faculty Senate Report  
Submitted by: Bill Surver (surverw@clemson.edu)

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Bill Surver - Biological Sciences, Chair, Tom Boland - Bioengineering,  
Alan Grubb - History, Des Layne - Horticulture, Catalina Marinescu Physics/Astronomy  
Brad Meyer - Physics, Lydia Schleifer - Accountancy

The First meeting of the Policy Committee was held on Tuesday, August 14.

Action Items

Emeriti Faculty - We are waiting on a report from the Emeritus College Committee. Lydia Schleifer will represent the Policy Committee.

Faculty Ranks - We are awaiting for recommendations from the Committee Ranks and Titles. Alan Grubb will represent the Policy Committee.

Policy on Adjunct Faculty - There appears to be no uniform guidelines on appointment and reappointment of Adjunct Faculty. The Faculty Manual guidelines are not being followed.

TPR Guidelines - Lead Senators have been asked to collect departmental guidelines from their College. Senate will then review for inconsistencies and report those to Pat Smart. Guidelines will then be placed on either the Provost's Web site or College Web site or both.

Research Council - Request from VP for Research and Economic Development the status of The Research Council and reasons for the inactivity of this Council.

Non-secular Prayer Policy

University Compliance Issues - We will jointly with the Research Committee to investigate faculty and department chairs concerns related to compliance.

Other Items

Ethics Policy - Teaching policy

Non-secular prayer

Faculty Manual Items

Final acceptance of Faculty Grievance Procedures - In Faculty Manual - Section X

Honorary Degrees/Campus Names Committee - Deletion from Section IVc
MEMORANDUM

TO: CHRISTIAN E. G. PRZIREMBEL, VICE PRESIDENT FOR RESEARCH AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

FROM: CHARLES H. GOODING, FACULTY SENATE PRESIDENT

BILLY S. OOUNER, CHAIR, FACULTY SENATE POLICY COMMITTEE

SUBJECT: RESEARCH COUNCIL

The Faculty Manual in Section VII, Part E, page VII-11 identifies a Research Council that is to provide advice and representation on issues affecting Clemson's research efforts. It is to provide the Vice President for Research and Economic Development direct faculty input on future policy and procedural matters to enhance the quality of scholarly endeavors and the growth of research programs under the Vice President's direction. Membership to the Council is clearly identified in this section.

In addition, several committees are to report to the Research Council including the Animal Research Committee, the Institutional Biosafety Committee, the Human Subjects Committee, the Intellectual Property Committee and the Research Grants Committee.

It is apparent to us that this is an important Council. Several faculty and department chairs have contacted the Senate expressing concern that this Council has not recently (or perhaps ever) met and therefore, raising further concerns as to how the responsibilities of this Council are being addressed.

It is also the concern of the Senate regarding the status of this Council. The members of the Policy Committee and Research Committee have requested an explanation as to when this Council will meet and why it has not previously done so. There is no support in the Senate or on campus to eliminate this Council; in fact, we believe it is intended to serve a vital purpose, and we are hopeful that it will meet in the near future.

We would appreciate a response indicating when you anticipate convening this Council following the procedures as outlined in the Faculty Manual.

Thank you for your quick response.

CHG/WMS/cts

cc: Vince Gallichio
Minutes of the September 4, 2007, Finance Committee meeting


1. We discussed the changes in the format of the annual employee salary report. The committee recommends that the previous format, which includes percentage raises, be restored. The previous format was the result of many years of faculty senate involvement in encouraging transparency in reporting salary information, and specifically reporting percentage raises has served as an important indicator in the past to help identify trends and agendas.

2. The committee would like President Gooding to ask the Provost about the performance raise fund that was put in place several years ago and whether it is still functioning and its priority standing relative to other priorities.

3. The committee recommends that President Gooding reestablish the Budget Accountability Committee.

4. Information about the Faculty Senate joining COIA is being sent in an email to committee members and will be discussed at the next meeting.

5. The committee discussed recent news articles about travel expenses at Clemson and USC and will continue to seek an increase in the per diem rates.

6. The committee discussed GADs and will ask Dean Rafert to attend one of our meetings.

7. The committee briefly discussed differential tuition required of BBS majors and the possibility of a similar plan for CoES. Robert Campbell will look into how the extra fees have been used in BBS.

Next meeting: September 18, 2007 at 2:30 pm
President’s Report

September 11, 2007

Since last month’s meeting I have:

Met with or corresponded with chairs of most of the Standing Committees and Faculty Senate Select Committees to clarify goals and answer questions.

Formally asked the lead senators to coordinate with other senators in their colleges and review the Tenure, Promotion, and Reappointment Guidelines and procedures now being used by each and every department. The objective here is not to meddle in the prerogative of individual departmental faculties to set appropriate standards of performance, but rather to insure that the TPR expectations are being communicated clearly to faculty members, that chairs and TPR committees are on the same page whenever possible, and that established procedures are being followed.

Introduced new questions for the EAC to consider on
(1) conducting exit interviews with faculty who leave Clemson to learn more about what we are doing right and wrong from their perspective;
(2) possible affiliation with the national Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics.
These matters may be brought to the full Senate later depending on the recommendations at the next EAC meeting.

VP Bryan Simmons and I met with the Provost for almost 2 hours last Friday to get a preview of her thoughts on a variety of issues now being considered by our various committees.

Spoke to the Calhoun-Clemson Rotary Club on the Faculty Senate at Clemson.

Gave the Emeritus College Board an overview of issues the Senate is addressing this year.
Has Clemson always had a Faculty Senate?
Clemson's Faculty Senate came into existence in September 1955... a "Constitution and By-Laws" of the Academic Faculty and the Faculty Senate of Clemson College was approved at a general meeting of the faculty on January 27, 1956 and ratified by the Board of Trustees on April 9... The Senate has become increasingly active in the governance of the University and serves as the official representative body of the faculty and link between the faculty and the administration on matters of general and specific concern. The Senate reviews and recommends academic policies and procedures, which are compiled in the Faculty Manual. It also handles grievance procedures, makes recommendations concerning the welfare of the faculty, and participates in the selection of top University administrators...The Senate President attends meetings of the Board [of Trustees'] Educational Policy Committee and addresses the Board at its regular quarterly meetings. The President reports to the faculty twice a year at the general faculty meeting. (from a history of the Faculty Senate compiled by Alan Grubb)

How is the Clemson Senate organized and how does it work?
35 voting members distributed by population among the five colleges and the library. Members and alternates [substitutes] are elected to 3-year staggered terms by peers within their college.
Senate officers include President, Vice President/President-elect, and Secretary.
Five standing committees do most of the work not done by the Senate Goddess.
  Policy – revision of university policy as it relates to faculty.
  Welfare – faculty compensation, fringe benefits, work load, etc.
  Scholastic Policies – academic matters (students, curriculum, requirements).
  Research – things related to research.
  Finance – relevant financial matters of the university.
Full Senate meets on 2nd Tuesday, August-June.
Executive and Advisory Committees (officers, committee chairs, other selected reps) meet together on last Tuesday each month to plan the agenda for full meetings.

What are some current issues?
academic calendar
admission of athletes
classroom and campus security
compliance with federal laws on research
day care
enhancing Clemson’s national reputation
day care
faculty ranks
exam schedules
hiring of spouses
guidelines for tenure and promotion
performance evaluation
parking
roles and rights of emeritus faculty
professional development
top 20 compensation
Rotary Club talk on the Clemson Faculty Senate
September 7, 2007
Charles H. Gooding, 2007-2008 Senate President

(note: italicized text below is copied from the Clemson University Faculty Manual)

What is a university?
Institutions of higher learning are communities of scholars in which faculty gather to seek, teach, and disseminate knowledge for its own sake rather than for any immediate political, social, or economic goal. Such institutions are conducted for the common good and not to further the interests of either the individual faculty member or the institution as a whole. The attainment of that common good depends upon the free search for truth and its free expression.

What is shared governance?
In accordance with the Will of Thomas Green Clemson and the Act of Acceptance by the General Assembly of South Carolina, ultimate responsibility for the governance of Clemson University is vested in the Board of Trustees. ...

In order to operate the university effectively, the Board delegates responsibility in various areas to the President of the University, to certain administrative officials, and to the faculty. ...

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

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

What is the Faculty Senate?
The Faculty Senate is the elected body that represents the faculty in its relationship with the administration, especially in regard to policy matters involving the academic prerogatives of the faculty and faculty welfare.
MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE
OCTOBER 9, 2007

1. Call to Order: President Charles H. Gooding recognized guests and called the meeting to order at 2:34 p.m.

2. Approval of Minutes: The Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting dated September 11, 2007 were approved as written, as were the Minutes of the August 21, 2007 Victor Hurst Academic Convocation.

3. "Free Speech": The following is a summary of a presentation by Dr. Mary M. Beck, Department Chair of Animal and Veterinary Science: Compliance with federal guidelines for care and use of animals in research, teaching and Extension programs is excessively stringent at Clemson, in ways that negatively impact those programs. A list of specific examples was provided to show that the negative impacts are indeed real and substantive. Recent efforts by the Senate’s Research and Policy Committees to address some of this issue were acknowledged and the Senate was asked to address three other aspects: Immediate revision of IACUC composition; review of faculty service and performance reviews of faculty by chairs and deans; and a periodic review of compliance procedures at Clemson. Questions and answers were then exchanged.

4. a. Senate Committees:


2) Scholastic Policies Committee - Chair Antonis Katsiyannis submitted and explained the Committee Report dated September 18, 2007 (Attachment B).

3) Research Committee - Chair Christina Wells submitted and explained the Committee Report dated September 24, 2007 (Attachment C). Senator Wells noted that Senator Steve Stuart has worked diligently on the creation of a research handbook to be distributed to new faculty which is a compilation of research information and directions so that faculty will have one location to go to for research information and that the Provost and the Research Grants Committee has increased the monetary cap from $3,000 to $10,000.

4) Policy Committee - Chair Bill Surver submitted and explained the Committee Report dated October 9, 2007 (Attachment D).

b. Faculty Senate Select Committees:

1) Emeritus College – Chair Lydia Schleifer reported that this Select Committee is working on bylaws and proposed changes to the Faculty Manual.

2) Faculty Ranks/Titles – The Select Committee Reported dated October 8, 2007 was submitted on behalf of Chair Hap Wheeler (Attachment F).

3) Faculty Evaluation and Professional Development – President Gooding reported that this Committee, chaired by Mary Ann Taylor (Professor of Psychology) has worked during the past year on a three-part effort and have developed in interim report that focuses on determining skills and attributes that are most important to effective teaching, research and service. (Unfortunately, Dr. Taylor has resigned as Chair of this Select Committee due to time constraints.) This report has been discussed with the Provost, who is anxious to accomplish revision of the faculty evaluation system in the current academic year, if possible. The Provost has developed a conceptual outline of a flexible but systematic approach to faculty evaluation based on FAS goals and accomplishments and will discuss the basic ideas with the chairs tomorrow at a retreat. President Gooding stated that this effort on faculty development and evaluation is separate from, but certainly related to the Faculty Senate review of departmental TPR guidelines and bylaws. The goal of this connected effort is to have all academic departments to the place where each faculty member knows clearly what his or her responsibilities are with respect to teaching, research and service; has some control over the distribution and focus of these efforts and is ensured that his or her work will be evaluated using fair, consistent processes and criteria for tenure, promotion and salary adjustments.

4) Academic Reputation – Co-Chair John Ballato stated that this Select Committee was conceived as a result of unprecedented participation by him (as Faculty Representative to the Board of Trustees) and Charlie Gooding (as Faculty Senate President) in the BOT Summer Retreat. The Committee is in the information and fact finding stage now. The question the Committee hopes to answer is “what can faculty do to create a culture where Top 20 isn’t the vision but the norm.” Discussion followed during which the Provost challenged the Faculty Senate to answer the question: “what does it mean (when we get to Top 20) we want Clemson to still be Clemson?”

c. Other University Committee/Commissions: None

5. President's Report: President Gooding spoke about the Board of Trustees (BOT) meeting held last week. He provided the Senators with an admission update and reports made by him, the presidents of the Staff Senate, the undergraduate Student Body and the Graduate Student Body. He stated that the Faculty Senate Dinner hosting the BOT was well attended and very positive (and fun!). President Gooding noted that he and John Ballato were included in numerous committee discussions and in the open meeting on Friday. They were asked to stay and contribute to some of the executive sessions of the committees. President Gooding believes the BOT is sending a clear signal that they value a productive relationship with the faculty and that they welcome our input on important issues. We have thanked them for these opportunities.
John Ballato and President Gooding will be glad to discuss with you what we know about things discussed and actions taken in the open meetings.

The Board approved several capital projects. The timing and method of presenting these projects to the Board for approval has been modified. At the President’s Cabinet meeting yesterday, President Barker suggested to interim Chief Business Officer SteveCopeland that he provide more information to the faculty on how this process works. President Gooding asked that faculty also receive better information on how capital projects get on the docket to begin with and how priorities among projects are established. President Gooding will meet with Mr. Copeland and Brett Dalton, Chief Financial Officer to follow up on this initiative and establish a continuing line of communication through the Senate Finance Committee so that faculty will be informed and may have opportunities for input.

6. **Old Business:** None

7. **New Business:**

   a. Senator Wells submitted and explained proposed *Faculty Manual* changes regarding research compliance issues. Following much discussion, during which two suggestions were made for clarification, vote was taken and passed unanimously with two-thirds vote requirement (Attachment G).

   b. Senator Wells submitted a proposed *Faculty Manual* change to include the Associate Vice President for Research and Economic Development as an ex-officio member on the Research Grants Committee. Motion was seconded. Following discussion motion was made to postpone indefinitely. Vote to postpone was taken and passed unanimously. This issue will be referred back to Research Committee.

   c. Noting that the Executive/Advisory Committee unanimously agreed, Senator Smotherman asked for the Senate’s approval to request that the faculty salary report be restored to the previous format which included percent of raises and justification for raises. Vote was taken and passed unanimously.

   d. President Gooding made a motion to approve Clemson’s membership in COIA, a Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics. The Executive/Advisory Committee has considered this membership and unanimously approved joining COIA at its September meeting. Motion was seconded and discussion was held. Vote to join COIA membership was taken and passed unanimously.

8. **Announcements:**

   a. Grievance Board Training hosted by the Provost and the Faculty Senate – October 10, 2007, Madren Center - 11:00 – 4:00 p.m. (Lunch Included)

   b. Class of ’39 Award for Excellence – Nominations due October 19, 2007

   c. Faculty Display – Connector between Madren Center and Martin Inn

   d. Next Faculty Senate Meeting – November 13, 2007
9. Adjournment: 4:26 p.m.

Deborah Thomason, Secretary

Cathy Toth Sturkie, Program Assistant

Absent: D. Layne (G. Wang for), Y.An, S. Clarke (M. Martin for), G. Tissera (J. Field), F. Edwards, E. Weisenmiller (E. Muth for), W. Sarasua (D. Warner for)
Monthly Report

The Faculty Senate Welfare Committee held its monthly meeting on September 18, 2007. Senators An, Li-Bleuel, Futral, White, and Bowerman attended. Dr. Patricia Smart, Faculty Liaison to the President and Provost also attended. We report here on the activities of our committee. Each report is authored by the Lead Senator for that issue.

Progress on Priorities for the Year

1. Issues Related to Child Care Lead: Linda Li-Bleuel

According to Dr. Pat Smart, several options are being considered for a child care center site. Dr. Smart has been in contact with developers and is seeking funding, but there has been much bureaucracy during this process. The goal for establishing a child care center remains for Fall 2008.

In the meantime, I am looking into the possibility of establishing an occasional child care database. This idea was introduced to me by Dr. Michelle Martin. This database would be a resource for Clemson University parents in the case of sudden illness (child care centers in Clemson do not care for sick children) or after hours care. Ideally, this database would contain names of potential baby sitters with their contact information, schedules and references. Background checks would be performed on all of them. I am modeling this idea after University of Iowa’s occasional child care list.

2. Issues Related to Campus Parking Lead: Meredith Futral

There will be a forum to report the results of the parking and transportation study on Monday 24th for faculty, staff, and students. I will be attending one of the sessions and will report at the next welfare committee meeting.

3. Issues Related to Spousal Hires Lead: Curtis White

No report at this time.

4. Top 20 Goal-Top 20 Compensation Lead: William Bowerman
Dr. Bowerman has distributed bound copies of benefit pages from the top 32 public universities to the senators of the Welfare Committee. We have just assigned each senator benefits they are to compare and are in the process of comparing our benefits to these universities.

5. **State Universities Welfare Summit**  Lead: Francie Edwards

No report at this time.

6. **General Welfare Issues**  Lead: Yanming An

**Faculty Senate Initiative on Exit Interview**
Proposed by the Sub-committee of Welfare (9/20/2007)

Rationale: To improve the faculty work environment at Clemson and identify any common and correctable reasons that are causing faculty to leave prematurely, an ad hoc Faculty Senate committee should interview faculty who are leaving voluntarily to learn more about the reason(s). The suggested procedure is outlined below.

- Each Nov. 15 and April 1 (on or about) Cathy Sturkie will contact the chief payroll person in each college to identify the faculty who leave voluntarily.
- The ad hoc committee will consist of all previous presidents of Faculty Senate. Each interview team will consist of at least two members.
- Cathy Sturkie will contact each faculty leaving to arrange his/her meeting with the committee members.
- In the interview, the team will explain that the faculty member leaving will determine what information can be shared. Team members will take notes and later produce a summary of discussion. The faculty member leaving will have the opportunity to edit the summary for accuracy or exclusion of information. The edited summary will be sent to the full senate without name being listed.
- In January and July, the current Senate President and Cathy Sturkie will compile results and issue a report to the University Provost and President and current Senate Ex/Ad Committee. The name(s) of faculty leaving and the reports will be retained in the Senate Office.

