During the 2009-2010 academic year the committee responded to new and continuing concerns of faculty members.

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

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

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

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

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