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Senate President’s Report

Semi-Monthly Paychecks & 9 Month Faculty
By now, you all have been notified through Inside Clemson about the changes related to semi-monthly paychecks. 9-month faculty should take particular note that there will now be only one August paycheck—on 31 August. As a result of the change, there will be fewer paydays each year, but the amount of money in each check will be slightly larger. An online tool has been developed which you can use to see how this change will impact your pay: Semi-Monthly Pay Calculation Tool. For additional information, visit the Semi-Monthly Paycheck Changes Web page. For questions, contact the Office of Human Resources online at Ask-HR or by phone at 864-656-2000.

Insurance Premium Increase
The South Carolina Supreme Court heard arguments January 23 in a lawsuit filed by state employees to block a health insurance premium increase approved by the South Carolina Budget and Control Board last year. This decision only impacts employees enrolled in the Standard State Health Plan or Savings Plan. The 2013 premium increase for the HMO BlueChoice Plan was not impacted by this court case. Employees enrolled in the HMO BlueChoice Plan were notified on December 20 about the 2013 increase. The Office of Human Resources will provide information on the Court’s decision when it becomes available.

CTE Update: The Holy Grail Achieved
In my November column, I suggested that the day was

Trustee David Dukes
1. What is your job as a member of the Board of Trustees? In addition to working with the Board to help develop policies that are consistent with Clemson’s mission statement, I serve on the Board’s Research and Economic Development Committee and the Agriculture and Natural Resources Committee.

2. What do you think about your time as a Trustee so far? It has been a true privilege to serve on the Clemson Board. We have an extremely dedicated and hardworking Board that brings a lot of knowledge and experience to the opportunities and challenges facing Clemson. I’ve spent much of my time since I was elected last May listening and learning from my fellow Board members and from the Administrative Council. The learning curve is pretty steep, but it has been a very enjoyable experience so far and I look forward to my future service.

3. Do you have any specific goals/plans/vision you would like to mention? At this point my goal is to support the Clemson 2020 Road Map and to help ensure that institutionally we are focusing not only on today’s issues, but also the opportunities and challenges that all public universities will face over the next decade. I am particularly excited about, but also concerned about, the impact that technology changes such as online learning will have on Clemson and other universities. I have been reading books on higher education and I subscribe to
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the Chronicle of Higher Education so that I can try to stay abreast of the latest thinking about how top universities are going to thrive in the future in a world that is probably going to change faster for higher education than it ever has.

4. What is your relationship with the Faculty Senate? And Faculty? I’ve been very impressed with Faculty Senate president Jeremy King’s presentations at the Board meetings. Otherwise I haven’t had a lot of interaction with faculty in the nine months that I have served on the Board of Trustees. I did attend a Faculty Senate and new faculty reception that was held in conjunction with our October Board meeting and I was very impressed with the backgrounds and enthusiasm of the new faculty members that I met. My wife, Karen, and I have a second year student at Clemson now and will also have a freshman next year so I am very interested in meeting more faculty members and understanding what we as a Board can do to continue to make sure that we are retaining, recruiting and supporting outstanding faculty. As a Clemson parent, I understand that our students’ education will only be as good as the faculty that teaches and mentors them.

5. Do you need any help/input from Faculty? If so, how can they help? I think it is always important for the Board of Trustees to understand the concerns of the faculty and certainly the Faculty Senate representative at Board meetings is one way for that to occur. However, I also value more informal and casual interactions with faculty and I hope I will have those opportunities in the future.

6. What do you think are important issues that the Faculty should be aware of? My sense is that the faculty is very aware of the issues facing Clemson and has been instrumental in helping Clemson deal with the significant challenges we have faced since 2008. I know that both President Barker and the Board of Trustees strive to be as transparent as possible about our challenges as well as our plans to overcome them. Finally, as a Trustee and a Clemson parent I am very optimistic about our ability working together to achieve our vision of being a top 20 public university as well as a great place to live, teach and learn.

7. What were some memorable experiences from your time at Clemson? I graduated in 1981, so I saw lots of great football games while I was a Clemson student. I was also president of the Interfraternity Council, so every Monday morning at 9:00am Dean Cox’s office would call to have me come over to review with him any incidents that had taken place on the Quad over the weekend. He was not very understanding of my trying to explain that I did not have the ability to control over a thousand Clemson students, particularly during weekends.

8. What was your favorite course at Clemson and why? Who taught it? My favorite course at Clemson was a 400 level finance course taught by Dr. Perry Woodside. The class was split into groups and each group was responsible for creating a hypothetical company, raising funding for the company, and developing a marketing plan. It was a great, hands-on, real world educational experience. Ironically, after I became a lawyer Dr. Woodside, who had left Clemson, appeared as an expert witness on the other side of one of my cases. We had a good laugh about the student cross examining the professor.