7. **Meeting with Staff Senate**  Lead: William Bowerman

Charlie Gooding and I meet with Tim Drake, Bill Hughes, David Crockett, and Karon Donald of the Staff Senate on September 11, 2007. It was a very good meeting and we would like to establish liaisons between the welfare committees of both senates. We would also like to work
jointly on parking issues, child care issues, and pursue further the idea of a state-wide university faculty/staff senate forum in Columbia in the spring.
FACULTY SENATE SCHOLASTIC POLICIES COMMITTEE
MONTHLY MEETING MINUTES
ANTONIS KATSIIYANNIS, CHAIR
September 18, 2007 (420 Tillman Hall)

Present: Senators Smith, Shelburne, Weisenmiller, Willoughby, Winchell, and Katsiyannis were in attendance.

Guests: Debra Jackson, Associate Provost; Wickes Westcott III, Director of Institutional Research, Ted Champan, Student Government

1. Student Assessment of Instruction: Shelburne/Smith moved to approve proposed language that will allow for consistency across different sections of the faculty manual, define summaries, and allow automatic access to summaries by chairs.

Part IX - 6 in the manual states:
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.

Part IV - 9. Summary of statistical ratings from student assessment of instruction (if appropriate to the individual's duties) for the last 5 years.

Appendix E. Annually, summaries of statistical ratings from student assessment of instruction completed anonymously by students through a standardized process and submitted for each class taught.

Next Meeting: October 16 at 2:30 in 420 Tillman Hall (Issues-Admission of Student Athletes, and Procedures for students who may harm selves or others)
The Faculty Senate Research Committee met on September 24th from 4-5 PM in E-142 Poole Ag. Center. Senators Liu, Meriwether, Stuart and Wells were in attendance. Also present were Senators Surver and Layne, Tracy Arwood, Ed Pivorun, Fran McGuire, Cathy Sturkie and Mary Beck.

1. Senator Meriwether reported on his conversation with Provost Helms regarding chairs' control of faculty grant money. Senators Surver and Wells agreed to follow up.

2. Senator Stuart reported on his work with Angela Rogers' ENG 304 section, which is developing a handbook for new research faculty. He has met with the class to outline the project and guide their initial research. By the end of the semester, they will have drafted a document that guides new faculty in proposal preparation, new lab set-up, purchasing, protocol approval, EHS policies, and related matters.

3. Senator Wells introduced Tracy Arwood, director of Research Compliance. Ms. Arwood outlined proposed changes to the faculty manual (Part VII E pg. VII-11). These changes reflect federally-mandated functioning of compliance committees on campus and clarify the role of the Research Committee (see attached).

4. Attendees discussed the functioning of the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (previously known as the ARC) and the role of the University Veterinarian. Many life science faculty contend that their research and teaching are significantly hampered by the IUCAC's current composition and functioning. Senators Surver and Wells agreed to convene an open meeting on this topic within the next 6 weeks; we are requesting that President Gooding invite VP Przirembel to attend.
COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Bill Surver - Biological Sciences, Chair; Tom Boland - Bioengineering; Alan Grubb - History; Des Layne - Horticulture; Catalina Marinescu - Physics/Astronomy; Brad Meyer - Physics; Lydia Schleifer - Accountancy

The last meeting of the Policy Committee was on Tuesday, September 18.

The following items were discussed

1. Response of the Vice President for Research and Economic Development to a letter written by President Gooding and Policy Chair Bill Surver - attached

2. The status of Lecturers at Clemson - Cathy's office is collecting data and information for the Committee (see attachment)
   a. Distinction between teaching and non-teaching Lecturers
   b. Why title is given to administrators
   c. Plan of action so far as Lecturer title and possible changes in the Faculty Manual

3. Status of Emeritus College Task Force
   a. Lydia Schleifer will be submitting some proposed Manual changes
   b. Lucy Rollins from Task Force will speak at the November Senate Meeting

4. Policy on Non-sectarian prayer
   a. The Policy Committee will seek advice from University Counsel, outside counsel, ACLU, SC Ombudsman, sister campuses, and any other input before making any recommendation(s) regarding a Faculty Manual Policy
On September 24, the Policy Committee met jointly with the Research Committee regarding Compliance Issues

1. Proposed changes to Faculty Manual policy will be presented by Research Committee - Policy Committee approval is not necessary

2. Dr. Mary Beck, Chair of Animal and Veterinary Sciences will be giving a Free Speech at the October Senate Meeting detailing specific faculty concerns regarding the handling of compliance and experimental animals

3. More information to be presented at Senate meeting
MEMORANDUM

TO: Charles H. Gooding
   Faculty Senate President

FROM: Christian E.G. Przirembel
      Vice President for Research and Economic Development

DATE: September 10, 2007

SUBJECT: Research Council

Thank you for your memorandum bringing to my attention the section of the Faculty Manual that identifies the Research Council. This Council has not met during my tenure in my current position. From the files in the Research Office, it appears that the last meeting of this Council occurred in February 2001, while my predecessor held the University Research Officer position and reported to the Provost.

As I assumed the duties of the Vice President for Research in July 2001, the existence of this Research Council was not brought to my attention nor has it until very recently. During the last six years, I have sought faculty input through the Senate Research Committee, and especially through the Associate Deans for Research, who meet regularly with the Associate Vice President for Research.

From the Faculty Manual description, the role of such a Council would be a welcomed addition to the above two entities in providing advice and counsel on policy and procedural matters related to the Office of the Vice President for Research and Economic Development. I will immediately start the process to assemble the members of the Research Council. I would anticipate this process will take at least a month, primarily depending on the time required to elect representatives from the academic colleges and the library. I would expect my appointments to be handled somewhat more expeditiously. I would expect to hold the initial meeting of the Research Council by the end of October, 2007.

In reading this section of the Faculty Manual, I am interpreting the “report” by the listed committees to be for information and advice, i.e. from an organizational chart to be “dotted line”, rather than “solid line” reporting structure.

Please let me know if you have any questions or comments.

Thank you.

cc: Vince Gallicchio
Dear Cathy,

I was surprised to see that the faculty senate discussed the lecturer rank. I had the mistaken impression that the faculty senate was comprised of and interested solely in tenured and tenure track faculty. Perhaps you could fill me in on something.

I am a lecturer. I teach about 150-180 undergraduate students per semester. This is my ninth year in my current department, having been a visiting assistant professor in Chemistry for two years prior to that. I have a PhD, and worked for 20 years in industrial research prior to coming into academia.

What provision is there for salary increases for lecturers, and what is done by other departments? I have been told for several years now that the raise money is distributed by the department head on a performance basis, on the basis of numbers of graduate students completing their programs, grants awarded, publications, and several other criteria on which those of us who teach undergraduates only cannot compete. We can get exemplary student evaluations, but that's about it when our responsibility is 100% teaching. That means that although his available funding includes the percentage of the lecturers' salaries, lecturers cannot hope to get a raise. That constructively gives him more than the given
Minutes of the September 18, 2007, Finance Committee meeting

Members present: R. Campbell, R. Figliola, H. Liu, W. Sarasua, and M. Smotherman
Guests: B. Rafert, L. Benson

1. Dean Rafert discussed Graduate Assistantship Differentials (GADs). Most of the discussion focused on GADs for graduate research assistants (GRAs).

   a. As part of the Board of Trustees' decision to implement GADs in 2005, all tuition money for graduate students must be budgeted and accounted for. (2006 OIR data: there were 1,838 MS students, 1,008 PhD students, and 291 unclassified graduate students; total = 3137. Of these, about 1700-1800 are graduate assistants.)

   \[\text{GAD} = \text{Graduate Tuition - Graduate Fee}\]

   Based on a competitive analysis of tuition rates at peer universities, there are now four tiers to the graduate tuition rates.

   \[
   \begin{array}{ccc}
   \text{per semester} & \text{resident} & \text{nonresident} \\
   \text{Tier 1} & $3,960 & $7,923 \\
   \text{Tier 2} & $3,641 & $7,285 \\
   \text{Tier 3} & $3,157 & $6,317 \\
   \text{Tier 4} & $2,810 & $5,622 \\
   \end{array}
   \]

   (This is down from the 2006-2007 tuition rates of $4,643 resident and $9,255 nonresident.)

   The Graduate Fee is currently $950 per semester, $315 per summer session (down from $1,079 per semester in 2006-2007).

   The tuition rates and Graduate Fees are mandated and set by the Board of Trustees.

   b. With the market-driven, tiered tuition rates, PIs at Clemson are not at a disadvantage with respect to tuition recovery in proposals.

   c. With regard to GRA GAD cost sharing, there is automatic cost sharing if the sponsor disallows tuition. If a new assistant professor receives a small grant and does not have GRA GADs funded as part of a start-up package, Dean Rafert and the Associate Deans in the colleges are typically inclined to grant a cost share for the GRA GAD.

   d. Out of 700 GRAs in FY07 only 50 or so had GADs funded by grants and contracts. This is a 1:14 ratio of external-to-internal GRA GAD funding. (The top research schools have a 10:1 ratio, that is, external funding of GRA stipends and tuition waivers dominates internal funding. Dean Rafert would like to see a 1:3 ratio or better in GRA GAD funding in the next two to three years.)

   Another 60 to 70 GRAs had GAD money budgeted into proposals for FY07, but there were losses along the way:

   * the PI removed the GRA GAD money when the sponsor reduced the award; or,
* the PI was unable to find a qualified GRA; or,

* due to accounting oversights and mistakes, the GRA GAD money was not charged to the grant.

In some cases, the unspent GRA GAD money was not reallocated to another budget category and was returned to the sponsor:

e. The $480K collected in grant-funded GRA GADs in FY07, along with significant additional funding from the Provost, went toward:
   * increasing graduate assistant stipends
   * subsidizing graduate assistant health fees
   * fellowship pool
   * graduate student professional development activities
   * graduate program marketing efforts
Dean Rafert has plans to increase the fellowship pool by $100K each year.

f. PhD enrollments have been increasing by 10% per year for the past few years. Without corresponding faculty size increases, departments with both PhD and MS programs should consider deemphasizing the MS program in order to better handle the increase in PhD students. Departments should also consider the value of recruiting and funding PhD students as GRAs rather than MS students or inexpensive but low-quality postdocs. For some disciplines, job opportunities make it wiser for MS students to take a loan rather than an assistantship and finish in one year instead of two.

g. It is not clear that the conventional wisdom about undergrad education subsidizing graduate education and research is correct. A study at Michigan Tech showed the opposite: that graduate education and research were subsidizing undergrad education. If the conventional wisdom is also incorrect for Clemson but we are making business decisions based on it, then we may be making some bad business decisions.

2. Possible action items:
   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. Start a revenue/expense study of all revenues and costs associated with graduate education and research to determine whether undergrad education is subsidizing graduate education and research (knowing about the cross-subsidies can make all the efforts better.)
   f. Identify and recommend changes to financial policies and practices that put Clemson at a competitive disadvantage in recruiting top graduate students.

Next meeting: October 23, 2007, at 2:30 pm
The Committee reconvened with new membership on September 27. The following items were divided among the members for analysis and recommendations.

1. Continue the investigation of the practice of using non-teaching lecturer as a title.

2. Determine the status of and make a recommendation for grievance procedures for non-teaching lecturers (and other unclassified staff).

3. Determine the status of the philosophy for merit raises for lecturers; prepare a recommendation for chairs to consider.

4. Continue the determination of the sources by which research faculty are paid; prepare a recommendation for a revision to the Faculty Manual policy on this issue.

5. Consider and recommend alternate teaching and clinical faculty ranks.

6. Determine the status of and prepare a recommendation regarding "vanity" ranks.

7. Determine the status of faculty hiring by centers and institutes.
E. Committees Reporting to the Vice President for Research and Economic Development

The Research Council provides advice and representation on issues affecting the university’s research efforts. The Research Council will provide the Vice President for Research and Economic Development direct faculty input on future policy and procedural matters to enhance the quality of scholarly endeavors and growth of research programs under his/her direction. The Research Council will be expected to transcend unit and college lines to promote shared values, and to represent a cohesive point of view to the Vice President for Research and Economic Development.

The Council membership consists of one faculty member elected from each college and the library for a three-year term; one faculty member appointed from each college by the Vice President for Research and Economic Development in consultation with the collegiate dean; the current chair of the Faculty Senate research committee (or designee); and the chairs of each of the committees listed below.

The Vice President for Research and Economic Development shall convene the membership for the purpose of electing a chair. The council will meet at least three times each academic year. A special meeting can be called by the chair, Vice President for Research and Economic Development, or by a third of the council’s members in order to manage the council’s business.

The following committees will provide annual reports to the council. Additional reports will be provided as requested.

RESEARCH COMPLIANCE

Universities, as partners in the national research enterprise, are required by federal and state regulations to establish specific research committees to ensure the safety and welfare of research subjects, those conducting research, and others who work or study within the research environment. Following are descriptions of the committees which have been established to oversee these particular research areas: animal subjects, human subjects, recombinant DNA, biohazards and hazardous chemicals. The Institutional Care and Use Committee (IACUC), the Institutional Review Board (IRB), and the Institutional Biosafety Committee (IBC) are administered by the Clemson University Office of Research Compliance (ORC). The Office of Research Compliance reports to the Vice President for Research and Economic Development. The Vice President for Research and Economic Development is also the Institutional Official for matters related to animal use and human subjects. Selection of new committee members will be based on operating guidelines which can be found on the ORC website.

1. Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC) is committed to ensuring that animals involved in teaching and research receive humane care and treatment. The IACUC is charged with reviewing all faculty, staff, or student-proposed research or teaching use of animals, regardless of where the work is performed and source of funding, if any. The IACUC has set forth procedures for reporting, without fear of reprisal, concerns about the humane use and treatment of animals utilized in research and teaching at Clemson University. The committee regularly inspects and monitors the animal care and use program at the University to ensure that all components are in compliance with regulations and guidelines outlined in the federal Animal Welfare Act. The animal facilities are registered with the U.S. Department of Agriculture and undergo frequent inspection by that agency. The IACUC has the responsibility and authority to review, approve, disapprove or require changes in research, teaching or testing activities involving the use of animals. The IACUC meets monthly to review research applications/protocols which involve animal use. Clemson University’s Animal Welfare Assurance is approved by the Department of Health and Human Services. Committee membership is structured in accordance with federal requirements and members are appointed by the President of the University. Fifty percent or more of the faculty on the committee will be tenured.

2. Institutional Biosafety Committee (IBC) is responsible for reviewing all research that involves the use of recombinant DNA in accord with the NIH Guidelines (NIH Guidelines for Research Involving Recombinant DNA Molecules dated April 2002) and ensuring that the proposed activities comply with the federal guidelines.
regulations governing them. Recombinant DNA is defined as work with those molecules which are constructed outside living cells by joining natural or synthetic DNA segments to DNA molecules that can replicate in a living cell or which result from the replication of those described above.

The NIH Guidelines state institutions need not restrict the IBC's responsibilities to recombinant DNA. Clemson University has chosen to include in the scope of the IBC the review of research involving the use of biological hazards (including human blood, tissue, infectious agents and cell lines; and select agents) and, chemical hazards (i.e., those defined as highly toxic, mutagenic, teratogenic, carcinogenic, or explosive; or listed as Schedule I or II drugs).

The role of the committee is, to the best of its ability, identify potentially hazardous agents or situations and have those corrected by the PI prior to initiation of the research. This helps to ensure the safety of personnel working with these materials and that laboratory practices conform to federal and state regulations. All research activities as described above, regardless of the source of funding, must be reviewed by the IBC. The IBC has the responsibility and authority to review, approve, disapprove, or require changes in research activities. The IBC holds meetings at least quarterly, and as needed to review non-exempt protocols.

Clemson University’s Institutional Biosafety Committee is registered with the National Institutes of Health’s Office of Biotechnology Activities (OBA). The IBC works closely with Clemson University’s Department of Environmental Health and Safety. Committee membership is structured in accordance with federal requirements and members are appointed by the President of the University. Fifty percent or more of the faculty on the committee will be tenured.

3. Institutional Review Board (IRB) is committed to protecting the rights and welfare of human subjects who participate in research conducted by any member of the faculty, staff, or student body, regardless of source of funding. Clemson University subscribes to the basic ethical principles that underlie the conduct of biomedical and behavioral research involving human subjects as set forth in the Belmont Report, the statement of ethical principles and guidelines for the protection of human subjects published in 1979 by the National Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects of Biomedical and Behavioral Research. The IRB is charged with ensuring that the rights and welfare of human subjects are protected in all research projects involving Clemson University faculty, staff, and students. The IRB has the responsibility and authority to review, approve, disapprove, or require changes in research activities involving human subjects. All research activities involving human subjects, regardless of source of funding, must be reviewed by the Clemson University Institutional Review Board. The IRB holds regular monthly meetings to review research applications/protocols involving human subjects. Clemson University’s Federal wide Assurance is approved by the Department of Health and Human Services, and the Institutional Review Board is registered with the Department of Health and Human Services, Office for Human Research Protections. Committee membership is structured in accordance with federal requirements and members are appointed by the President of the University. Fifty percent or more of the faculty on the committee will be tenured.

4. Intellectual Property Committee consists of a chair appointed by the Vice President for Research and Economic Development; the senior contract advisor who acts as secretary; the general counsel or his/her designee; a representative from administration and advancement; an associate dean from each college; one graduate student representing the graduate student government, for a one-year term; one undergraduate student nominated by the dean of student affairs for a one-year term; a faculty representative elected from each college; and the person from Cooper Library identified as patent coordinator serving in an ex officio, non-voting capacity. This committee recommends intellectual property policy to the Vice President for Research and Economic Development; approves or disapproves patent and other intellectual property proposals submitted in accordance with patent policies of the university; and makes recommendations to the Vice President for Research and Economic Development.

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.
Operating procedure

Selection of compliance committee members (IACUC, IBC, IRB)

Each spring, workload statistics for the current academic year will be evaluated to determine from which departments protocols originate and the types of research being reviewed. Vacancies left by expired terms or resignations will be reviewed to determine what, if any, federally required position must be filled. (See federal requirements for each committee below.) The composition of the membership will be considered in the context of this information and recommendations for members will be based on the appropriate combination of expertise and experience to fill each committee vacancy.

For example, the IRB receives 38% of applications from Psychology in a given year. The IRB receives 4% of applications in that same year from Food Science. The IRB membership will be reviewed to make sure adequate psychology expertise is available and a recommendation would follow the results of that analysis appointing a faculty member from Psychology before a member from Food Science.

Normally, members are appointed for 3 year terms. However, terms may deviate from this norm based on committee needs. Efforts will be made to rotate members off periodically to ensure others in the CU research community are offered an opportunity to serve. Serving on a compliance committee is a vital function for the research community; it also presents an opportunity for those who serve to gain a deeper understanding of the relevant regulations, thereby creating a larger pool of resource people for the CU research community. Therefore, a lengthy series of terms (assuming proper expertise can be found in others) does little to promote wide range understanding among the entire CU research community.

Members should be recruited from those who not only have the appropriate experience and expertise, but those who are also willing and able to commit to the time and effort committee membership requires.

Chairs will be chosen based not only on experience and expertise, but also their ability to provide effective leadership, through conflict resolution, educational efforts, and respectful communication.

50% or more of the faculty on the committee will be tenured.

Recommendations from faculty regarding membership appointments are welcomed and will receive appropriate consideration.

Federal membership requirements –

IRB - 45 CFR 46.107

IRB membership.
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(a) Each IRB shall have at least five members, with varying backgrounds to promote complete and adequate review of research activities commonly conducted by the institution. The IRB shall be sufficiently qualified through the experience and expertise of its members, and the diversity of the members, including consideration of race, gender, and cultural backgrounds and sensitivity to such issues as community attitudes, to promote respect for its advice and counsel in safeguarding the rights and welfare of human subjects. In addition to possessing the professional competence necessary to review specific research activities, the IRB shall be able to ascertain the acceptability of proposed research in terms of institutional commitments and regulations, applicable law, and standards of professional conduct and practice. The IRB shall therefore include persons knowledgeable in these areas. If an IRB regularly reviews research that involves a vulnerable category of subjects, such as children, prisoners, pregnant women, or handicapped or mentally disabled persons, consideration shall be given to the inclusion of one or more individuals who are knowledgeable about and experienced in working with these subjects.

(b) Every nondiscriminatory effort will be made to ensure that no IRB consists entirely of men or entirely of women, including the institution's consideration of qualified persons of both sexes, so long as no selection is made to the IRB on the basis of gender. No IRB may consist entirely of members of one profession.

(c) Each IRB shall include at least one member whose primary concerns are in scientific areas and at least one member whose primary concerns are in nonscientific areas.

(d) Each IRB shall include at least one member who is not otherwise affiliated with the institution and who is not part of the immediate family of a person who is affiliated with the institution.

(e) No IRB may have a member participate in the IRB's initial or continuing review of any project in which the member has a conflicting interest, except to provide information requested by the IRB.

(f) An IRB may, in its discretion, invite individuals with competence in special areas to assist in the review of issues which require expertise beyond or in addition to that available on the IRB. These individuals may not vote with the IRB.

IACUC – PHS policy IV, A, 3b & c

b. The Assurance must include the names, position titles, and credentials of the IACUC chairperson and the members. The committee shall consist of not less than five members, and shall include at least:

(1) one Doctor of Veterinary Medicine, with training or experience in laboratory animal science and medicine, who has direct or delegated program authority and responsibility for activities involving animals at the institution (see IV.A.1.c.); (2) one practicing scientist experienced in research involving animals;

(3) one member whose primary concerns are in a nonscientific area (for example, ethicist, lawyer, member of the clergy); and

(4) one individual who is not affiliated with the institution in any way other than as a member of the IACUC, and is not a member of the immediate family of a person who is affiliated with the institution.
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c. An individual who meets the requirements of more than one of the categories detailed in IV.A.3.b.(1)-(4) of this policy may fulfill more than one requirement. However, no committee may consist of less than five members.

IACUC – Animal Welfare Act Section 2.31

(b)(1) The Secretary shall require that each research facility establish at least one Committee. Each Committee shall be appointed by the chief executive officer of each such research facility and shall be composed of not fewer than three members. Such members shall possess sufficient ability to assess animal care, treatment, and practices in experimental research as determined by the needs of the research facility and shall represent society's concerns regarding the welfare of animal subjects used at such facility. Of the members of the Committee--

(A) at least one member shall be a doctor of veterinary medicine;

(B) at least one member--

(i) shall not be affiliated in any way with such facility other than as a member of the Committee--

(ii) shall not be a member of the immediate family of a person who is affiliated with such facility; and

(iii) is intended to provide representation for general community interests in the proper care and treatment of animals; and

(C) in those cases where the Committee consists of more than three members, not more than three members shall be from the same administrative unit of such facility.

IBC – NIH Guidelines

Section IV-B-2-a-(1). The Institutional Biosafety Committee must be comprised of no fewer than five members so selected that they collectively have experience and expertise in recombinant DNA technology and the capability to assess the safety of recombinant DNA research and to identify any potential risk to public health or the environment. At least two members shall not be affiliated with the institution (apart from their membership on the Institutional Biosafety Committee) and who represent the interest of the surrounding community with respect to health and protection of the environment (e.g., officials of state or local public health or environmental protection agencies, members of other local governmental bodies, or persons active in medical, occupational health, or environmental concerns in the community). The Institutional Biosafety Committee shall include at least one individual with expertise in plant, plant pathogen, or plant pest containment principles when experiments utilizing Appendix P, Physical and Biological Containment for Recombinant DNA Research Involving Plants, require prior approval by the Institutional Biosafety Committee. The Institutional Biosafety Committee shall include at least one scientist with expertise in animal containment principles when experiments utilizing Appendix Q, Physical and Biological Containment for Recombinant DNA Research Involving Animals, require Institutional Biosafety Committee prior approval. When the institution conducts recombinant DNA research at BL3, BL4, or Large Scale (greater than 10 liters), a Biological Safety Officer
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is mandatory and shall be a member of the Institutional Biosafety Committee (see Section IV-B-3, Biological Safety Officer). When the institution participates in or sponsors recombinant DNA research involving human research participants, the institution must ensure that: (i) the Institutional Biosafety Committee has adequate expertise and training (using ad hoc consultants as deemed necessary); (ii) all aspects of Appendix M have been appropriately addressed by the Principal Investigator; (iii) no research participant shall be enrolled (see definition of enrollment in Section I-E-7) in a human gene transfer experiment until the RAC review process has been completed (see Appendix M-I-B, RAC Review Requirements); and (iv) final IBC approval is granted only after the RAC review process has been completed (see Appendix M-I-B, RAC Review Requirements). Institutional Biosafety Committee approval must be obtained from the institution at which recombinant DNA material will be administered to human research participants (rather than the site involved in manufacturing gene transfer products).

Section IV-B-2-a-(2). In order to ensure the competence necessary to review and approve recombinant DNA activities, it is recommended that the Institutional Biosafety Committee: (i) include persons with expertise in recombinant DNA technology, biological safety, and physical containment; (ii) include or have available as consultants persons knowledgeable in institutional commitments and policies, applicable law, standards of professional conduct and practice, community attitudes, and the environment, and (iii) include at least one member representing the laboratory technical staff.
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Charter of the Coalition On Intercollegiate Athletics

March, 2003

The Coalition. The Coalition On Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA) is a group advocating for reform in intercollegiate athletics, created by and representative of faculty senate leaders at Bowl Championship Series conference schools.

Origins. The impetus for creating the Coalition was evidence of some sustained momentum towards reform, indicated by a succession of national statements from groups such as the Knight Commission and the AAUP, a series of studies that provided new data and insight on relevant issues, and the formation of the Group of Six cooperative effort among BCS-conference presidents. In late 2002, the adoption of the initial set of Group of Six reform proposal and the appointment of Myles Brand at the NCAA reinforced this momentum.

Goals. The Coalition's purpose is to articulate a broad national faculty voice in support of reform efforts, to contribute ideas towards a successful long-term strategy for reform, and to work with other groups committed ensuring that athletics enhances rather than undermines the academic mission. The expectation at the outset is for an initial period of several years of high Coalition activity, leading towards adoption of an acceptable comprehensive program of staged reform by the NCAA or by some alternative emerging structure, followed by a diminishing tracking the success of the adopted program.

Strategy. The Coalition advocates a strategy of reaching consensus among groups interested in reform on the long-term outcome of comprehensive reform, and building an agenda of specific phased steps to accomplish that over time. While rapid elimination of negative aspects of athletics practices may be desirable, emphasis on speed limits both the goals that can be set and the chances of success. Therefore, the Coalition's strategy balances goal speed, comprehensiveness, and practicability.

Membership. The Coalition has been established on the basis of membership by individual faculty senate leaders who have determined individually the degree to which they may seek sanction for their decision to participate; faculty leadership groups within their institutions. Its initial structure is ad hoc, and it makes no strong claim to represent faculty in a broad sense. To the degree that the Coalition is able to build legitimacy by developing a program that faculty may broadly support and accomplishing steps towards initial success, it may choose to formalize issues of membership, engagement with local faculty leaderships, etc., to maximize the degree to which it can represent a national faculty voice.

Leadership. The Coalition will initially be led by a Steering Committee that includes at least one and no more than representatives from each of the six conferences that have participated in founding the Coalition. Committee members are nominated by faculty senate leaders within each conference, and appointed by agreement of those leaders; the committee will begin from ad hoc procedures, and formalize its governance principles to the degree this seems useful to the committee, or to the degree Coalition members indicate this necessity. Initially, the Steering Committee will attempt to draft a vision of long-term reform objectives and a tentative agenda for reaching them that Coalition members can respond to, refine, and perhaps adopt. The committee is also charged to undertake on its own a foundation for the Coalition's organizational viability, and play a leadership role in the activities listed below.

Activities. The Coalition's activities may fall into the following categories:

1) Bringing together ideas from a wide variety of people, both within the Coalition and outside, faculty and non-faculty, and including campus NCAA faculty athletics representatives, administrators, and trustees interest in reform, and national groups, such as the NCAA, AAUP, and the Association of Governing Boards (AGB).

2) Drafting documents that articulate faculty viewpoints and that constructively contribute to reform efforts.

3) Organizing or participating in events, such as conferences, that can bring together people interested in reform, both to enlarge the coalition and to accomplish specific tasks efficiently.

4) Identifying key issues and proposals where developing additional data is critical to designing reform that can be effectively advocating for it, and working with other groups, such as the NCAA, AAUP, and AGB, to identify...
specialists and find funding to support necessary research.

**Scope of Reform.** The Coalition seeks comprehensive reform that would affect five broad categories of intercollegiate athletics activities (the examples below are not intended to be exhaustive and some bridge more than one of the five categories):

1) **Academics.** This includes issues of initial and continuing eligibility; admissions and student-athlete academic standards, etc.

2) **Student Welfare.** This includes issues of scholarship policies; academic advising and other forms of student support; equity concerning matters such as gender and race; athletics scheduling; training expectations and time limits; athletes’ engagement in campus life, etc.

3) **Finances and Scale.** This points towards issues related to the athletics “arms race,” and includes issues of structure of athletics departments and revenue/non-revenue programs; financial planning, reporting, and competitive equity within conferences and divisions; the relationship between winning programs and solver constraints of anti-trust law, etc.

4) **Commercialization.** This concerns responses to financial imperatives that may lead to dependency on corporate and media funding, requiring various forms of commercial behavior that may conflict with academic missions or values, including corporate sponsorship contracts and branding control; media contract scheduling/marketing control; high-stakes dependency on revenue streams influenced by factors outside institutional control and not related to institutional priorities, etc.

5) **Governance.** This includes the shared governance roles among faculty, presidents, athletics administration, and trustees on individual campuses over such matters as academic standards and support for student-athletes, athletic personnel decisions, supervision of financial planning and performance of athletics auxiliaries, programmatic department decisions, etc.
Framing the Future:
Reforming Intercollegiate Athletics

The Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA)
http://www.neuro.uoregon.edu/~tublitz/COIA/index.html
Adopted on 15 June 2007 by vote of the Coalition membership

SUMMARY

The Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA) is an alliance of 55 Division IA faculty senate whose mission is to provide a national faculty voice on intercollegiate sports issues. Our underlying premise is that intercollegiate athletics, while providing positive benefits to athletes, the campus and the broader community, at times clashes with the educational goals and mission of our institution. These conflicts, which by many measures are on the increase, have the potential of undermining values and aims of higher education. This paper identifies the current, major challenges facing intercollegiate athletics and offers a set of proposals that are meant to enable college sports to be integrated into the overall academic mission and remain a positive force on our campuses.

This paper is the result of a lengthy deliberative and revision process. The initial version was developed over the period of January through March 2007 by the COIA Steering Committee in consultation with the NCAA leadership. A second draft was prepared by the COIA Steering Committee and sent out for evaluation to many external groups including the NCAA, the Association of Governing Boards (AGB), the Faculty Athletics Representatives Association (FARA), the Division IA Athletics Directors Association, the Division IA Faculty Athletics Representatives (DIA FARs), the Knight Commission, the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), the Colleget Sports Project, and the National Association of Athletic Academic Advisors (N4A). Their thoughtful comments formed the basis for a third draft which was reviewed by all COIA faculty senates in early May 2007. Representatives of COIA member senates met at Stanford in mid-May 2007 to revise the third draft. The final version was formally adopted by a vote of the entire COIA membership in June 2007.

The 28 proposals in this paper cover four major areas of concern: academic integrity and student-athlete welfare, campus governance of intercollegiate athletics, and fiscal responsibility. The level of implementation - local, conference, and/or national - is identified for each proposal. This paper is meant to stimulate dialog at these various levels with the ultimate goal of having these proposals accepted as standard working policies and practices.
Proposals earmarked for local action should initially be addressed by the campus governance body, usually the Faculty Senate or equivalent, in close consultation with the campus Faculty Representative (FAR) and the Campus Athletics Board (or equivalent) where applicable. Success in implementing these proposals on each campus will ultimately depend on the commitment and leadership exhibited by the University President (i.e., the head administrator of the campus on which the student-athletes are registered). We strongly urge each University President to take an active role in addressing the issues and proposals raised in this paper. The COIA understands that not all local proposals are appropriate for all institutions because each school has its own unique atmosphere, faculty governance system and athletics department. We hope each institution will carefully review the proposals in this paper and initiate a campus-wide dialog resulting in the adoption of those proposals that fit local needs and strengthen the academic mission.

Several proposals in this paper are focused at the conference level. The FARs are the institution liaisons to the conferences and as such are in the best position to evaluate and champion these proposals. The COIA encourages FARs to work closely with their conference commissioners and university presidents to discuss, promote and accept these proposals.

Most reforms proposed here can only be implemented successfully at the national level. Five changes in or enforcement of existing NCAA legislation. The rest are proposed as best practices that become part of the NCAA certification process. The COIA continues to work closely with NCAA leaders to formulate strategies enabling these proposals to be adopted as national policies and practices.
OVERVIEW

The Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA), an alliance of 55 Division IA (DIA) faculty senates, provides a faculty senate voice on athletic reform issues. Formed in 2002, the primary goal of the COIA is to ensure that college sports are fully integrated within the academic goals, values missions of our universities and colleges. Although many individual reforms have been discussed local, conference, and/or national levels, there have been few attempts to distill and unify these concepts into a single cohesive framework. This white paper, written and approved by faculty leaders across the country, attempts to fill this gap by providing a structure for a comprehensive set of athletic reform proposals. Here we enunciate the principles underlying sports in a collegiate setting, and propose 28 reforms within the four, broad categories of academic integrity and quality, student-athlete welfare, campus governance of intercollegiate athletics, and fiscal responsibility. The level of implementation -- local, conference, and/or national -- is explicitly identified for each suggested reform. We also propose the convening of a yearly national conference of stakeholder groups to develop and implement practical solutions that will allow intercollegiate sports to thrive and prosper into the indefinite future. This paper was approved by the COIA membership in June 2007.

INTRODUCTION

Why Should Faculty Care About Athletics?

"When the public -- both local and en masse -- begin to believe that the value of the institution is to be measured by the success of its athletics teams, the core mission of the university is threatened. The central role of the faculty is ignored in favor of winning the big game or recruiting the next young man with athletics star potential. And the ability of the university to successfully educate and push forward the boundaries of knowledge and the creative arts is compromised."

NCAA President Myles Brand at the NCAA Annual Convention, 01-08-2005

Discussions of the contemporary college sports scene have generated two increasingly opposing groups. Pessimists are quick to point to on- and off-field misbehavior by student-athletes, resume-padding by highly paid coaches, fake courses run by faculty, admission of unqualified student-athletes, and a facilities "arms race". On the other side are the optimists who do not believe that these reports are an accurate reflection of the conduct of intercollegiate athletics as a whole. Instead, optimists are encouraged because student-athlete graduation rates are up, academic requirements have been raised, and athletics is the primary gateway for some to attain a post-secondary education. The polarizing rhetoric by these two groups leaves little opportunity for a more nuanced, middle-of-the-road view that accepts the positive benefits of intercollegiate sports while acknowledging the need to ameliorate its problematic aspects.