David Dukes earned his bachelor’s degree in financial management at Clemson in 1981 and his Juris Doctor, Cum Laude from the University of South Carolina School of Law in 1984. He has served his community in various roles including: Trustee, South Carolina Governor’s School of Science and Math Foundation Board; Trustee, South Carolina Governor’s School for the Arts Foundation Board; Board of Directors, First Citizens Bank; and, Past Co-Chair, CityYear, Columbia. He is the past president of two national defense lawyer organizations.
The Research Committee
The Research Committee is chaired by Jim McCubbin, Professor of Psychology and Public Health Sciences. The primary purpose of the Research Committee is to study and make recommendation on policies, procedures, and practices primarily related to the university’s research mission. They also interface with other senate committees on topics related to faculty scholarly success, including, intellectual property, the status of postdoctoral fellows, graduate and undergraduate student research involvement, and all other matters related to faculty research and scholarly success.

Faculty should be aware that the Research Committee has been soliciting faculty input to identify the most pressing campus-wide issues that impact faculty research and scholarly success (jmccubb@clemson.edu). Specifically the committee is now examining faculty input on the effectiveness of the university’s research infrastructure, teaching load policies and graduate student recruitment. The Committee will use faculty input to develop an agenda of high priority research concerns to use in their work with University administration. They may continue to poll faculty on their research challenges and successes to better the institutional support and overall research climate at Clemson.

Jim McCubbin has been at Clemson for over fifteen years and served as the Chair of the Department of Psychology. He has a PhD in Psychology and Neurobiology from the University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill. Before coming to Clemson, he served on the faculty of Duke University Medical Center and the University of Kentucky School of Medicine. As of two years ago he has returned to teaching and research. His research is on brain mechanisms in the early development of hypertension has been funded by NIH for over 20 years. He has also served as Chair of NIH’s Behavioral Medicine Study Section and has received Clemson University’s Provost’s Award for Scholarly Achievement. In his spare time he enjoys fly-fishing and playing American primitive blues guitar.

Other members of the Research Committee are Peter van den Hurk, Biological Sciences; Robert Hewett, Planning and Landscape Architecture; Megan Mowrey, Accountancy and Finance; Mike Ellison, Mathematical Sciences and Engineering; Sarah Griffin, Public Health Science; Julie Northcutt, Food, Nutrition and Packaging; and, Julia Frugoli, Genetics and Biochemistry.

The Scholastic Policies Committee
Chaired by David Tonkyn, Associate Professor of Biological Sciences, the Scholastic Policies Committee deals with all academic policies concerning students. This includes recruitment, admissions, transfer credit, academic honors policies, class attendance, graduation requirements, and other issues.

The other committee members are Wayne Goddard, School of Computing; Alan Grubb, History; John Leininger, Graphic Communications; Catalina Marinescu, Physics and Astronomy; and, Graciela Tissera, Languages. Because most of their deliberations affect students, they are regularly joined by Perry Austin, the Academic Affairs Committee Chairman of the Undergraduate Student Government, for a student perspective. In addition, they are often joined by administrators such as Jeff Appling, Associate Dean of Undergraduate Studies and Stan Smith, Registrar, for their knowledge and perspectives.

The SP Committee represents the Faculty Senate and through it the entire faculty on a wide range of university committees, including the Faculty Advisory Board on
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Online Education, Council on Undergraduate Studies, Undergraduate Admissions Committee and the Scholarship and Awards Committee. In addition, they tackle specific questions that arise around student academics. For example, they provided input into changes in the Latin Honors requirements, in changes to International Travel policies, and briefly considered whether faculty might provide numerical rankings of their students in addition to grades.

The SP Committee is now working on four main areas. First, they are helping to ensure that the new student records system is consistent with academic policies set by the faculty. They insisted that Banner be modified to allow Departments to continue to compel students to meet with their academic advisors prior to registering for classes. However, they relented on the former strict limit on withdrawal hours, which apparently is rare outside of Clemson and would be expensive to implement. Second, they will be surveying Chairs on how and when they use student teaching evaluations in evaluating faculty for tenure, promotion and pay raises. They want to see if these uses are appropriate to the data, clearly communicated to the faculty, and consistently applied. Third, they are exploring the rules surrounding the growing number of articulation agreements in which students receive their early training at other colleges then transfer to Clemson to complete their degrees. Finally, they are asking how students who enter Clemson through the Bridge Program fare in comparison with Clemson Freshmen.

Throughout their work, the SP Committee is trying to ensure that, as university and educational practices evolve, their standards are well-thought out and maintained, changes are well-considered and appropriate, and the educational experience and diploma remain as valuable as ever. They welcome input on all academic issues from faculty (tdavid@clemson.edu).

David Tonkyn graduated with a PhD from Princeton University. He focuses his research on conservation biology, with an interest in effects of and risk reduction as a result of climate change as well as genetic, disease and demographic threats to small and endangered populations. Each year he takes students to the Rocky Mountains and to study abroad in India.