Fortunately, most faculty members are neither jaded pessimists nor sunny optimists but down-to-earth realists. We understand that the status of intercollegiate athletics and the educational experiences of our students lie somewhere in between these two views. Faculty members worry that the culture of big-time sports, influenced by television and the mass media, is inching ever closer to a professional model. At the same time, we continue to strive for the ideal collegiate sports model when...
“student-athlete” draws no objections based on doubt about the academic engagement of college athletics, even when referring to student-athletes in high profile sports.

Most Americans believe that the primary mission of our universities is to teach, learn, and conduct research. Any lessening of our academic integrity in our athletic programs will do far more harm “than a dozen losing seasons ever could” (Knight Commission, 2001). The primary question for faculty and those responsible for the academic integrity of our universities is: how the faculty can ensure there is an appropriate relationship between athletics and the university as a place of learning?

What Can Faculty Do to Strengthen Academic Integrity within Our Athletic Programs?

"Of all the major constituencies in a university, faculty members are in the best position to appreciate academic values and insist on their observance. . . . They have the greatest stake in preserving proper academic standards and principles, since these values protect the integrity of their work and help perpetuate its quality."

Former Harvard University President Derek Bok, in his 2003 book, Universities in the Marketplace.

The faculty is the steward of academic integrity on our campuses. Faculty members are specifically responsible for developing and upholding academic standards, maintaining intellectual rigor, monitoring student performance, providing career opportunities, and facilitating personal growth. The faculty is historically and, at some institutions, legislatively mandated to oversee all aspects of student life. The faculty adheres to two fundamental principles: that all students are treated fairly and equally and that all students are provided with opportunities to succeed academically. Given these principles, it is imperative that faculty not only be concerned about athletics reform but in fact take the lead in developing and implementing reform initiatives and solutions.

To achieve these goals, the COIA has taken two complementary approaches: (1) writing papers and reports that identify problematic issues and propose feasible solutions; and, (2) developing robust dialogues and strong partnerships with national organizations involved in intercollegiate athletics.

Over the lifetime of the COIA, the organization has drafted three white papers and two reports focusing on reform in college sports. The COIA papers have proposed best practices to guide campuses in developing policies appropriate for their local programs. Each paper has focused on a specific area of reform, with the 2003 Framework outlining the general reform agenda and mission of the COIA, the 2004 Governance document defining specific roles for faculty in athletics decisions, and the 2005 Academic Integrity in Intercollegiate Athletics paper dealing with issues ranging from admissions to athletics advising. COIA reports to the NCAA Presidential Task Force (2005) and to the NCAA Working Group Reviewing Initial Eligibility Trends (2006) have further elaborated on these concerns and remedies. These papers and reports have resulted in NCAA by-law proposals currently in the NCAA legislative pipeline as well as provided a basis for conversations on athletics reform on many campuses. Several schools have adopted the COIA recommendations as campus policies (e.g., www.colorado.edu/FacultyGovernance/STCOM/ATHLCOMM/athletic-ref.html).

COIA POLICY PAPERS (www.neuro.uoregon.edu/~tublitz/COIA/policypapers.htm)

The COIA has also worked to develop strong collaborative ties with several like-minded organizations including most importantly the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) and the Knight Commission. We have also met and maintained communication with the Association of Governing Boards (AGB), the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), the National Athletic Academic Advisors Association (N4A), Division IA Faculty Athletics Representatives (FARs), the Faculty Athletic Representatives Association (FARA), the Division IA Athletic Directors Association and the Division III College Sports Project. This relationship-building effort has enabled COIA to provide a missing and much needed faculty senate voice on sports reform issues at the national level with these groups through which many sports reform efforts must be directed.

Association of Governing Boards (AGB; www.agb.org)
American Association of University Professors (AAUP; www.aaup.org)
College Sports Project (www.collegesportsproject.org)
Division IA Faculty Athletics Representatives (DIA FARs; oneafar.org)
Division IA Athletic Directors Association (www.d-1a.com)
Faculty Athletics Representatives Association (FARA: org.elon.edu/ncaafara/fara.html)
Knight Commission (www.knightcommission.org)
National Association of Athletic Academic Advisors (N4A; www.nfoura.org)
National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA; www.ncaa.org)

Since an early point in the COIA's development, the COIA has found the NCAA to be a key partner in acknowledging differences on some specific issues, yet working actively with the COIA to strengthen faculty awareness of the need for change and involvement in long-term reform. Established in 1905, the NCAA mission is to "govern competition in a fair, safe, equitable and sportsmanlike manner, and to integrate intercollegiate athletics into higher education so that the education experience of the student-athlete is paramount" (www.ncaa.org). Under the leadership of NCAA President Myles Brand, the NCAA in the past five years has promulgated a series of unprecedented changes whose goals have been to strengthen the academic performance of student-athletes and to re-establish the primacy of academics in intercollegiate athletics enterprise. The interests, issues, and governance of the NCAA are complex, and it is true that from the COIA's point of view, many longstanding problems remain. However, the emergence of the NCAA as an agent of positive change has altered
the framework in which athletics reform can be pursued at the local, conference and national levels.

"The Second-Century Imperatives" report is the most recent reform effort undertaken by the NC. Issued in October 2006 by a 50-member presidential task force (PTF), it assessed the current intercollegiate athletics from a presidential viewpoint and suggested a wide range of improvements. The primary message of the PTF report was “taking reform home,” a call for university presidents (i.e., chief campus administrator) to work with their faculty to initiate reform on their individual campuses. The PTF appropriately focused on local, institutional level changes. The proposed PTF reforms are strongly supported by the COIA and we encourage their adoption and implementation at the institutional level.

Where Do We Go From Here?

The PTF report did not attempt to be comprehensive and thus did not address several important aspects of the intercollegiate athletics enterprise that directly or indirectly impact academic quality. The aim of this white paper is to fill this void by providing a faculty voice on the major issues surrounding college sports that have an impact on academic quality and standards. Through the reforms proposed here, the long term goal of this paper is to ensure that athletics remains fully integrated into the academic mission of our universities. This goal will be achieved only if the faculty takes a leadership role in acknowledging the need for reform, getting stakeholders to work to identify specific problems, and developing real world, functional solutions. Success of these proposals is dependent on DIA faculty leaders and their campus Faculty Senate or equivalent (hereafter referred to as the “faculty campus governance body”) strongly championing these reforms at the local, conference and national levels.

PRINCIPLES UNDERLYING THE PROPOSED REFORMS

The unique value of intercollegiate athletics lies in its potential to enhance the educational experience of student-athletes through engagement in sports. In the best of worlds, participation in college athletics plays an important role in the personal development of student-athletes, provides a community framework for other students, and develops strong institutional loyalty among students, alumni, faculty, and broader communities. When in concert with the educational mission of the institution, intercollegiate athletics clearly adds value to the educational experience of our student-athletes and the institution as a whole. The success of college sports, however, has created a series of issues that threaten the academic integrity and financial stability of our universities and colleges. These issues will become increasingly problematic until reforms are implemented. Ensuring that college sport is aligned with academic goals requires acknowledgement of the following fundamental principles, which form the foundation for the reforms presented in this paper:

- **Intercollegiate athletics must be in alignment with the educational mission of the institution.**
  The fundamental mission of a university is academic in nature. Higher education institutions provide educational opportunities, promote personal growth, and generate and disseminate knowledge. College athletics must adhere to and support the institution’s academic mission in all its activities, including providing students with opportunities to succeed academically.

- **College sports must adhere to the collegiate athletics model.** When consistent with
educational goals, the benefits of intercollegiate athletics are tangible: they develop life skills and character in student-athletes, create a focus for the campus community, and maintain relationships between universities and its alumni and public. However, the primary goal of student-athletes to attend a college or university is to receive an education. Their athletic endeavors should be entirely subsidiary to their educational goals. Unlike professional student-athletes do not receive compensation for participating in their sport, and what financial aid they do receive is strictly limited to paying for the costs of their education. The goal associated with athletic participation must complement rather than supplant the goals of education and personal growth.

PROPOSED REFORMS

Addressing the current challenges facing intercollegiate athletics requires attention to four overarching areas: academic integrity and quality; student-athlete welfare; campus governance; and financial responsibility. For each area, we identify the current issues and propose specific reform measures that in our opinion are the most urgent and which require immediate implementation. For each reform we also include the level at which it should be implemented, e.g., local at the individual institutional level, regional at the conference level, or national through action by the NCAA. Of the 28 proposals here, 23 are put forward as best practices, policies that have worked well at some schools or which address problems that have resisted solution. We recommend these 23 best practice proposals, denoted as "NCAA certification," become part of the NCAA re-certification process. Four proposals, listed as "NCAA legislation," are offered as new NCAA by-laws affecting all schools. One proposal requests continued enforcement of current NCAA legislation.

The reforms here are the product of much internal discussion by the COIA members. Outside the NCAA, including the AGB, the FARA, the Division IA FARs, the Knight Commission, the AAUP, the Division IA Athletic Directors, the College Sports Project, and the N4A were each sought out for advice on previous drafts. This paper incorporates many of their thoughtful suggestions.

1. Academic Integrity and Quality Reforms

"Intercollegiate athletics programs shall be maintained as a vital component of the educational program, and student-athletes shall be an integral part of the student body. The admission, academic standing and academic progress of student-athletes shall be consistent with the policies and standards adopted by the institution for the student body in general."

NCAA Constitution, Article 2.5

A fundamental principle of the NCAA, expressed in Article 2 of its Constitution, is that student-athletes shall be held to the same academic standards as all other students at the institution. The NCAA enforces this principle for Division I schools through its Athletics Certification Procedure, which requires each institution to demonstrate that its admissions and academic policies are applied consistently for athletes and non-athletes and that they are administered by the same academic officials for all students. But while it has established a clear standard, the NCAA does not have the resources to monitor the implementation of these principles at every Division I school, nor the responsibility to do so. Moreover, certification occurs only once every 10 years. The maintenance of academic integrity and quality for all students, including student-athletes, is the primary responsibility of the institution's faculty. The faculty's role begins with the recruiting and admissions processes and...
continues through to graduation. As with all other students, faculty must be deeply involved in academic aspects of the student-athlete’s university experience. Faculty involvement includes overseeing admissions policies to ensure that admitted student-athletes are able to perform at university level and that they have a reasonable prospect of obtaining a degree; setting minim standards for eligibility to compete that are consistent with the goal of having every student-athlete graduate; and ensuring that student-athletes are not denied the opportunity to pursue their educational objectives because of the demands of participation in athletics. In short, the faculty charged with enabling student-athletes to attain their academic potential and preparing them for the post-university real world. Faculty must take the lead in pressing for academic reforms to student-athletes to reach their educational and life goals.

1.1 Institutional Admission and Recruiting Policies

1.1.1 Student-athletes should be admitted based on their potential for academic success and not primarily on athletic contribution to the institution. General admissions policies should be the same for all student-athletes and non-student-athletes. Campus administrators and campus faculty governance bodies should work together to develop admission policies consistent with the educational mission of the institution. [COIA 2005 Report to NCAA Presidential Task Force section VIII recommendations 1-3 & goal 2; and national (NCAA certification)]

1.1.2 The academic profiles of freshmen or transfer student-athletes as a group and by sport should be similar to those of the entering freshman class or the non-athlete transfer cohort, as applicable. Data on the academic profiles of entering student-athletes and non-student-athletes should be reviewed at least annually by the Campus Athletics Board or the campus faculty governance body. [COIA 2005 Report to NCAA Presidential Task Force section VIII recommendations 1-3 & goal 2; local and national (NCAA certification)]

1.1.3 Special admissions of freshman and transfer student-athletes should reflect the same philosophy as admissions of non-student-athletes. Data on the academic performance of student-athlete special admissions should be reviewed at least annually by the Campus Athletic Board or the campus faculty governance body. [New; local and national (NCAA certification)]

1.1.4 Faculty should be involved in developing and overseeing campus policies regarding recruiting of student-athletes. [New; local and national (NCAA certification)]

1.2 The Primacy of Academics

1.2.1 No academic programs or majors should be designed specifically for student-athletes or created for the purpose of allowing student-athletes to maintain their eligibility. Qualified student-athletes should be allowed and in fact encouraged to pursue the major of their choice and to have the same access to academic classes and programs as other students without explicit or implicit athletic consequences. Data on student-athletes' choice of major should be gathered and evaluated by the campus faculty governance or the Campus Athletic Board and should also be provided to all prospective recruits. [New; local and national (NCAA certification)]

1.2.2 To preserve academic integrity, the campus faculty governance body or the Campus Athletic Board should monitor student-athlete enrollment by course. [COIA 2005 Academic Integrity in Intercollegiate Athletics section 3.1; local and national (NCAA certification)]

1.2.3 Academic Progress Rate (APR), Graduation Success Rate (GSR) and other available graduation rate should be reviewed annually by the campus faculty governance body to sustain processes that will improve the academic success and graduation rates of student-athletes. [New; local and national (NCAA certification)]
1.2.4 The NCAA should continue to enforce rigorously contemporaneous and historical penalties for team institutions that fail to meet NCAA APR and GSR standards. [New; national (enforcement of existing N legislation)]

1.2.5 To ensure that student-athletes are acquiring the educational foundation leading to a degree, eligibility shall be dependent on the maintenance of a minimum cumulative GPA of 2.0 on a 4.0 scale. [local, conferences and national (NCAA legislation)]

2. Student-Athlete Welfare Reforms

"If the Knight Commission felt that everything was going on as it should be, there wouldn't be a Knight Commission."

Amy Perko, executive director of the Knight Commission, in response to a question about whether a plan for stricter academic standards is working, Chronicle of Higher Education, 09-14-2006

Local and national surveys, including results from the 2007 NCAA GOALS and SCORE study document high levels of student-athlete satisfaction with their collegiate experience. Aggregate survey data, however, frequently obscure important financial, academic and social welfare issues significantly and oftentimes negatively affect the educational experience of many individual student-athletes. For example, student-athletes would be more secure in the knowledge that scholarships will be renewed annually assuming they remain in good academic standing and adhere to athletics department and campus codes of conduct. Course assignment completion and exam preparation would be improved if competitive events and athletics practices were scheduled to minimize missed classes and lost study time. Concerted efforts to enhance student-athlete integration into campus life would likely arrest the increasing isolation of student-athletes from the rest of campus. Such integration must be a responsibility shared across all stakeholder groups, including faculty, instead of leaving it solely to the athletic department. Strengthening academic oversight of athletics learning centers would enhance the quality and integrity of these facilities. Improvements in these areas would enable student-athletes to participate more fully in the academic and social aspects of campus life.

2.1 Athletics Scholarships

2.1.1 Athletics scholarships should be awarded on a year-by-year basis with the presumption that they should renewed up to four times for a total award of five years, or until graduation, whichever comes first. Students who are in good academic standing, conform to campus codes for student behavior, conform to athletics department's standards of conduct, and adhere to team rules. Institutions should establish criteria for revoking a scholarship. The final authority for revoking a scholarship should rest with the campus' chief financial aid officer or with the chief academic officer. A student awarded an athletics scholarship who is no longer participating in athletics should be counted against the NCAA maximum number of awards for that sport, unless the scholarship is revoked. [COIA 2005 Academic Integrity Intercollegiate Athletics section 2.1; local and national (NCAA legislation)]

2.2 Competition and Practice Scheduling

2.2.1 Individual athletic competitions, as distinct from conference, regional and national tournaments
championships, shall not be scheduled during final exam periods unless an exception is granted by Campus Athletics Board or equivalent. [COIA 2005 Academic Integrity in Intercollegiate Athletics section 4.3.6; local, conferences, and national (NCAA legislation)]

2.2.2 Individual athletic competitions and associated travel should be scheduled to minimize lost class time. Institutional policies designed to minimize lost class time should be described. [COIA 2005 Academic Integrity in Intercollegiate Athletics section 4.3; local, conferences, and national (NCAA legislation)]

2.2.3 Athletically-related activities (e.g., formal and informal practices, team meetings, and any activities at which the attendance of student-athletes is required) should be scheduled outside the prime times for academic classes. Each institution should explain how it achieves this scheduling goal. [New; local, conference: national (NCAA certification)]

2.3 **Integration into Campus Life**

2.3.1 Life skills and personal development programs for student-athletes should have as a goal the integration of student-athlete into the rest of the student population. These programs should help student-athletes develop an appropriate balance between their athletic time requirements and their paramount need for academic integration. Administrators, faculty and athletic departments should mitigate the time demands of student-athletes to allow them to pursue the full range of educational experiences open to other students. [COIA 2005 Report to NCAA Presidential Task Force section VII recommendation 2b & 2e; local, conferences, and national (NCAA certification)]

2.4 **Campus Integration of Academic Advising for Student-Athletes**

2.4.1 Academic advising and academic support for student-athletes should be structured to give student-athletes a valuable and meaningful educational experience as possible and not just to maintain their athletic eligibility. [COIA 2005 Report to NCAA Presidential Task Force section VII recommendation 2c; local, conferences, and national (NCAA certification)]

2.4.2 The academic advising facility for student-athletes should be integrated into and report through the existing academic advising structure and not through the Athletics Department. [COIA 2003 Framework for Comprehensive Athletics Reform section 1.4; local and national (NCAA certification)]

2.4.3 The campus academic advising structure or the office of the chief academic officer should have oversight and regularly review the academic advising of student-athletes. [COIA 2003 Framework for Comprehensive Athletics Reform section 1.4; local and national (NCAA certification)]

2.4.4 Athletic academic advisors should be appointed by and work for the campus academic advising structure, not solely for the Athletics Department. [COIA 2003 Framework for Comprehensive Athletics Reform section 1.4; local and national (NCAA certification)]

3. **Campus Governance of Intercollegiate Athletics Reforms**

"The bad part is (the athletics department) is something that has to be watched so carefully because when you get in trouble, it's something you get hammered on all across the nation, from the press and your own constituents."

Karen Holbrook, president of Ohio State University, providing an explanation for the sizable amount of time spent by university presidents on intercollegiate athletics. Indianapolis Star, 01-09-2006
It is universally agreed that athletics programs, like all other programs at universities and colleges, must adhere to and support the academic mission. Most athletics departments aspire to attain this goal. Ensuring that athletics activities are consistent with the institution’s educational mission requires formal campus oversight processes and increased conversation between athletics and the rest of campus. Campus Faculty Athletics Representatives (FARs) play a key role in both issues because of their knowledge of and involvement in many aspects of athletics including NCAA certification of student-athlete eligibility. The COIA formally acknowledges and deeply appreciates the efforts of campus FARs to ensure the academic integrity of their programs. However, the increasing complexities of intercollegiate athletics on most Division IA campuses require additional, broad-based campus oversight through the Faculty Senate (or equivalent) and other official governance bodies. These campus groups should work closely with the FAR, AD and campus president to provide input on academic, fiscal, and student-athlete welfare issues. To be successful, these governance reforms must be supported by the University President who has the ultimate responsibility for integrating athletics into academics. Effective presidential leadership on this issue will only occur as a result of close consultation with and advice from faculty through faculty governance structures.
3. **Campus Governance of Intercollegiate Athletics**

3.1 Each NCAA member institution should establish a Campus Athletic Board. The charge of this Board should monitor and oversee campus intercollegiate athletics. A majority of Board members should be tenured faculty who should be appointed or elected through rules established by the campus faculty governance body. The Faculty Athletic Representative should be an ex officio voting or non-voting member of the Board chair of the Board should be a senior (tenured) faculty member. An Athletic Director should not be a voting or non-voting member of the Board. The chair of the Board should be a senior (tenured) faculty member. An Athletic Director should not be the chair. [COIA 2004 Campus Athletics Governance - the Faculty Role section 2B; local and national (NCAA certification)]

3.2 Major athletic department decisions (e.g., hiring of the athletic director and key athletic department personnel, changes in the total number of intercollegiate sports, initiation of major capital projects, etc.) should be in consultation with the Campus Athletic Board and leaders of the campus faculty governance body. Appropriate faculty committees(s). [COIA 2005 Report to NCAA Presidential Task Force section recommendation 1b; local and national (NCAA certification)]

3.3 The Faculty Athletic Representative (FAR) should be appointed by the University President based on recommendation by the campus faculty governance body. The FAR appointment should be made for a specific term and a review of the performance of the FAR should take place prior to reappointment. Such a review should include meaningful participation by the campus faculty governance body, or the Campus Athletic Board. [COIA 2004 Campus Athletics Governance - the Faculty Role section 1B; local and national (NCAA certification)]

3.4 The Athletic Director, Faculty Athletic Representative and the Campus Athletic Board chair should report orally and in writing at least once a year to the campus faculty governance body. Their reports should include academic benchmarks including the APR, GSR, graduation rates and the percentage and progress of student-athlete special admits. [COIA 2005 Report to NCAA Presidential Task Force section recommendation 1c; local, conferences and national (NCAA certification)]

3.5 Leaders of campus faculty governance body should report annually to the University President (1) the extent to which the faculty has been able to fulfill its responsibilities in regard to athletic governance, or (2) that it has not been able to fulfill any of these responsibilities in regard to athletic governance. These reports shall be made available to the NCAA during re-certification [COIA 2004 Campus Athletics Governance - the Faculty Role section 3A; local and national (NCAA certification)]

4. **Fiscal Responsibility Reforms**

"It is America, and it doesn’t bother me if (baseball player) Alex Rodriguez makes $25 million a year because that’s private (business). It doesn’t matter to me what Allen Iverson (of the NBA) gets. But at the university level, in athletics, there has to be some stability.”

Skip Bertman, Louisiana State University athletics director, on “excessive” college pay packages, USA Today, 01-04-2007

One of the biggest issues currently facing university presidents and athletics department administrators is athletics cost containment. Recent NCAA data demonstrate that athletics department budgets across the country are rising much more quickly that that of the rest of the university. Finding sufficient resources to underwrite these increases is straining institutional finances already burdened by rising academic expenses. The impact of this growth is particularly severe at institutions, such as
the non-BCS schools, that do not have the ability to offset mounting expenditures with new revenue sources. The non-BCS schools, for example, feel pressure to schedule football games during the week in order to compete for precious television coverage otherwise dominated by the major conferences. The 2006 NCAA Presidential Task Force report proposed many excellent approaches that begin to tackle this complex situation. The COIA fully supports the PTF fiscal reform package. Here we propose additional reforms that complement the PTF proposals. The PTF and COIA proposals together form a strong foundation that addresses the challenges associated with keeping athletic expenses in alignment with institutional values, mission and goals. As with the other reforms proposed in this paper, strong leadership on these fiscal responsibility reforms must be exerted at the University President. Successful implementation of these proposals will only occur through a working relationship between the University President, faculty leaders, and senior athletics department personnel. Schools, particularly those within conferences, should work with each other to develop strategies to control costs that do not raise anti-trust concerns.

4. **Fiscal Responsibility**

4.1 The Athletic Department’s budgets, revenues and expenditures should be transparent and aligned with the mission, goals and values of the institution. The University President should take the lead to ensure that reports, including dash board indicators as listed in the 2006 NCAA Presidential Task Force report, are annually and made available to the campus faculty governance body. The President should work closely with faculty leaders, existing faculty committees, and athletic department personnel to achieve these goals. [2005 report to NCAA Presidential Task Force section I; local, conferences and national (NCAA certification)]

4.2 The overall annual growth rate in the Athletic Department’s operating expenditures should be no greater than the overall annual growth rate in the university’s operating expenditures. [New; local, conferences national (NCAA certification)]

4.3 The athletic department budget should be integrated into the university general budget process where feasible. The proposed athletic department budget should be evaluated by the same process as the budget for academic units. [COIA 2005 report to NCAA Presidential Task Force section I; local and national (NCAA certification)]

4.4 The University President should take the appropriate steps to fuse athletic fundraising efforts into those of the rest of the university, including eliminating separate, athletic-only 501(c)(3) entities and establishing faculty representation on the board of the institutional fund-raising entity [New; local and national (NCAA certification)]

4.5 Commercialization policies in athletics should be comparable to other commercialization policies cond throughout the University and should include meaningful faculty participation in their oversight. [New; local and national (NCAA certification)]

**ROAD MAP FOR REFORM**

"In my view, faculty must take a leadership role on academic reform issues."

NCAA President Myles Brand at the Sport Business Journal Intercollegiate Athletic Forum in NYC, 12-10-2003

It is increasingly clear that national sports reform cannot be implemented without the strong support of and leadership by faculty. The COIA, as an organization of faculty governance bodies, has emerged as one of the primary faculty voices for a realistic and feasible reform agenda. Success will
not be possible, however, if faculty do not work together with other stakeholder groups. Dialog is necessary first step to identify and delineate the issues, and collaboration with groups mentioned throughout this document is imperative for forward progress. To achieve the reform goals outlined requires consensus, concerted effort, and action at a variety of levels, from local to conference national.

At the local level, the campus faculty governance body, usually the Faculty Senate, is the most likely primary venue for these conversations. Faculty leaders must bring all stakeholders to the discussion to including the President, Athletic Director, Governing Board members, FAR, student-athletes, athletic boards, and the faculty at large. The COIA understands that each institution is unique, with its own ethos, atmosphere and culture. Each campus will therefore need to review each reform individually to ascertain its local appropriateness. What works well on one campus may be unsuitable at other institutions. Schools already in the "reform mode" may find that many of the recommendations are already in place on their campuses. The course of action for these schools might be to connect directly with other universities in their conferences to put together a conference roadmap. Schools that feel they have no official faculty voice on athletics issues may find recommendations daunting. For those schools, the course of action might be to form a core group of informed faculty to meet with administrators and begin the process of defining shared governance on their campus. Whatever the current circumstances, the proposed reforms in this document should be used by faculty governance bodies as a starting point to design their own campus-specific agenda.

Ultimate success of these proposals depends on the commitment and leadership shown by the University President. Most university presidents directly oversee athletic departments and are in a position to effect change. For example, it is only the university presidents who can protect athletic directors and coaches who demonstrate adherence to the educational mission of the institution even though that might potentially risk competitive success. The COIA cannot be more emphatic in calling for university presidents to initiate and oversee local, campus-wide discussions leading implementation of new policies and procedures that ensure the integration of athletics into institution’s academic mission. However, even the most courageous and steadfast University President will be unable to achieve these goals without strong, consistent backing from the faculty and the board of governors/trustees. Without that support, university presidents will be unable to withstand the onslaught of public criticism from boosters and others who remain wedded to the separation of athletics from academics.

Other reforms described in this white paper are aimed at the conferences, which oversee many aspects of intercollegiate athletics. We strongly encourage conferences to hold frank discussions with their member institutions on the issues raised here, including but not limited to athletics scheduling, student-athlete welfare, integration of athletics into academics, eligibility standards, and athletics expenditures. We believe the conference commissioners in conjunction with Faculty Athletic Representatives and university presidents can and should provide the necessary leadership and critical mass to initiate and direct these conversations in a profitable direction.

Still other reforms detailed here can only be implemented successfully at the national level. Many of them require changes in NCAA legislation. The COIA looks forward to working closely with the NCAA leadership and its members to move these proposals forward with the shared goal of achieving long-term sports reform.

Although most of the proposals presented here address the need for academic primacy over all athletic
endeavors, the COIA is not unaware that financial needs drive many athletics decisions. Many currently facing college sports, including over-commercialization, the athletics "arms race pay-for-play, rapidly rising athletics budgets, coaches’ compensation, and competition between academic and athletics fundraising, all stem from a local inability to rein in athletics expenditures. This problem, which threatens the long term health of intercollegiate athletics, is beyond the control of university presidents, Conference Commissioners or even the NCAA.

Solutions to the problems of intercollegiate athletics outlined here and in our previous papers and reports will only be obtained through respectful conversation and a strong consensus of all stakeholder groups. Towards this goal, we propose the initiation of annual national summit meetings of all stakeholders for the explicit purpose of developing and implementing practical solutions that will allow intercollegiate sports to thrive and prosper into the indefinite future.
APPENDIX A: LIST OF PROPOSALS

1.1 Institutional Admission and Recruiting Policies

1.1.1 Student-athletes should be admitted based on their potential for academic success and not primarily their athletic contribution to the institution. General admissions policies should be the same for students, student-athletes and non-student-athletes. Campus administrators and campus faculty governance bodies should work together to develop admission policies consistent with the education mission of the institution. [COIA 2005 Report to NCAA Presidential Task Force Section VIII recommendations 1-3 & goal 2; local and national (NCAA certification)]

1.1.2 The academic profiles of freshmen or transfer student-athletes as a group and by sport should be similar to those of the entering freshman class or the non-athlete transfer cohort, as applicable. Data on the academic profiles of entering student-athletes and non-student-athletes should be reviewed at least annually by the Campus Athletics Board or the campus faculty governance body. [COIA 2005 Report to NCAA Presidential Task Force section VIII goal recommendations 1-3 & goal 2; local and national (NCAA certification)]

1.1.3 Special admissions of freshman and transfer student-athletes should reflect the same philosophy as special admissions of non-student-athletes. Data on the academic performance of student-athlete special admits should be reviewed at least annually by the Campus Athletics Board or the campus faculty governance body. [New; local and national (NCAA certification)]

1.1.4 Faculty should be involved in developing and overseeing campus policies regarding recruiting of student athletes. [New; local and national (NCAA certification)]

1.2 The Primacy of Academics

1.2.1 No academic programs or majors should be designed specifically for student-athletes or created in purpose of allowing student-athletes to maintain their eligibility. Qualified student-athletes should be allowed and in fact encouraged to pursue the major of their choice and to have the same access to academic classes and programs as other students without explicit or implicit athletic consequences. Data on student-athletes' choice of major should be gathered and evaluated by the campus faculty governance body or the Campus Athletic Board and should also be provided to all prospective recruits. [New; local and national (NCAA certification)]

1.2.2 To preserve academic integrity, the campus faculty governance body or the Campus Athletic Board should monitor student-athlete enrollment by course. [COIA 2005 Academic Integrity in Intercollegiate Athletics section 3.1; local and national (NCAA certification)]

1.2.3 Academic Progress Rate (APR), Graduation Success Rate (GSR) and other available graduation rate data should be reviewed annually by the campus faculty governance body to sustain processes that improve the academic success and graduation rates of student-athletes. [New; local and national (NCAA certification)]

1.2.4
The NCAA should continue to enforce rigorously contemporaneous and historical penalties for teams and institutions that fail to meet NCAA APR and GSR standards. [New; national (enforcement of existing NCAA legislation)]

1.2.5

To ensure that student-athletes are acquiring the educational foundation leading to a degree, athletic eligibility shall be dependent on the maintenance of a minimum cumulative GPA of 2.0 on a 4.0 scale. [New; local, conferences and national (NCAA legislation)]

2.1 Athletics Scholarships

2.1.1 Athletics scholarships should be awarded on a year-by-year basis with the presumption that they should be renewed up to four times for a total award of five years, or until graduation, whichever comes first, for students who are in good academic standing, conform to campus codes for student behavior, conform to the athletics department’s standards of conduct, and adhere to team rules. Institutions should establish criteria and a mechanism for revoking a scholarship. The final authority for revoking a scholarship should rest with the campus’ chief financial aid officer or with the chief academic officer. A student awarded an athletics scholarship who is no longer participating in athletics should be counted against the NCAA maximum number of awards for that sport, unless the scholarship is revoked. [COIA 2005 Academic Integrity in Intercollegiate Athletics section 2.1; local and national (NCAA legislation)]

2.2 Competition and Practice Scheduling

2.2.1 Individual athletic competitions, as distinct from conference, regional and national tournament championships, shall not be scheduled during final exam periods unless an exception is granted by the Campus Athletics Board or equivalent. [COIA 2005 Academic Integrity in Intercollegiate Athletics section 4.3.6; local, conferences, and national (NCAA legislation)]

2.2.2 Individual athletic competitions and associated travel should be scheduled to minimize lost class time. Institutional policies designed to minimize lost class time should be described. [COIA 2005 Academic Integrity in Intercollegiate Athletics section 4.3; local, conferences, and national (NCAA certification)]

2.2.3 Athletically-related activities (e.g., formal and informal practices, team meetings, and any activities at which the attendance of student-athletes is required) should be scheduled outside the prime times for academic classes. The institution should explain how it achieves this scheduling goal. [New; local, conferences and national (NCAA certification)]

2.3 Integration into Campus Life

2.3.1 Life skills and personal development programs for student-athletes should have as a goal the integration of the student-athlete into the rest of the student population. These programs shall ensure that student-athletes develop an appropriate balance between their athletic time requirements and the paramount need for academic and social integration. Administrators, faculty and athletic department should mitigate the time demand on student-athletes to allow them to pursue the full range of educational experiences open to other students. [COIA 2005 Report to NCAA Presidential Task Force section VII recommendation 2b & 2e; local, conferences, and national (NCAA certification)]
2.4 Campus Integration of Academic Advising for Student-Athletes

2.4.1 Academic advising and academic support for student-athletes should be structured to give student-athletes as valuable and meaningful an educational experience as possible and not just to maintain their athletic eligibility. [COIA 2005 Report to NCAA Presidential Task Force section VII recommendation 2c; local, conferences, and national (NCAA certification)]

2.4.2 The academic advising facility for student-athletes should be integrated into and report through the existing academic advising structure and not through the Athletics Department. [COIA 2003 Framework for Comprehensive Athletics Reform section 1.4; local and national (NCAA certification)]

2.4.3 The campus academic advising structure or the office of the chief academic officer should have oversight of and regularly review the academic advising of student-athletes. [COIA 2003 Framework for Comprehensive Athletics Reform section 1.4; local and national (NCAA certification)]

2.4.4 Athletic academic advisors should be appointed by and work for the campus academic advising structure and not solely for the Athletics Department. [COIA 2003 Framework for Comprehensive Athletics Reform section 1.4; local and national (NCAA certification)]

3. Campus Governance of Intercollegiate Athletics

3.1 Each NCAA member institution should establish a Campus Athletic Board. The charge of this Board should be to monitor and oversee campus intercollegiate athletics. A majority of Board members should be tenured faculty who should be appointed or elected through rules established by the campus faculty governance body. The Faculty Athletic Representative should be an ex officio voting or non-voting member of the Board. The chair of the Board should be a senior (tenured) faculty member. An Athletic Director should not be chair. [COIA 2004 Campus Athletics Governance - the Faculty Role section 2B; local and national (NCAA legislation)]

3.2 Major athletic department decisions (e.g., hiring of the athletic director and key athletic department personnel, changes in the total number of intercollegiate sports, initiation of major capital projects, etc.) should be made in consultation with the Campus Athletic Board and leaders of the campus faculty governance body. [COIA 2005 Report to NCAA Presidential Task Force section VII recommendation 1b; local and national (NCAA certification)]