**College Elections to Senate**

This March, each College will hold elections to identify faculty members who are to serve as representatives of the faculty and whose decisions will play a major role in formulating University policy. Contact your Dean and Lead Senator to place your name on your College’s ballot: AFLS, Dale Layfield (dlayfe); AAH, Alan Grubb (agrub); BBS, Alan Winters (awinter); E&S, Bill Pennington (billp); HEHD, Sarah Griffin (sgriffi); and, Libraries, Scott Dutkiewicz (scotmd).

New this year is the addition, approved via a procedural bylaw change at the 12 February 2013 Senate meeting, of Faculty Senate Delegates. The Faculty Senate shall confer the status of "Delegate to the Faculty Senate" on two (full time) lecturers or senior lecturers from each College in recognition of the role of these special faculty ranks in the core University enterprise and of the importance of broad input into faculty-related concerns and policy. Delegates have the right to attend Senate functions, make themselves heard, and serve on Senate committees.

Faculty members eligible for election are those who hold regular faculty rank (Instructor, Tenure-track Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor, and Librarian) with the exception of those holding Nonacademic Administrative appointments as described in Part VI Section K or Academic Administrative appointments who should be evaluated under Part VI Section J (Review of Academic Administrators) of the Faculty Manual.

Delegates (elected by full-time lecturers and senior lecturers) and Senators serve 3-year non-successive terms. Each college will elect two Alternate Senators, the Library one (1) each year to serve a one (1) year term.
Senator x-ray

What brought you to serve on Faculty Senate?

John Meriwether, Physics & Astronomy (E&S) – Curiosity about the bigger picture of what people at the university do. Also interested in helping the University operate better by asking pointed questions as to why certain activities are taking place.

Rob Baldwin – I felt an inner sort of sense of responsibility; it was against my better judgment. But it seemed like the right thing to do as my unit was undergoing much change and I wanted insight in to how the university works.

Alan Grubb – I believe in government, and not simply being governed. If you don't participate, I don't believe you should complain about the process. You have to put in to get anything out of things; that's the philosophy I've followed as a senator, FS president, and Faculty Representative to the Board of Trustees.

How do you feel Faculty Senate benefits the University?

Rob Baldwin, School of Agriculture, Forest and Environmental Sciences (AFLS) – The faculty senate is an indispensable arm of University management; it represents the faculty who are the ones who carry out the mission of the University; it informs and learns from Administration; it nurtures the special role of faculty, a body of employees that needs maximum intellectual freedom within a sensible structure within which to teach and conduct research.

Alan Grubb – I believe in faculty governance of universities, or what's now called "shared governance", although I don't think much is actually shared by the administration anymore. Potentially the Senate could be of great benefit to the University if only as an oversight and advisory group. However, senators have to talk to do that and committees have to propose real, meaningful changes. I haven't seen that happening much in the past few years and consequently this university has returned largely to a top-down institution for all the talk of "shared governance."

How do you feel you are benefited/what have you gained by working with Faculty Senate?

Rob Baldwin – I enjoy meeting the people across the wide range of disciplines that exist within the umbrella that represents our university's grasp of Knowledge and Understanding of Nature and the World.

Alan Grubb, History (AAH) – Working for the Faculty Senate has made me more aware of what administrators and Board members do and also understanding (if not always agreeing with) their positions. Many faculty simply don't know how the University works; the Faculty Senate is a real education in that. Also, I view the Senate as a real help to faculty, especially in grievance matters. Faculty in general don't appreciate the value of the Faculty Manual or the Senate's work until they've run afoul of administration for some reason or other; they then expect the Senate to "save" them, and usually it does, with very little thanks.

John Meriwether – I enjoy meeting the people across the wide range of disciplines that exist within the umbrella that represents our university's grasp of Knowledge and Understanding of Nature and the World.

Any other thoughts regarding Faculty Senate?

Rob Baldwin – More faculty should understand the level of advocacy that the Faculty Senate provides for us; it is a place of hard work, thoughtful deliberation and discussion, and quiet and sometimes not so quiet advocacy. It sort of represents our better natures.

John Meriwether – It is a vibrant institution that serves the students and faculty rather well. Perhaps I am being a bit naive saying this but I do continue to be impressed by the level of dedication that I have encountered in fellow Faculty Senators.
President’s Report
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igh when chronic traumatic encephalopathy could be detected via imaging of living brain tissue. That day is now here. A UCLA study in the American Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry has successfully imaged, via PET scans, β amyloid and t protein accumulations in the brains of 5 living former NFL players. The results are not pretty. http://www.nytimes.com/2013/01/23/sports/football/study-suggests-pet-scans-mayidentify-cte-in-living-patients.html?_r=2&

Following: (a) the NCAA President’s recent state-of-the-association address, which was described as “Thirty-two minutes of nothing” by CBS Sports, (b) a January NCAA convention whose centerpiece was regulatory reform related to burning issues such as cream cheese provision and the use of Twitter, and (c) the NCAA’s cancellation of its Scholarly Colloquium and removal of funding for its scholarly journal (perhaps more to due with quasi-fascism than budget: http://chronicle.com/blogs/players/ncaa-withdraws-financial-support-for-its-scholarly-colloquium/32309?cid=at&utm_source=at&utm_medium=en)

Faculty should not get their hopes up concerning a near-term substantive NCAA response to this development.