3.3 The Faculty Athletic Representative (FAR) should be appointed by the University President based on recommendation by the campus faculty governance body. The FAR appointment should be made for a specific term and a review of the performance of the FAR should take place prior to reappointment. Such a review should include meaningful participation by the campus faculty governance body, or Campus Athletic Board. [COIA 2004 Campus Athletics Governance - the Faculty Role section 1B; local and national (NCAA legislation)]

3.4 The Athletic Director, Faculty Athletic Representative and the Campus Athletic Board chair should report orally and in writing at least once a year to the campus faculty governance body. The reports should include a focus on academic benchmarks including the APR, GSR, graduation rates and the percentage and progress of student athlete special admits. [COIA 2005 Report to NCAA Presidential Task Force section VII recommendation 1c; local, conferences and national (NCAA certification)]

3.5 Leaders of campus faculty governance body should report annually to the University President (that the faculty has been able to fulfill its responsibilities in regard to athletic governance, or (2) that it
Framing the Future text and appendix has not, in which case the report should specify the obstacles that have prevented it from doing so. These reports should be made available to the NCAA during re-certification [COIA 2004 Campus Athletics Governance - the Faculty Role section 3A; local and national (NCAA certification)]

4. Fiscal Responsibility

4.1 The Athletic Department’s budgets, revenues and expenditures should be transparent and align with the mission, goals and values of the institution. The University President should take the lead to ensure that fiscal reports, including dashboard indicators as listed in the 2006 NCAA Presidential Task Force report, are issued annually and made available to the campus faculty governance body. The President should work closely with faculty leaders, existing faculty committees, and athletic department personnel to achieve these goals. [COIA 2005 report to NCAA Presidential Task Force section I; local, conferences and national (NCAA certification)]

4.2 The overall annual growth rate in the Athletic Department’s operating expenditures should be greater than the overall annual growth rate in the university’s operating expenditures. [New; local, conferences and national (NCAA certification)]

4.3 The athletic department budget should be integrated into the university general budget process where feasible. The proposed athletic department budget should be evaluated by the same process as a budget for academic units. [COIA 2005 report to NCAA Presidential Task Force section I; local and national (NCAA certification)]

4.4 The University President should take the appropriate steps to fuse athletic fundraising efforts with those of the rest of the university, including eliminating separate, athletic-only 501(c)(3) entities and establishing faculty representation on the board of the institutional fund-raising entity [New; local and national (NCAA certification)]

4.5 Commercialization policies in athletics should be comparable to other commercialization conducted throughout the University and should include meaningful faculty participation in their oversight. [New; local and national (NCAA certification)]
From Florida State University

How would you describe the level of activity of your Senate in the COIA? Our steering committee has been very active in investigating COIA, discussing its purpose and deciding to join when the coalition grew to about 50 schools. Our past pres. and faculty rep have attended the national meetings where the white paper was finalized. We were active in discussion and input into the white paper. We presented this info to our Senate and they approved joining without any dissent.

Do you think COIA membership has given your faculty a more informed and active role in athletic affairs at your university? We already have a very strong and active involvement in academic affairs and have had for years. We were already in compliance with all of the univ level recommendations in the white paper. We have advised our Pres and Athletic Dir. that we are pursuing this affiliation and will be bringing issues from COIA to FSU for adoption. Everyone thinks this is a good idea. The Athletic dir. does not necessarily agree with the white paper's recommendation for national NCAA changes in policy but he recognizes the faculty's right to try to influence this process.

What other benefits do you perceive that you have gained from COIA membership? We feel that we have aligned with a very prestigious group of individuals that share our values about university athletics and that this coalition may have future impact on the NCAA. There are a good number of ACC schools involved.

Has there been any down side to membership in COIA? None that we are aware of.

Please add any other comments that you think might be helpful in our deliberations. Our Senate generally feels that this is a good thing and that as advocates for students, we, the faculty might, just be able to influence national policy.

Jayne Standley, Pres.
FSU Faculty Senate
From Wake Forest University

I am the Wake Forest University Senate representative to the COIA. I am pleased to hear that you are considering joining the Coalition, and will be happy to answer your questions.

How would you describe the level of activity of your Senate in the COIA?
Wake Forest was among the first universities to join the COIA, and has sent a representative to each of its meetings. I will be taking over as COIA co-chair in May. So we are very active.

Do you think COIA membership has given your faculty a more informed and active role in athletic affairs at your university?
We have an Athletics Committee at Wake Forest, which surprisingly, some schools do not. I am a member of the Athletics Committee, and have reported to them annually on the issues that arise at the COIA meetings. This has given us the opportunity to discuss some of these issues. I also report annually to the Senate. So the faculty is better informed, and the administration is aware that we are taking an active interest issues such as recruiting, financial contributions of the college to Athletics, and academic standards.

What other benefits do you perceive that you have gained from COIA membership?
One of the benefits of being a member of COIA is that it is the only national organization of faculty senates that I know of. The discussion at the socials covers much more than athletic issues. Most of the representatives to COIA are senate presidents or ex-senate presidents. We have a chance to compare academic governing structures and other issues facing our universities.

Has there been any down side to membership in COIA?
None that I can think of.

If you have any other questions, please feel free to contact me!

Carole Browne
From the University of South Carolina (received in summer, prior to inquiry)

USC has been participating in COIA for the last couple of years. The group began in 2003 with a concern over the need for a stronger faculty voice in collegiate athletics, and an increased focus on the welfare of student athletes.

As you might expect from a group composed of leaders of faculty senates from Division I schools, this is a very collegial group with tremendous consensus-building abilities. COIA is welcoming to all Division IA schools to join the group, and there are no dues, and it is not necessary to agree with any of the specific premises of the proposals that are in development. This year, Myles Brandt, the President of NCAA joined the meeting to deliver a keynote talk, and two of the NCAA senior staff were on hand throughout the meeting to help advise the group on NCAA practices and policies.

I am in support of COIA personally because it seems intent on expressing the faculty voice in issues that are of significant concern in the life of the academy. Below are some key points that might help frame their role for you.

1) COIA is a national Division IA organization.
2) It is a group of faculty senates, not individual faculty.
3) COIA currently has 55 members (out of 117 DIA schools).
4) No membership fee or annual cost other than appointing a COIA rep and attending, where possible, our annual meetings.
5) COIA is run by flexible consensus. We do not require lockstep agreement. No single member organization will agree with all of our proposals. Most are best practices guidelines.
6) The COIA group has developed strong working ties with the NCAA and the Knight Commission as well as many other national groups involved in intercollegiate sports.
7) Our current white paper, released publicly in mid-June recommends 29 proposals related to collegiate athletic practices. Many of these will be jointly put forward by COIA and NCAA for adoption by the NCAA through the legislative or certification process.

Robert G. Best, Ph.D.
USC Faculty Senate Chair
Professor and Director, Division of Genetics
University of South Carolina School of Medicine
Department of Obstetrics & Gynecology
From Auburn

Our level of activity is not high. The Senate, of course, voted to join the COIA a few years ago. Since that time, one or two Senate leaders have attended a COIA meeting each year and reported back to the Senate and our Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics on the activities. As a matter of courtesy, I also copy the Athletic Director and several members of the compliance staff on what occurred at the COIA meeting.

I don't think our faculty are more informed about athletics at our university, but they are more informed regarding the state of athletics in the NCAA and nationwide. The initiatives of the COIA are largely aimed at maintaining and increasing academic standards and our faculty truly appreciate such initiatives. So in that regard, I believe COIA membership has been valuable at Auburn. Most of the COIA initiatives have NCAA support which makes it better. As I understand it, the NCAA views COIA as an important outlet for supporting and even introducing such initiatives since it give them a direct link to the faculties at member institutions.

Other benefits...I would say insight into what has been introduced and where the NCAA is heading is a large benefit. It allows the Senate and faculty extra time to plan how initiatives would be implemented on-campus and how they would affect our programs. We have not seen any downside at this point. I believe the only negative is that at this time there are only approximately 57 institutions who are members. The larger that number grows, the more influence and impact COIA initiatives will have throughout the academic community.

Personally, I believe that COIA membership was a good choice for Auburn. Since it focuses so much on academics and the well-being of athletes, the initiatives are moving in the right direction. Some of the things which are addressed are cost-saving initiatives which most everyone supports.

I hope that information is useful.

David Cicci, Chair
AU Faculty and Senate
844-6820
From the University of Arkansas

The University of Arkansas has been associated with the COIA since 2001/2002. Curt Rom served as the Campus Faculty Chair, later the Faculty Senate Chair, at that time and was a part of the original COIA steering committee that developed the organization, etc. Subsequently, when I was the chair, I took over the role of being the representative to COIA for the university. We now have a system where the Faculty Senate Chair and an appointed faculty representative serve as the liaisons between the UA faculty and COIA. I have served as the representative attending COIA meetings, etc. since 2003/2004.

Thomas D. Jensen, Ph.D.
Sam M. Walton College of Business

How would you describe the level of activity of your Senate in the COIA?
Moderate. Early it was with a Faculty Senate Chair on the steering committee for COIA. Now we send a representative (me) to all COIA meetings and then to report back to the Faculty Senate and, when needed, Athletic Committee. Our Provost of Academic Affairs picks up the tab for expenses and is very supportive of the activity.

Do you think COIA membership has given your faculty a more informed and active role in athletics affairs at your university?
As the COIA representative I have found the association to be very useful in bringing back best and worst practices from other institutions. In my reports to the Faculty Senate, I am always quick to remind the senators of the good things we have as well as some things that could be improved, examined, etc. Yesterday the Faculty Senate Executive Committee forwarded the latest COIA white paper to the Athletic Committee with the charge to report on the “campus level” COIA recommendations at the November Faculty Senate meeting. Having an organization and its documents as a starting point for campus dialogues is very useful.

What other benefits do you perceive that you have gained from COIA membership?
There are many different benefits including (1) being informed other university practices and situations, (b) having a document as a starting point for campus discussions, and (c) having a “seat at the table.” This last one is very important. COIA has the attention of the NCAA, Knight Commission, etc. as the faculty voice. I believe all Division 1 institutions should be involved in giving the faculty voice. I agree with most, but not all, the COIA recommendations in the recent white paper. Representing the University of Arkansas faculty, I had the opportunity shape the faculty voice, have the UA faculty voice heard.

Has there been any down side to membership in COIA?
Not all of COIA’s positions and/or recommendations are supported by the UA Faculty Senate. In fact a huge downside is that COIA normally needs me, as the representative, and the current Faculty Chair to vote on specific recommendations, white papers, etc. without the full Faculty Senate seeing the documents, debating the issues, or voting for support, abstention, or nonsupport. Some institutions do not participate in that voting unless their senate has had the opportunity to see, debate, and vote.
Auburn comments continued

Please add any other comments that you think might be helpful in our deliberations. The association with COIA has assisted with the dialogue about athletics on campus. It has also facilitated conversations at the national level (e.g., COIA itself, NCAA, Knight Commission. A recent e-mail from one of the co-chairs, Nathan Tublitz at Oregon, stated: “Two things you might consider doing on your campuses are: 1) initiate a dialog on the white paper in your campus governance system this fall; and 2) develop a conference wide faculty leadership meeting to discuss issues of common interest including but not limited to athletics.” I think using COIA and COIA materials as a starting point for some dialogue between the SEC Faculty Senates about athletics and other issues would be extremely valuable. The SEC Academic Consortium is another excellent avenue. The consortium, however, was not initiated by faculty, nor does it necessarily represent the faculty voice.
From the University of Mississippi

Honestly, I didn’t even realize that we were an official member of COIA. Nevertheless, I find it to be an interesting organization and appreciate their concerns and goals.

We have an Athletics Committee with quite a few faculty representatives. The Chair of the Committee is Professor Ron Rychlak who serves as a faculty advocate on campus. I’m copying Ron on this because my feeling is to let Ron’s committee decide the level and degree of involvement they would like to have with COIA. Ron and I agree that it would likely be unproductive to have two different faculty groups trying to do the same types of things. I will try and answer your questions as best as I can.

*How would you describe the level of activity of your Senate in the COIA?*
Very small; I have spoken with Ginny Shepard (by email) on half a dozen occasions.

*Do you think COIA membership has given your faculty a more informed and active role in athletic affairs at your university?*
Ron and I have visited the COIA website, and try to check on updates to it, but honestly Ron stays on top of our athletic-faculty relations and what others are doing much more so than I. He is good enough to keep the faculty informed of what is going on.

*What other benefits do you perceive that you have gained from COIA membership?*
I personally believe that what the COIA is trying to do is a good thing. That is to bring together athletics and academics in positive ways. I think that this is something that we need to encourage and support.

*Has there been any downside to membership in COIA?*
This is my 2nd time to serve as Chair of our faculty senate; I served 10 or 12 years ago as well. One thing that I have learned is that any kind of confrontational approach to solving problems is a waste of time and energy; it rarely solves anything. I’ve not had enough interaction with COIA to determine whether their approach is demanding or discussing, but if it is the former, I would rather approach issues and concerns outside of their organization.

*Please add any other comments that you think might be helpful in our deliberations.*
I would really appreciate if you would let me know of your final decision and some of the reasons for it. I promise to keep them confidential, but it would really give me some insight as well.

John S. Williamson
Professor
Department of Medicinal Chemistry
School of Pharmacy
University of Mississippi
Handling Student Threats to Self & Others

Suggestions for Referring Students Who Threaten to Harm Themselves or Others

1. When a student lets you know that he/she is considering harming him/herself or others, consult with Counseling and Psychological Services (CAPS) at 656-2451 as soon as feasible. For after-hours coverage and when the University is officially closed, access CAPS counselor on-call through CUPD 656-2222. If you e-mail CAPS, be sure and follow up with a phone call in urgent matters.

2. The CAPS psychologist will advise you on possible actions to take. These may include: summon immediate emergency aid (calling 911), walk-over of student to CAPS, on-site visit by CAPS psychologist, or developing agreement for next day walk-over to CAPS.

3. If immediate transport (911) is not indicated, you should contact the student and suggest you walk over to CAPS together at a specific time on the same day or the next morning.

4. If CAPS walk-over does not happen:
   1. Student refuses CAPS walk-over -- Notify the Dean of Students Office (656-0471) by telephone and explain the circumstances. Please do not send e-mail only. (Telling the student that the Dean will be notified if they don't show might assist in getting the student to go to CAPS voluntarily.)
   2. Student does not show up for walk-over, you should assess the need and take one of the following actions:
      1. Re-contract with the student for walk-over to CAPS,
      2. Call CUPD for welfare check (then facilitate the walk-over), or
      3. Dial 911.
   Following the action taken, please notify the Dean of Students if you believe that office should become involved.

5. If student exhibits continued problems and/or does not follow-through on your recommendations for CAPS assistance, contact the Dean of Students Office (656-0471) immediately.

6. Note that threatening harm to oneself or others is a violation of the Student Code of Conduct. Threat of harm to self should be met with a referral to CAPS with confidentiality and compassion so long as the student follows your recommendation for assistance. Should the student not follow your (and CAPS) recommendations, the best course of action is to contact the Dean of Students so that the university regulations may be used to require the student to make use of university counseling and other resources for the sake of student and campus safety. Concerns that a student may be a threat to others should be addressed immediately.
MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE
NOVEMBER 13, 2007

1. Call to Order: President Charles H. Gooding recognized guests and called the meeting to order at 2:33 p.m.

2. Approval of Minutes: The Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting dated October 9, 2007 were approved as distributed.

3. Class of ’39 Award for Excellence

4. "Free Speech": None

5. Special Orders of the Day: Biff Kennedy provided information on the United Way and encouraged the participation of the Senators (Attachment A).

   Rusty Guill, Associate Dean of Students, explained the newly-established CARE Network.

6. a. Senate Committees:


   2) Scholastic Policies Committee - Chair Antonis Katsiyannis submitted and explained the Committee Report dated October 16, 2007 (Attachment C). Senator Katsiyannis noted that some items would come under New Business from this Committee. New issues this Committee will address are class attendance and grade inflation.

   3) Research Committee – For Chair Christina Wells, Senator John Meriwether submitted and explained the Committee Report dated October 29, 2007 (Attachment D).

   4) Policy Committee - Chair Bill Surver submitted and explained the Committee Report dated October 30, 2007 (Attachment E) and noted there would be items under New Business. Senator Surver encouraged lead senators to inquire as to who was appointed to the Research Council from their respective colleges.

b. Faculty Senate Select Committees: None

c. Other University Committee/Commissions: None

7. President's Report: President Gooding:

a. noted that he has heard from the Library and HEHD regarding their respective college's promotion, tenure, reappointment guidelines. He asked that other lead senators compile their college information and forward to Cathy Sturkie, Pat Smart and to President Gooding, as well. If the lead senator notices that there may be trouble where policies are not required to give him a brief analysis and he will talk with the department chair.

b. stated that COIA has been notified of our vote to join the coalition and have accepted us as members. The Athletic Council will spend a significant amount of time looking at the items in the COIA Report to see Clemson's standing.

8. Old Business: None

9. New Business:

a. Senator Bowerman moved to adopt the initiative of exit interviews for faculty and motion was seconded. Discussion was held, during which a vote passed to include (with the permission of the person being interviewed) names. Call to Question was requested and seconded. Vote on call was taken and passed with required two-thirds vote. Vote was taken on amended motion to adopt exit interview initiative and passed unanimously (Attachment G).

b. Senator Surver made a motion to approve the proposed Faculty Manual change, VII.E.3 Adjunct Faculty. Following much discussion and a motion to close debate, which was seconded and passed unanimously, vote on proposed change was taken and passed unanimously with required two-thirds vote (Attachment H).

c. Senator Surver made a motion to approve the proposed Faculty Manual change, VII.C. 7 Summer Reading Advisory Committee. Following discussion and a motion to close debate, which was seconded and passed unanimously, vote on proposed change was taken and passed unanimously with required two-thirds vote (Attachment I).

d. Senator Katsiyannis made a motion to collectively approve proposed Faculty Manual changes regarding Post-Tenure Review Statistical Ratings and Evaluation of Teaching by Students. Discussion was held. Call to Question was requested and seconded. Vote on call was taken and passed with required two-thirds vote. Vote on proposed changes (IV.H.6b Post-Tenure Review Statistical Ratings of Teaching Evaluations; IX.D. 11 Evaluation of Teaching by Students; and Appendix E.8 Summaries of Statistical Ratings) was taken and passed unanimously with required two-thirds vote (Attachments J, K, L).

e. Senator Katsiyannis, on behalf of the Scholastic Policies Committee, recommended that President Gooding ask President Barker to submit Clemson University's student athlete admissions policy to the NCAA to ensure that Clemson is in compliance. Senator
Katsiyannis further requested President Gooding to request of President Barker that when the current policy for the admission of student athletes is reviewed, that a wide range of constituents be included in that review. Discussion was held. A Sense of the Senate was taken to accept Senator Katsiyannis’ recommendations and passed.

10. **Announcements:**

   a. Vice President Bryan Simmons informed the Senate of Chuck Linnell’s (a former Faculty Senator and current Grievance Board member) recent stroke. The Senate will plan to assist the Linnell family during Chuck’s rehabilitation.

   b. President Gooding reminded everyone to visit the Faculty Display in the Connector between the Madren Center and the Martin Inn.


   e. Bell Tower Ceremony at the Carillon Gardens – Tuesday, January 8, 2008 at 10:00 a.m.

   f. Nick Green, Faculty Senate Student Assistant, asked senators to encourage their students to give blood during the Clemson/Carolina Blood Drive and to respond to the question, “when we get to the Top 20, what does it mean to say ‘we want Clemson to still be Clemson?’ ”.

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

    Deborah Thomason, Secretary

    Cathy Toth Sturkie, Program Assistant

Clemson University supports all three counties in the upstate: Anderson, Pickens, and Oconee, and the 3 United Ways have asked me to speak on their behalf. I don't mind begging for a worthwhile cause!

I think the United Way deserves your support for these reasons:

- It helps people who need help:
  - toddlers who need speech and hearing services,
  - people out of work who need medical attention and medication,
  - abused children,
  - cancer patients who need a ride to their treatment center,
  - and many more..

- I like the basic integrity of the process – all funds go through a formal budget and allocation procedure, with opportunity to question all programs and all expenditures.

- The United Way takes significant burdens from local service providers, for example from the 3 emergency rooms in Oconee, Anderson, and Pickens Counties.

- Almost all (98%) of the money you give stays in the county where it is given and helps those in your immediate area.

2. All three United Ways, in Oconee, Pickens, and Anderson counties, depend on the income from Clemson. Clemson is among the top five givers in all counties. All 3 United Ways also benefit from student community learning service volunteers and volunteers among the faculty and staff.

Our costs have gone up, and if you are already a United Way donor, I would ask you to consider the amount of your pledge in that light. If you are not a United Way donor, please try us for one year. At the end of that year, you will be glad knowing the help you have given to those who need it.

United Way is simply the best way to reach the most need.

To find out more about United Way activities, call or contact:
Clemson University: Jennifer Shurley 656-0243 jshurle@clemson.edu
Pickens County: Julie Capaldi 850-7094 capaldi@charter.net
Anderson County: Dayle.Stewart 226-3438 dayle.stewart@unitedway.org
Oconee County: David McCutcheon 882-9743 uwoconee@bellsouth.net

I enjoyed talking with the Clemson faculty senate and appreciate your giving me the chance to speak there on behalf of United Way.
Monthly Report

The Faculty Senate Welfare Committee held its monthly meeting on October 16, 2007. Senators Futral, and Bowerman attended. Other Senators were excused due to scheduling conflicts, however, they did submit their monthly reports. We report here on the activities of our committee over the past month. Each report is authored by the Lead Senator for that issue.

Progress on Priorities for the Year

1. **Issues Related to Child Care**  
   Lead: Linda Li-Bleuel  
The initial review of the top 30 public institutions comparing child care benefits is attached.

2. **Issues Related to Campus Parking**  
   Lead: Meredith Futral  
The Parking Services Web Page now has a link to the Parking and Transportation Master Plan results. This is the PowerPoint that was presented on September 24th. Financial data should be available within the next month. Here is the link to the results:  
   [http://stuaff.clemson.edu/parking/docs/ptmpResults.pdf](http://stuaff.clemson.edu/parking/docs/ptmpResults.pdf)

3. **Issues Related to Spousal Hires**  
   Lead: Curtis White  
Continuing to work with Pat Smart to determine what criteria has been established and if a policy needs to be written. Secondly, what impact does this have on current faculty/staff that be looking to advance.

4. **Top 20 Goal-Top 20 Compensation**  
   Lead: William Bowerman  
A number of benefits have been assigned to Senators to analyze. A comparison of bereavement (i.e., funeral leave) is appended to this report as a first cut at how we are going to compare each type of benefit across the top 30 public universities (U.S. News & World Report, 2006 rankings) which includes 32 universities. Since the University of California system has 6 top 30 universities, but has a common benefit program, we will compare 27 different benefit plans. It is to be noted that it will be very difficult for us to compare the economic value of every single benefit, however, we will be able to compare presence/absence of a benefit among these 27 plans.

5. **State Universities Welfare Summit**  
   Lead: Francie Edwards  
Senator Edwards is on sabbatical leave this semester.

6. **General Welfare Issues**  
   Lead: Yanming An  
No new information to report for this month.

The next meeting will be held at 1:30-2:30pm on November 13th at the Madren Center, just before the Faculty Senate meeting.
Top 30 Universities Report on Child Care

Multiple university-affiliated child care centers, infant to 5 years (3 or more)
- University of California (all)
  - UC Berkeley has 10 child care centers
  - UCLA has 3 child care centers
  - UC-Irvine has 6 child care centers
- Indiana University
  - 3 child care programs
  - Recently expanded funding for campus child care
- University of Iowa
  - 5 child care centers
  - Comprehensive occasional child care listings
- University of Michigan
  - 5 child care centers
    - 2 take infants to 5 years old
    - 3 take children 21/2 to 5 years old
- University of Washington
  - 4 child care centers
- University of Wisconsin
  - 5 child care centers

2 or more university-affiliated child care centers
- Ohio State University
  - Infant to 5 years
  - Evening child care available
- Purdue University
  - Infant to 5 years
  - 3-5 years

1 university-affiliated child care center, infant to 5 years
- University of Connecticut
  - Limited care and hours
  - Childhood developmental laboratory
    - Specifically used to train future early childhood educators
- Miami University (Ohio)
- Michigan State University
  - Sick child care
  - Emergency back-up child care
- University of Minnesota
- University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill
- University of Florida
- University of Georgia
- University of Maryland
- Penn State University
• University of Pittsburgh
• University of Texas-Austin
• Texas A&M University
• University of Virginia
• College of William and Mary

1 university-affiliated child care center, no infants
• University of Delaware
  o 3-5 years old

On-campus child care center associated with university, infant to 5 years old, but privately owned
• Georgia Institute of Technology
  o 1 on-campus child care center
  o Priority given to GA Tech faculty and staff
• Rutgers University
  o 8 privately owned centers, priority given to Rutgers faculty, staff, and students
  o Discount for Rutgers faculty, staff, and students

No university-affiliated child care, no private on-campus child care center associated with university
• Clemson University

AND, even though these are not top 30 public universities...just something I found interesting close to home....

• College of Charleston
  o University-affiliated child care center
  o 2-5 years old
• University of South Carolina
  o University-affiliated child care center
  o Infants-3 years old
• South Carolina State University
  o University-affiliated child care center
• Bob Jones University
  o University-affiliated child care center
    • Infant to pre-K
  o After-school care through the 12th grade
Benefit Analysis: Bereavement Leave

Benefit Analyzed: Leave for attendance at funerals of immediate family members.

One to Three Days from Sick Leave, Dependent on Out of Town Travel: University of Washington

Three Days from Sick Leave: University of Illinois, University of California*, University of Michigan, Clemson University, University of Texas, Purdue University, Rutgers University, Indiana University

Three to Five Days from Sick Leave: University of Iowa

Four Days from Sick Leave: University of Georgia, Pennsylvania State University

Five Days from Sick Leave: University of Connecticut, University of Delaware, Ohio State University, Texas A&M University

Reasonable Number of Days from Sick Leave

Miami University (Ohio), Georgia Institute of Technology, University of Florida, University of Minnesota, University of Virginia, University of North Carolina, William and Mary College, University of Wisconsin

Universities Where Days Are Not Taken From Sick Leave: Michigan State University, 3 days; University of Maryland, 3-5 days; University of Pittsburgh, 5 days

Bereavement Comparison

Clemson is within the lower 1/3 of all 27 Benefit Plans*

*6 University of California campuses are within the top 32 public universities, all with the same plan, based on US News rankings of 2006.
Admission of student athletes
LaForge provided a brief historical overview of the function of the Athletic Admissions Review Committee and related procedures established in 2002 in an effort to retain NCAA certification. LaForge also provided an overview of current guidelines established last spring. Several concerns associated with the current guidelines include:

- The use of overall team academic performance (APR and GSR) to make admissions decisions for individuals does not address individual achievement and potential for success at Clemson University.
- Comparisons of Clemson’s APR and GSR to median APR and GSR rates for ACC and SEC public institutions as a trigger to provide admissions flexibility in a given sport may be misleading. Admitting student-athletes with very low standardized test (SAT and ACT) scores without a committee review that involves faculty is problematic.
- The use of GSR in the admissions process is problematic because it covers athletes admitted 6 years earlier.
- Admission of student athletes with inadequate academic credentials are less likely to succeed at Clemson and pose a burden for programs (e.g., PRTM).

The Scholastic Policies Committee is extremely concerned with the potential of not being in compliance with NCAA academic integrity standards given the present policy and requests 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.

Policy/Procedures on student who may harm selves or others...
Dr. Smith provided an overview of procedures for emergency situations, particularly with regard to students who may harm selves or others. Emergency alerts will include sirens with "voice", clear text messaging...Also, referrals by faculty, residence hall personnel...are being cross referenced...

Dr. Smith will be invited to address the senate in a future meeting.

Addition to the membership of the "summer reading" committee
Ex officio member from student Affairs

Next meeting: November 20, 2007 at 2:30 in 420 Tillman Hall
Items- Development of attendance policy
The Faculty Senate Research Committee met on October 29th from 4-5 PM in D-136 Poole Ag. Center. Senators Clarke, Liu, Meriwether, Stuart and Wells were in attendance. Also present was Associate Vice President Vincent Gallicchio.

1. Senator Stuart reported that students in Angela Rogers' ENG 304 section are making continued progress on the manual for new research faculty. They will have a draft completed for the committee's review by the end of the semester.

2. Dr. Gallicchio reported on three matters related to Clemson research:

   A. FBI agents from Greenville and Charleston recently visited campus to debrief administrators on potential threats of espionage and terrorism related to University research. They reminded the University that they can come onto campus at any time in order to investigate such threats. They may be interested in meeting with researchers at a future date to discuss this topic.

   B. The COMPETES Act was signed into law on August 9th. This law requires NSF-funded Institutions to provide training in the responsible conduct of research, survival skills, and research ethics.

      Specifically, the legislation directs institutions to comply with Sections 7008 (postdoctoral fellows), 7009 (responsible conduct of research) and 8008 (Accountability and transparency of activities authorized by this Act). All proposals must address the following:

      Section 7008. If funding is requested for postdoctoral researchers, the proposal must include a description of the mentoring activities that will be provided for such individuals. This part of the application is evaluated under the Foundation's broader impacts merit review criterion.

      Section 7009. Each institution that applies for financial support from NSF for science and engineering research and education must describe in the proposal a plan to provide appropriate training and oversight in the RESPONSIBLE and ETHICAL CONDUCT of research to UNDERGRADUATE students, GRADUATE students and POSTDOCTORAL FELLOWS participating in the proposed project.

      Section 8008. Deals with subcontract arrangements and conflicts of interest.

      The Research Committee will draft a memo to the Clemson research community, making them aware of these changes.

   C. The NSF has reported a 400% increase in the number of proposals that contain plagiarized material. Dr. Gallicchio is inviting NSF representatives to present a President’s Colloquium on this topic in March of 2008.
3. Dr. Przirembel has asked the committee to identify the top five barriers to research productivity at Clemson. The committee drafted a two-part plan to accomplish this goal: (1) a list of potential barriers to research productivity will be assembled based on responses of faculty senators, and (2) a 5 minute web-survey based on this information will be designed and administered to the full university faculty.

4. The research committee has been charged by President Gooding with investigating the issues raised by Dr. Mary Beck’s free speech on October 9th. At present, the committee is drafting a strategy for conducting the investigation. This strategy will include consultations with chairs of four departments with significant numbers of Animal Care protocols: AVS, Bioengineering, Biological Sciences, and Forestry and Natural Resources. Dr. Jeff Foltz, Chair of the IACUC, has also offered to meet with the committee.
Policy Committee of the Faculty Senate  
30 October 2007  
Faculty Senate Report - Executive/Advisory Committee  
Submitted by: Bill Surver (surverw@clemson.edu)

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Bill Surver - Biological Sciences, Chair  
Tom Boland - Bioengineering  
Alan Grubb - History  
Des Layne - Horticulture  
Catalina Marinescu - Physics/Astronomy  
Brad Meyer - Physics  
Lydia Schleifer - Accountancy

The last meeting of the Policy Committee was on Tuesday, October 23

The following were approved and are submitted for Senate approval

1. Submitted by Dr. Bill Bowerman to the Committee.

Section III-4 C

*Change term of adjunct appointment from up to one year or less to up to three years*

Rationale:

Each spring departments and colleges are required to write reappointment letters for adjunct faculty. This change would lessen the burden on departments, colleges, and PTR committees.

2. Submitted from Scholastic Policy Committee

*Item 1:*

Part IV, section H # 6 b (p. IV - 9)

b. The faculty member undergoing Part II of PTR must provide, at a minimum, the following documents to the PTR committee and the department chair.

- a recent copy of the curriculum vita (paper or electronic);
- a summary of teaching evaluations (if appropriate to the individual's duties) for the last 5 years, including student evaluations; replace with: **a summary of teaching evaluations for the last 5 years including a summary of statistical ratings from student assessments of instruction (if appropriate to the individual's duties)***.

- a plan for continued professional growth;
- detailed information about the outcomes of any sabbatical leave awarded during the preceding five years; and
- if required by departmental personnel policy procedures, the names of six referees outside the department whom the PTR committee could contact for references.

---

**Part IX, Section D # 11 (p. IX-6)**

11. Evaluation of Teaching by Students. ....

Student evaluation of teaching is mandatory for all instructors at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. All evaluation forms are returned directly to the instructor to be retained for a six-year period. Course summary information from the evaluation forms 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 evaluation summaries for the purpose of verification that the evaluations have been carried out. These summaries will also be used for annual review, reappointment, tenure, promotion or post-tenure review only if a faculty member’s forms are not available. Access to these electronic summaries shall be with notification to the faculty member involved.

Delete paragraph above and replace with:

**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.

Appendix E # 8 a (p. xiv)

a. Annually, instruction and course evaluation forms completed anonymously by students through a standardized process and submitted for each course (not section) taught.

Change above to:

a. Annually, summaries of statistical ratings from student assessment of instruction completed anonymously by students through a standardized process and submitted for each class taught.

Rationale:

Clarifies what is meant by student summaries to now reflect statistical summaries.

Item 2:

Addition to the membership of the "summer reading" committee

ADD: Ex officio member from student Affairs

3. Policy of prayer - the Committee voted to not recommend a Faculty Manual policy on prayer. We do encourage the administration to develop a statement on prayer.

4. Update on compliance issues - to be discussed at meeting.

5. Update on Emeritus College - we are awaiting proposed Manual changes from ad hoc committee.

6. Ranks an Titles Select Committee

Report from Alan Grubb

I met with Clay Steadman and Lawrence Nichols this morning about the grievance procedures for non-teaching faculty (lecturers). Charlie met earlier with Lawrence and we will apparently not be able to do away with the lecturer category.
However, those who have administrative status and are unclassified are identified as non-teaching. Clay is going to get me a copy of the proposed policy and procedures for dealing with grievances by non-teaching faculty within the contact of the Faculty Manual.

This would entail adding a section under the Grievance I and II procedures specifying how they're handled for non-teaching faculty. This is not an ideal solution, but it's better than having them under the teaching faculty's procedures as outlined in the FM. I was most concerned that teaching faculty not be involved in these cases and that non-teaching faculty grieving be assured of due process and a jury or panel of their peers. I will have to wait until Clay gets me the proposal to comment on it.

This distinction seems to be the best we will be able to accomplish, since non-teaching faculty must have access to internal grievance procedures (which they don't have now). This would not involve us in their problems.
Minutes of the October 23, 2007, Finance Committee meeting


1. The committee reviewed a set of slides from Jim McCubbin, Senior Associate Dean of BBS, on the general categories of use of the money obtained from differential tuition in BBS. Robert Campbell has asked for the actual numbers.

2. The committee discussed a reported lack of information on budgeting for study abroad programs. Mark Smotherman will follow up with OIA, and Robert Campbell will also ask a colleague in BBS.