However, I believe the UCLA study could be a watershed moment when viewed through the distant lens of history. The results mean that, in principle anyway, baseline and longitudinal measurements of the physiological impact of football can be made for all players at all levels. That’s a game changer when the day comes that higher education might have to reckon with moral culpability and legal liability concerns.

Faculty should also be concerned that the University is willing to invest its resources on initiatives such as tobacco and alcohol (perhaps firearms will be next?) – policies that, while worthy of attention, do not have the potential to fundamentally, systemically, and radically alter the University enterprise and culture in the near-unimaginable ways that changes to the football enterprise do. Whatever transpires, faculty will see over the near-term whether the statement that “we teach not only by formal instruction but also by example” is an obscure admonition for faculty in the Faculty Manual, or a description of the University’s broader culture.

I appreciated Clemson faculty member Jimmy Sanderson’s recent blog on the issue of sports and long-term health. Thank you, Jimmy, for speaking up and communicating with both passion and balance. I would only like to remind faculty of the grave dangers in calling this and thinking about this as a “concussion” issue or problem. Almost a century of mounting medical and epidemiological evidence makes it increasingly clear it is much more insidious and broad: a Subconcussion problem. How we label things does matter.

ColA Athletics Oversight Initiative

The Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics, of which the Clemson University Faculty Senate is a member, has sent the NCAA a letter advocating the convocation of a national summit to explore specific ideas for improving and strengthening faculty oversight of athletics. You can read a bit more about this initiative at: http://chronicle.com/blogs/players/faculty-group-urges-ncaa-to-convene-summit-on-athletics-oversight/32627

The APLU, AAU, Monsanto, and Big Ag: Sacrificing Core Values in Public Higher Education?

The Association of American Universities, the Association of Public and Land-Grant Universities, and several public research universities have filed an amicus brief (http://sblog.s3.amazonaws.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/01/WARFMcBrideAmicusJanuary24-2013.pdf) with the U.S. Supreme Court siding with Monsanto in the use of patent-infringement concerns to stifle (their own, in the case of North Dakota State University!) academic faculty’s freedom of inquiry to independently study the company’s genetically modified seeds (Bowman v. Monsanto were argued Feb 19).

Faculty should be concerned that this is yet another confounding case of the AAU and the APLU acting to deleteriously distort the core mission of research universities in the chase for the dollars associated with
the blind monetization of university research. Clemson faculty should be prepared for these issues to impact our campus at some time in the future given the our strategic initiatives in faculty-generated revenue, becoming a more deliberate economic development agency, initiating an agribusiness program, and continually enhancing and diversifying our genetics and computational presence.

As the Bowman v. Monsanto case demonstrates, the confluence of these initiatives risks transforming the public research university into a fragile system under which core tenets of free scientific inquiry are sacrificed. Faculty, the administration, and the Board should have a discussion about the importance of these values in the context of ongoing initiatives before such legal tensions arrive at our doorstep, and whether such tensions have their ultimate origin in the removal of public support for public higher education. Seed is just the beginning of such questions; ahead of us lie questions dealing with novel future technology (e.g., chemical and biological computers).

**A New University President’s View on Higher Ed**
The new Purdue University president, former IN governor Mitch Daniels, has clearly been doing a lot of homework (or reading this newsletter) regarding the current macro-picture of public higher education. I recommend reading his inaugural remarks, which contain stimulating fodder for Clemson faculty. The challenges he identifies are the great ones of our time, and ones that would be ultimately best addressed by faculty—who will need to exit their silos to do so:


**New AAUP Recommendations on Contingent Faculty**
The AAUP has just issued a new report with recommendations concerning the definition of faculty and the role of lecturers, postdocs, and grad students in faculty governance:

https://www.aaup.org/report/governance-inclusion

Suffice it to say that these recommendations would radically alter the current policies and culture at Clemson. I find a lot of policies debated and enacted across campus to be primarily justified on the grounds that “everyone is doing this” or “this eminent body recommends doing this.” I’ve also found this is the case because other intelligible forms of justification are lacking. Ultimately, I hope the Senate and the faculty will do what makes the most sense for Clemson faculty—irrespective of what the AAUP recommends. I’m sure this report will provide the basis of many long and passionate (and sorely needed!) discussions about the classification and rights of faculty during President-Elect Smith’s term.

**Moody’s Outlook for Higher Education**
Moody’s Investors Service has issued a 12- to 18-month negative outlook concerning the credit conditions for higher education. While Moody’s does not believe higher ed is in a bubble, and sees continued demand for higher education, they anticipate 5 key challenges moving forward: (a) lack of strong leadership and the need for better governance, (b) compressed real net personal incomes and net worth, (c) regulation stemming from increased demand for transparency/regulation by the public and political entities, (d) the impact of the perceived value of a college education driven by increasing student debt amounts and default rates, and (e) systemic black swan collapse of diverse revenue sources. Moody’s believes those institutions that have a large dependence on tuition, low brand recognition, smaller endowments, and competition from lower cost competitors will especially feel these challenges. In the very near-term, faculty should watch closely the effects of Congressional sequestration efforts in or around March, and their impact on subsidized loans and Pell grants.


**Senate President’s Column**

**The 4th Dimension: This is the Dawning of the Age of Assessment**

Faculty should expect that the State’s component of the FY 2013-2014 University budget will have a performance-based element. How did we get here, where are we going, and how are we going to be assessed? How do we best serve our students—
particularly those of color—and increase faculty diversity? The germ of answers to some of these questions can be found in a few cautionary tales suggesting that higher education, despite the best of intentions, may not always be doing things in the best interests of students—but we can’t seem to stop based on our current models and appreciation of assessment. That will have to change.

January’s column talked a bit about old and new visions of the current social tapestry—in particular how that tapestry is being woven with the threads of new class structures spawned by information/knowledge-based economies. While that circumstance may be the root cause of growing socioeconomic division and may have quasi-Orwellian outcomes (already manifest in miniature in outcomes such as the LEV parking policy in its current form), we visited those aspects last month.

This month, let’s consider other impacts close to home. In the 25 January Saturday Essay in the Wall Street Journal (http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424127887323539804578261780648285770.html) Bill Gates told us how he was going to solve all of the worlds’ Big Problems. The core of his solution is measurement. Meh, maybe. The denizens of Sikes are no doubt tired of hearing me repeatedly parrot that not everything that counts can be counted, and ultimately humans—not data—need to solve problems in, and make decisions about, human systems.

But, there is little doubt that we find our drowsy selves peering out the window at the cloudy dawn of measurement gone wild. This is understandable. The expansion of global debt at twice the rate of global GDP over the past 25 years, and our own national fiscal gap incrementing lately at $11 trillion each year, are ultimately both political crises. But, the fiscal pressures these political phenomena produced have led parents, students, legislators, boards, accreditors, citizens, and executives to question the value of what we do—and to expect a quantitative answer. Or, as I heard our Provost describe it, faculty now find a 4th leg on their stool—assessment—to accompany teaching, research, and service.

Based on legislative and gubernatorial activity, faculty should expect a component of this coming year's budget to be performance-based. For those interested in asking why, I believe the history books will show that: (a) administrators, faculty, and boards have long-confounded quality with prestige and focused on inputs, rather than outputs, associated with our enterprise and (b) we ourselves have struggled to develop and apply meaningful robust quantitative metrics to our own enterprise. So, this will now be done for us, and probably quite poorly without careful thought about how one assesses quality, access, economic development, etc.

A consequence of this 4th dimension is that many of you will notice that the University has started to measure stuff—or, more worryingly, parrot measures of stuff—more. This trend is reflected in the University President’s Report Card that is provided to our BOT each quarter (http://www.clemson.edu/president/reportcard.pdf). As I’ve demonstrated in previous Columns, the intellectual merit is disappointing for some of these metrics (e.g., the SmartMoney magazine P/E ratios of graduates), which instead are more suitable for marketing purposes. But, it would be a grave misjudgment if faculty are not deliberately tolerant and encouraged: these hiccups are nonetheless evidence of evolution towards a culture of meaningful measurement, and we should understand that university presidents have become “captives of constituencies” through no large fault of their own—a fate that may await us all if we expend our time and energy howling at the frontline victims rather than recognizing the vanguard sails onwards towards us.

I offer a few cautionary tales and thoughts that might serve to refocus and guide us moving forward as that vanguard approaches.

Cautionary Tale #1— College Rankings: What’s the Most Meaningful Assessment Instrument?
This months’ issue of The Quarterly Journal of Economics contains an intriguing article entitled “A Revealed Preference Ranking of U.S. Colleges and
Universities” (http://qje.oxfordjournals.org/content/128/1/425.full.pdf+html). This study ranks institutions according to matriculating student preferences by looking at the outcome of several thousand individual “tournaments” when high-achieving students receive multiple admissions offers.

The analysis reveals some novel features of this ranking scheme, including near-insensitivity to self-selection by students based on early admissions and their own assessment of odds of admission, distance of institution from home address, differing financial aid packages, and net cost. The preference-based rankings also offer advantages over those based upon admission rates and yield, which can be gamed by admissions officers to make their institutions appear more selective. Moreover, the preference-based ratings avoid the statistical weighting choices of alleged quality metrics; the preference-based rankings naturally reflect the convolution of statistical weightings of various factors actually employed by students... not what USNWR pulls out of a hat.