3. The committee noted that OIR has agreed to provide the annual salary reports in the previous format.

4. The committee discussed the function of the Budget Accountability Committee and the pros and cons to reestablishing that committee. The committee agreed that a practical test of the need for a BAC was to see if the current finance committee could get a financial report of the projected and actual funding of the units reporting to the Provost for the past fiscal year.

5. Mark Smotherman reported on a recent meeting with President Gooding and Steve Copeland, the interim CBO, regarding prioritization of capital projects. The major points are:
   a) the campus master planner keeps the list (Gerald Vander Mey)
   b) the administrative council prioritizes the list
   c) academic projects are championed by the Provost
   d) research projects are championed by the Research VP or PSA VP
   e) there are a number of different funding sources and revenue streams, e.g., CIB (capital improvement bond) - state pays for debt services (rare to get; USC and MUSC typically get equivalent funding when Clemson is granted a CIB); SIB (state institution bond) - Clemson pays for debt services; other - e.g., food services, housing
   f) if an opportunity for funding arises, that will shift the project's priority

Mark Smotherman was asked to find out what the current plans are for the Douthit Hills area.

6. The Huron consulting group was hired to suggest administrative efficiencies (e.g., forms processing). They have finished their major report but are continuing work on some small follow-ups. Mark Smotherman was asked to follow up on how much they were paid and to get an estimate of the cost savings that they suggested.

7. The committee discussed follow-up actions based on the visit with Dean Rafert at the last meeting. If undertaken, this would be a major activity, needing the advice of a management accountant and the support of the CFO and CBO. Mark Smotherman was asked to follow up with Dean Rafert to determine if we can obtain a copy of the Michigan Tech study. Robert Campbell will review his files for information on a similar study at the University of Rhode Island.

Next meeting: November 20, 2007, at 2:30 pm
Faculty Senate Trial Initiative on Exit Interviews

Rationale: To improve the faculty work environment at Clemson University and to identify any common, correctable reasons that are causing faculty to leave prematurely, an ad hoc Faculty Senate committee should interview faculty who are leaving voluntarily in order to learn more about their reasons for leaving. The suggested procedure is outlined below.

1. On or about November 15th and April 1st of each academic year, the Faculty Senate Program Assistant will contact the chief payroll person in each college to identify which faculty members are leaving the University voluntarily.

2. The Program Assistant will send a letter to each person and follow up a few days later via phone to ask that s/he voluntarily meet with a team of past Senate Presidents for an exit interview. The Program Assistant will explain the purpose, as noted in the rationale above. The Program Assistant will make appointments for those who agree to participate in an exit interview.

3. The ad hoc committee will consist of former Faculty Senate Presidents. Each interview team will consist of at least two persons. The Faculty Senate Program Assistant will contact former presidents in order to constitute the ad hoc Exit Interview Committee.

4. At the interview, the team will explain that the faculty member leaving will determine what information can be shared. Team members will take notes and later produce a summary of discussion. The faculty member leaving will have the opportunity to edit this for accuracy or exclusion of information.

5. In January and July, the current Senate President and Program Assistant will compile results and issue a report to the University Provost and President and the current Senate Executive/Advisory Committee. These reports will be retained in the Senate Office.
PROPOSED FACULTY MANUAL CHANGE

OLD LANGUAGE:

Part III, Section E #3 (p. III-4):

3. **Adjunct Faculty.** The term "adjunct" denotes an advisory appointment. It may be assigned to individuals whose principal employer is other than Clemson University and who bring needed expertise to the teaching, research, or public service programs of the University. The qualifications for adjunct faculty rank shall be comparable to those for appointments at corresponding regular faculty ranks. Adjunct appointments generally do not involve remuneration from the university; are for one year or less; are individually negotiated as to terms; and may be renewable. Adjunct appointments shall be limited to those making active contributions to the teaching, research, or public service programs of the university, and are subject to review by departmental faculty.

PROPOSED NEW LANGUAGE:

3. **Adjunct Faculty.** The term "adjunct" denotes an advisory appointment. It may be assigned to individuals whose principal employer is other than Clemson University and who bring needed expertise to the teaching, research, or public service programs of the University. The qualifications for adjunct faculty rank shall be comparable to those for appointments at corresponding regular faculty ranks. Adjunct appointments generally do not involve remuneration from the university; are for up to five years; are individually negotiated as to terms; and may be renewable. Adjunct appointments shall be limited to those making active contributions to the teaching, research, or public service programs of the university, and are subject to review by departmental faculty.

RATIONALE:

Each spring departments and colleges are required to write reappointment letters for adjunct faculty. This change would lessen the burden on departments, colleges and PTR committees.
PROPOSED FACULTY MANUAL CHANGE

OLD LANGUAGE:

Part VII C #7 (p. VII-9)

7. Summer Reading Advisory Committee. 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. The student and faculty representatives serve one-year renewable terms.

NEW LANGUAGE:

7. Summer Reading Advisory Committee. 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.

RATIONALE:

Representation from the Division of Student Affairs will provide additional input into the book selection process.
PROPOSED FACULTY MANUAL CHANGE

OLD LANGUAGE:

Part IV, section H # 6 b (p. IV - 9)

b. The faculty member undergoing Part II of PTR must provide, at a minimum, the following documents to the PTR committee and the department chair.

• a recent copy of the curriculum vita (paper or electronic);
• a summary of teaching evaluations (if appropriate to the individual’s duties) for the last 5 years, including student evaluations;
• a plan for continued professional growth;
• detailed information about the outcomes of any sabbatical leave awarded during the preceding five years; and
• if required by departmental personnel policy procedures, the names of six referees outside the department whom the PTR committee could contact for references.

NEW LANGUAGE:

b. The faculty member undergoing Part II of PTR must provide, at a minimum, the following documents to the PTR committee and the department chair.

• a recent copy of the curriculum vita (paper or electronic);
• a summary of teaching evaluations for the last 5 years including a summary of statistical ratings from student assessments of instruction (if appropriate to the individual’s duties).
• a plan for continued professional growth;
• detailed information about the outcomes of any sabbatical leave awarded during the preceding five years; and
• if required by departmental personnel policy procedures, the names of six referees outside the department whom the PTR committee could contact for references.

OLD LANGUAGE:

Part IX, Section D # 11 (p. IX-6)

11. Evaluation of Teaching by Students

Student evaluation of teaching is mandatory for all instructors at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. All evaluation forms are returned directly to the instructor to be retained for a six-year period. Course summary information from the evaluation forms 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 evaluation summaries for the purpose of verification that the evaluations have been carried out. These summaries will also be used for annual review, reappointment, tenure, promotion or post-tenure review only if a faculty member’s forms are not available. Access to these electronic summaries shall be with notification to the faculty member involved.

NEW LANGUAGE:

11. Evaluation of Teaching by Students.

11. Evaluation of Teaching by Students.
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.

OLD LANGUAGE:

Appendix E # 8 a (p. xiv)

a. Annually, instruction and course evaluation forms completed anonymously by students through a standardized process and submitted for each course (not section) taught.

NEW LANGUAGE:

Change above to:

a. Annually, summaries of statistical ratings from student assessment of instruction completed anonymously by students through a standardized process and submitted for each class taught.

Rationale: Clarifies what is meant by student summaries to now reflect statistical summaries.
MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE
DECEMBER 11, 2007

1. **Call to Order:** President Charles H. Gooding recognized guests and called the meeting to order at 2:33 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 November 13, 2007 were approved as distributed.

3. **"Free Speech":** None

4. **Special Orders of the Day:** Cathy Sams, Chief Public Affairs Officer, presented information regarding the University Brand, an integrated marketing and communication effort for Clemson University. Questions and answers were then exchanged.

5. a. **Senate Committees:**

   1) **Welfare Committee** – Senator Linda Li-Bluel (for Chair Bill Bowerman) submitted and explained Report dated November 13, 2007 (Attachment A).

   2) **Scholastic Policies Committee** - Chair Antonis Katsiyannis noted that the Committee met on November 20 and December 4, 2007. He then submitted and explained the Committee Report dated November 20, 2007 (Attachment B).

   3) **Research Committee** – Chair Christina Wells stated that this Committee has not met and did note that Senator Steve Stuart’s endeavor to compile all University research information into one guide/location for faculty is almost ready. Senators will soon receive a request from the Research Committee asking for identification of any research barriers they have personally experienced and general opinions they would like to share. Senator Wells noted that the Research Council has been constituted (Attachment C).

   4) **Policy Committee** - Chair Bill Surver stated that this Committee will not meet in December. He expects to receive several proposed *Faculty Manual* changes in the New Year.

   5) **Finance Committee** - Chair Mark Smotherman stated that he met with the Provost and Jane Gilbert (from the Provost’s Office) to address questions regarding the budget. He thanked them for their cooperation with the Committee’s pursuit of answers to questions it had received. The Committee will look at the budget report presented to it from the
Provost. Senator Smotherman informed the Senate that rumors and questions abound regarding ICAR and that Vice President for Research and Economic Development Chris Przirembel is open to presenting more information as to Clemson's involvement. He noted also that the salary report will be provided in February, 2008 and will include the percentage of raises. (This information is now out in the public arena.) President Gooding stated that there have been good lines of communication regarding the budget information and that those involved have been cordial, cooperative and open with the representatives from the Faculty Senate.

b. Faculty Senate Select Committees: None

c. Other University Committee/Commissions: None

6. President's Report: President Gooding:

a. reported that he did send a letter to President Barker regarding guidelines and procedures for the admission of athletes (Attachment D).

b. noted the discovery of incorrect information in the Faculty Manual regarding the composition of a University committee. He asked Senators to help heighten the awareness of others that when changes are made to University committees, for the information to be shared with the Faculty Senate so that the Faculty Manual can be updated to include correction information.

c. stated that the Academic Council unanimously voted to modify the academic schedule. After much discussion with the student government, the Provost has decided to stand by her original statement to have a five-day exam period for next fall).

d. informed the Senate that he and Vice President Przirembel have discussed the possibility of the Faculty Senate sponsoring an ICAR faculty forum.

e. reminded committee chairs to begin to finalize this year's initiatives in February and March, 2008.

7. Old Business: None

8. New Business: None

9. Announcements:

a. President Gooding reminded everyone that it is time to think about Faculty Senate officers.

b. Donations to the Alan Schaffer Faculty Senate Endowment were solicited.

c. Faculty Display – Connector between Madren Center and Martin Inn

d. Celebration of the Great Class of '39 – Monday, January 7, 2008 –

e. Bell Tower Ceremony at the Carillon Gardens – Tuesday, January 8, 2008 – 10:00 a.m.
f. Next Faculty Senate Meeting – January 8, 2008

g. Fran McGuire, Faculty Manual Editorial Consultant, informed the Senate of a situation regarding information in the Faculty Manual and asked the Policy Committee to address the issue of authority.

10. Adjournment: 4:00 p.m.

Deborah Thomason, Secretary

Cathy Toth Sturkie, Program Assistant

Absent: H. Liu, B. Bowerman, Y. An, S. Clarke (M. Martin for), A. Grubb, K. Smith, E. Weisenmiller, F. Edwards, (E. Muth for), R. Campbell, T. Boland, J. Meriwether, R. Figliola, L. Howe
Faculty Senate Welfare Committee
William Bowerman, Chair
November 13, 2007

Monthly Report

The Faculty Senate Welfare Committee held its monthly meeting on November 13, 2007, just prior to the Faculty Senate meeting. Senators Li-Bleuel, Futral, White, and Bowerman attended. Also in attendance was Dr. Smart. We report here on the activities of our committee over the past month. We are in the midst of our work plan and expect to report on significant progress at the January Senate meeting. Each report is authored by the Lead Senator for that issue.

Progress on Priorities for the Year

1. 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.

2. 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

3. Issues Related to Spousal Hires  Lead: Curtis White
   Continuing to work with Pat Smart to monitor this issue.

4. Top 20 Goal-Top 20 Compensation  Lead: William Bowerman
   We continue to compare benefits among the top 32 US News & World Report Public Universities. President Barker has also directed Mr. Lawrence Nichols to also undertake this issue. We do not want to duplicate efforts and Mr. Nichols and I will be having lunch on 13 December to discuss progress and cooperation on this issue.

5. State Universities Welfare Summit  Lead: Francie Edwards
   Senator Edwards is on sabbatical leave this semester.

   No new information to report for this month.

The short meeting will be held at 2:30 pm on December 14th the Esso Club to discuss the outcome of the meeting with Mr. Nichols.
Senators Smith, Shelburne, and Katsiyannis were in attendance.

Guests: Jeff Appling (Associate Dean) and Stan Smith (Registrar)

1. Attendance Policy: Dr. Appling discussed present policy regarding class attendance as it exists in the 2007-2008 Undergraduate Announcements (pp. 26 & 27). He also reported on a draft of class attendance policies reflecting top 20 institutions (subheading included-General information, Enrollment, Anticipated Absences, Unanticipated Absences, and Appeals). The need for an attendance policy is, in part, driven by the need to develop a comprehensive “Pandemic Policy” and the number of grievances associated with attendance policies resulting in failing grades for a class. Committee members also discussed issues regarding penalties for unexcused absences (particularly, the awarding of a failing grade for missing a specified number classes regardless of student performance in meeting course requirements). Smith, Shelburne, and Katsiyannis will draft a proposal for consideration by the committee based on Appling’s draft and committee discussion.

2. Grade Inflation-Mr. Smith provided several sets of data regarding the request initiated by Professor Geist and the concern over grade inflation. Specifically, the Report on 2007 Undergraduate Admissions Report provided info on average entering SAT, ACT, and the number of students in the top 10% of their high school class since 2003 by college and university; Undergraduate Grade Distribution by College/university for spring 2007; Undergraduate Grade Distribution by university for spring from 1997 to 2007; and an Annual Statistics Report on Undergraduate Cumulative Grade Averages Grouped by Gender and Major. Committee members suggested that we have data for grades by university, college and department for the last 10 years preferably by fall/spring semesters combined. In addition, cumulative grade point averages for seniors by university, college, and department for the last 10 years should be reviewed. It would also be helpful to examine other factors such as increase in SAT scores...Mr. Smith will explore this request with Wicks Westcott.

Course of Action-Collect data; determine need for action; generate specific interventions if needed.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Charles H. Gooding  
Faculty Senate President

FROM: Christian E.G. Przirembel, Ph.D.  
Vice President for Research and Economic Development

DATE: November 29, 2007

SUBJECT: Research Council Update

The Research Council membership has been finalized and a member roster is attached. There is excellent representation on the Council and I look forward to working with this group.

We are now polling the members to determine a meeting date prior to the end of the calendar year.

Please let me know if you have any questions.
## Research Council Roster

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Scott</td>
<td>Animal &amp; Veterinary Science</td>
<td>College of Agriculture, Forestry &amp; Life Sciences</td>
<td>Elected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Schwedler</td>
<td>Biological Sciences/Associate Dean</td>
<td>College of Agriculture, Forestry &amp; Life Sciences</td>
<td>Appointed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cari Goetcheus</td>
<td>Planning &amp; Landscape Architecture</td>
<td>College of Architecture, Arts &amp; Humanities</td>
<td>Elected (Interim)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tharon Howard</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>College of Architecture, Arts &amp; Humanities</td>
<td>Appointed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Muth</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>College of Business &amp; Behavioral Science</td>
<td>Appointed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason Thatcher</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>College of Business &amp; Behavioral Science</td>
<td>Elected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Foulger</td>
<td>Materials Science &amp; Engineering</td>
<td>College of Engineering &amp; Science</td>
<td>Elected (Interim)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony Guiseppi-Ellie</td>
<td>Chemical Engineering</td>
<td>College of Engineering &amp; Science</td>
<td>Appointed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antonis Katsiyannis</td>
<td>Teacher Education</td>
<td>College of Health, Education &amp; Human Development</td>
<td>Elected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vivian Correa</td>
<td>Teacher Education</td>
<td>College of Health, Education &amp; Human Development</td>
<td>Appointed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meredith Futral</td>
<td>Cooper Library</td>
<td>University Libraries</td>
<td>Elected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christina Wells</td>
<td>Faculty Senate Research Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ex-Officio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Foltz</td>
<td>Institutional Animal Care &amp; Use Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ex-Officio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vance Baird</td>
<td>Institutional Biosafety Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ex-Officio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joel Greenstein</td>
<td>Institutional Review Board</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ex-Officio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caron St John</td>
<td>Intellectual Property Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ex-Officio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Backman</td>
<td>Research Grant Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ex-Officio</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11/29/2007
MEMORANDUM

To: President James F. Barker

From: Charles H. Gooding, President
Faculty Senate President

Subject: Guidelines and Procedures for Admission of Athletes

At its November 13, 2007 meeting the Faculty Senate asked that I forward to you two related recommendations that originated in the Senate Scholastic Policies Committee.

1. The Faculty Senate recommends that Clemson’s 2007-2008 Guidelines and Procedures for Admission of Athletes be submitted to the NCAA for review prior to the next scheduled NCAA inspection of our athletic procedures, policies, and practices.

2. The Faculty Senate recommends that wide range participation be sought from the Faculty Senate, the Athletic Council, the Faculty Athletic Representative, and other constituents when the current policy is reviewed at the end of the academic year.

The rationale behind the first recommendation is the same as that voiced by the Athletic Council Executive Committee in their May 7, 2007 memo to you. Basically the Senate is concerned that the current guidelines may not be in compliance with NCAA rules in the way that they use GSR and APR statistics in the admissions process. With respect to the second recommendation, the Senate thinks that the University will benefit from involving a wider cross-section of knowledgeable people in the process of reviewing and revising athletic admissions policies and procedures.

Thank you for consideration of these recommendations.

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
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