I'm sure you want to know how these demonstrated preference results differ from USNWR rankings, so here are some selected comparisons:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>USNWR national ranking</th>
<th>Preference-based ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U Virginia</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNC</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Tech</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn State</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Florida</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Maryland</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Georgia</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>&gt;110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purdue</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas A&amp;M</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>&gt;110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clemson U</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>&gt;110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Iowa</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>&gt;110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Tech</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>&gt;110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana U</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn U</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>&gt;110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida State U</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC-Boulder</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The preference-based rankings include some small 4-year colleges (e.g., Amherst, Middlebury, etc.) not in the USNWR national ranking. However, this matters little for the purpose of seeing that there exists considerable variability in the relative institution-to-institution rankings of USNWR versus student preference: USNWR ranks Clemson more highly than MSU, Indiana U, FSU, and UC Boulder. High-achieving students clearly believe otherwise and, more importantly, act accordingly on those beliefs. Perhaps we should be working hard to understand these rankings—not those of USNWR—and how to move their associated needles.

Cautionary Tale #2—Confronting our Deepest Darkest Fears: Unintended Consequences of Financial Incentives on Completion Rates.

What if the high-achieving students are correct in their assessment of college quality? That certainly presents a marketing dilemma, but also a bit of a puzzle. I certainly am impressed with the increasing quality of the in-state students in my Department over the past decade. I relate to our visiting faculty candidates my impression that, with the aid of the Life and Palmetto monies, we are keeping good in-state students in-state. That's good, right?

Good for whom? For now we have to face the questions that are the near-intractable inverse problems of academic epidemiology: what if those same good students had not come to Clemson, but had gone somewhere else (Furman, Emory, Vanderbilt) that their qualifications and records would have enabled? Would the eventual outcomes be different? Would those students be better off? What is it, exactly, that a Clemson education adds that other institutions’ education would not?

The unacknowledged fear of the answers to these questions is surely something that silently haunts marketers, administrators, and thoughtful faculty. What if our students are treated well here, receive a fine education here, go on to do well, but are not as well off as if they had been educated elsewhere? What if our students who don’t graduate in a timely fashion, or not at all, could have done so if they had matriculated at
Duke or at UVa? Is this possible, and how could such a circumstance occur?

Sarah Cohodes and Joshua Goodman of Harvard’s Kennedy School suggest (https://research.hks.harvard.edu/publications/getFile.aspx?id=836) that it is happening in Massachusetts, whose Adams Scholarship program offers tuition waivers at in-state public institutions for students who score well on the 10th grade state comprehensive examination. Cohodes and Goodman look at the marginal effects of the Adams Scholarship by examining cohorts barely above and barely below the Adams-qualifying threshold. By examining graduation records and using institutional quality measures from the IPEDS database, they reach some surprising conclusions.

In a nutshell, “high-skilled” students who could have attended higher quality institutions are easily swayed from doing so by exceedingly modest pecuniary sums. In doing so, a high-skilled student enrolling in an in-state public college lowers his or her odds of graduating in a timely fashion by over 40%. Indeed, the completion rates of this cohort of Adams scholarship students are so low that the authors conclude there is negligible impact on college graduate production. The quantitative results are astounding: only 1 in 6 of students enticed to enroll at a UMass campus by the Adams scholarship graduated in four years; only 1 in 4 of student enticed to enroll in any MA public four-year institution graduated in four years. The estimated lifetime earnings penalty that results from non-completion as a result of Adams Scholarship-induced decisions is a cool $250,000 per student—some 30 to 40 times the initial financial benefit (or the state’s cost). If MA state income tax rates then exceed 2.5-3%, this is a net financial loss for the state.

A similar analysis for the Life and Palmetto scholarship programs would be worthwhile. Until then, the takeaway conclusion of Cohodes and Goodman should serve as a warning for Clemson faculty: increasing quality cannot be accomplished by simply “changing the composition of the student body”. It seems to me that we, as an institution, nonetheless expend a good deal of effort at trying to do so. Those attempts may be short-sighted. Regardless, assessment can tell us.

**Cautionary Tale #3— Not Heeding Assessment: Opportunities, Unintended Consequences, and Racial Concerns**

Because student preference rankings suggest high achieving students have a propensity to go elsewhere and the Kennedy School study raises the possibility that we need to examine whether marginally high-achieving students might be better off going elsewhere, then faculty need to rethink the meaning of quality. Presumably this would be quality not as measured by inputs.

Outcomes/performance-based funding may be good for us, but not if outcomes and performance is meaningless bean counting. Happily, a variety of assessments—many unheeded—indicate opportunities to understand and achieve quality in some important contexts.

**The Phenomenon of Academic Mismatch**

In a 1966 American Journal of Sociology article, available from JSTOR via the URL http://www.jstor.org.libproxy.clemson.edu/stable/2775756?seq=1, the University of Chicago’s James Davis found that GPAs evinced greater correlations with career choice than “intellectual caliber” of a given student body. Davis concluded that students measure their own abilities by relative comparison with their on-campus peers, rather than in an absolute sense. Davis admonished us that we “might well consider the drawbacks...of sending a boy to a ‘fine’ college, if, when doing so, it is fairly certain he will end up in the bottom ranks of his graduating class”. Davis was especially wary of the concerns raised by his findings given what he saw, correctly, as a long-term trend of selectivity associated with the expansion of higher education.

Considerable work has been conducted on ethnicity and mismatch in science and engineering. In a 1996 Research in Higher Education article (http://www.seaphe.org/pdf/elliott-ethnicity.pdf), Rogers Elliot et al examine the sources of racial differences in science degrees awarded at four very selective institutions. While Hispanic and black students
had lower high school grades and standardized test scores, their initial interest in science was higher than that of white students. While Elliott et al. did not conduct comparisons that would eliminate various factors that correlate with race (e.g., lack of minority faculty role models), they speculate that minority students’ relative credentials compared with their on-campus peers drives lower persistence towards a science degree. Supporting this speculation is their data on 11 private institutions showing that students with 600 Math SAT scores at the least elite institution would be near the high end of the score distribution and have a 55% chance of completing a science degree; in comparison, the same SAT score would be in the bottom third of the distribution at their most elite institution, where such a students would have a 15% change of completing a science degree.

In a 2004 Research in Higher Education article (http://www.jstor.org/stable/40197327), Smyth and McArdle reach similar conclusions using a sample of minority students who intended to major in STEM fields at 23 universities. They find that, after academic student characteristics are controlled for, institutional selectivity is not associated with STEM major persistence. Rather, they find that pre-university academic preparation explains differences in STEM major persistence between underrepresented minorities and non-minorities. Their admonishment is that “Admission officials are advised to carefully consider the relative academic preparedness of scienceinterested students, and such students choosing among colleges are advised to compare their academic qualifications to those of successful science students at each institution.” Indeed, Smyth & McArdle estimate that 35% more minority males and 45% more minority females would have persisted to graduate with STEM degrees if their academic credentials were in line with institution averages.

A 2009 (apparently unpublished) report by UCLA’s R. Sander and R. Bolus examined, with multiple methods, minority attrition in sciences at nine UC campuses. They conclude that such attrition is driven by the mismatch of incoming academic credentials with their peers’ credentials at a given institution. http://www.seaphe.org/pdf/sciencemismatch.pdf

This mismatch is not inherently racial, but its manifestations are clearest in the racial disparities in degree attainment. This is especially true at public universities, which are often characterized by disparities in incoming academic credentials. For example, the University of Texas released SAT and high school GPA data for the freshman 2009 class as part of the ongoing Fisher v. University of Texas Supreme Court case: average SAT/GPAs are 1794/2.83 for Hispanics; 1524 and 2.57 for African-Americans; 1914 and 3.04 for Caucasians; and 1991 and 3.07 for Asians.

In the 2010 report Encouraging Minority Students to Pursue Science, Technology, Engineering and Math Careers, the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights finds that attrition of STEM majors and Ph.D. students is substantially due to academic mismatch—irrespective of race. The Commission also found that preferred admissions for minorities, however, contributed to mismatching at the heart of overall higher attrition rates for Hispanics and African-Americans. The Commission cautioned selective institutions to deny admissions to any STEMinterested applicants evincing academic credentials substantially lower than the institution’s STEM median credentials unless applicants were alerted to potential detrimental impacts. http://www.usccr.gov/pubs/EncouragingMinorityStudentsinScienceCareers.pdf

According to Sander, the same detrimental mismatch effects exist in law schools (http://www2.law.ucla.edu/sander/Systemic/SA.htm) contains the paper, the data, and supplemental analyses addressing criticisms): when Caucasian and African-American students have similar incoming credentials (LSAT and college GPA), they perform similarly; typically, however, credentials of an incoming class are grossly mismatched and relative performance (measured by first-year GPA) of African Americans suffers greatly.
The Future of Quality
What do all these studies suggest about the future for Clemson faculty? Where should we direct our efforts? I believe the answer is... quality. That's not very bold inasmuch as State performance-based funding standards will likely mandate a quality component. But, how do we define and work towards quality?

The 2012 study of college majors at Duke published in the IZA Journal of Labour Economics by three Duke faculty members (http://public.econ.duke.edu/~psarcidi/grades_4.0.pdf) suggests some ideas. These authors too find a near order-of-magnitude difference in the rate at which African-American and white males switch out of STEM majors, confirm that it is not due to differences in initial interest in such majors, and suggest that disparities are due to mismatches of incoming academic credentials. The authors also suggest that the GPA convergence of same-cohort minorities and white students between freshman and senior year is, unfortunately, illusory and driven by these mismatches: as minority students are driven out of STEM fields, they switch to humanities and social science majors with more lenient grading standards... that's not good for either STEM or humanities and social sciences.

In the context of the above, evidence of quality might include: (a) helping students pursue and be successful at their initial choice of major; (b) ensuring that all majors have well-prepared successful students, and don't serve as collecting pools of mismatched students; (c) institutionally serving as a better home for students who are currently academically mismatched at elite institutions; (d) serving as a backstop for well-matched students at HBCUs, which are facing incredible financial pressures and, in some cases, desperate crises of leadership; and, (e) making sure we do not promote mismatching students ourselves. This need not include an overt direct racial component because, it is important to note, such mismatching can also occur in legacy admissions and athletics-based admissions.

The bad news is that changing the trajectory of African-American mismatch and its consequences will be much harder now than it would have been a decade or two ago when this phenomenon was already apparent. The table below shows the demographics of Clemson students in selected years (from www.nces.ed.gov).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>AfricanAm</th>
<th>Hispanics</th>
<th>Asians</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>93.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>90.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>88.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>84.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>82.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>84.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We see that Clemson students became less white and more black in the 80's and early 90's. Curiously, since then, Clemson students have continued to become less white, but also less black. This same pattern (with interesting differences in the peak year of black enrollment) can be seen for other southeast public universities. The reason is the same for all of them: the increase in Hispanic and Asian students.

If the relative average credentials by race at U Texas are typical, then accommodating increased numbers of black students with well-matched credentials will be difficult given the increasing population of Hispanic students. One wonders if the optimal window to address African American mismatch started to close 20 years ago.

Given the demographic trends, reopening that window may require some form of admissions set asides. The legal possibility of that now rests in great part with the Fisher v. U Texas case. The political possibility of that is a complex cocktail of ideology, identity politics, intellectual leadership, and thoughtful policy.
The State certainly might have a considerable financial interest in mitigating mismatch by whatever means. Fifteen years ago, the former presidents of Princeton and Harvard, W. Bowen and D. Bok, published *The Shape of the River: Long-Term Consequences of Considering Race in College and University Admissions*. While the book attempts to showcase the success of affirmative admissions processes at very selective universities—and does so in restrictive cases—it also overlooks and misses the manifestations of mismatch in its own data appendices. In particular, Bowen and Bok show that black males at Princeton with the same high school rank and SAT scores and college major and college grades as black males at Penn State will make a lot more money. A triumph of affirmative admission in the Ivy League? Maybe not. If the college grades are not the same (as happens with academic mismatch), then the financial penalties are enormous. E.g., Bowen and Bok's own data suggest that black males in the bottom third of their class at Princeton, driven from STEM majors, will suffer an earnings hit of more than $50,000 per year compared to black males in STEM majors in the upper third of their class at Penn State. Over a graduate's lifetime, that's a lot of tax revenue lost by the state.

**Faculty Diversity**

The vast majority of academics believe that faculty racial/ethnic diversity is highly desirable due to a large number of perceived benefits. While some of those benefits are probably not supported by assessment (more on that in a bit), little progress on increasing faculty diversity has been made in the last few decades at our institution despite efforts, initiatives, and personnel attempting to do so. Frustration with this circumstance has grown to a sufficient level that I believe the President's Commission on Black Faculty and Staff will soon be issuing a report of recommendations and suggested strategic plans. The grapevine suggests some of these may be “interesting” and challenging—I suspect faculty, when apprised of this report, will have much to consider and discuss.

In the meantime, it's been 10 years since Stephen Cole (Stony Brook sociology) and Elinor Barber (deceased; Columbia U Provost's office) published *Increasing Faculty Diversity: The Occupational Choices of High-Achieving Minority Students*. The central conclusion of their work is that there is no difference in the professorial aspirations of high achieving minority and non-minority students; nor do the data reveal any greater efficacy of same-race role models for those minorities that do decide on an academic career. Rather, the key driver of the small pool of minority student Ph.D.’s is mismatch: minority students are more frequently steered to institutions where their relative performance is low; such students are not viable in subsequent faculty candidate pools. In sum, we not only see the effects of low faculty diversity, but we are also the cause.

The apparent connection between grades and professional aspirations (as distinct from eventual placement) themselves is very strong. Cole and Barber find that about 20% of African-American students with GPAs around 4.0 aspire to the professoriate, which can be compared to <5% for those students with GPAs around 2.6. These results are completely consistent with the connection between grades and professional aspirations/choices seen by Davis some 37 years before Cole and Barber.

Thus, increasing faculty diversity is really all about increasing educational quality, diversity of student success, and combating the insidious effects of academic mismatch. In this sense, faculty diversity is an issue that must, then, be addressed on a much longer timescale. Treating student diversity, disparities in student success, and faculty diversity as separate distinct issues and addressing them via programs, initiatives, and personnel in discrete silos will continue to fail in dramatic fashion. That's not something we can afford in the age of assessment and performance-based funding.

Jeremy King is solely responsible for the views expressed in The President's Column. They neither reflect the views of nor are endorsed by the Faculty Senate or Clemson University.