Survey of Chairs on their use of student teaching evaluation in evaluations: Graciela Tissera took the lead in developing a survey of Chairs on their use of student teaching evaluations for performance reviews. The goals are to determine which information is used, how it is weighted (for example does a high score indicate excellent or too easy teaching?), whether all faculty are evaluated in the same way, what other information is also used, and whether all these criteria are clearly communicated to faculty. Linda Nilson and Debra Jackson provided valuable input and David Knox implemented the survey online. It was endorsed Senate on Feb. 12 and went out soon after, followed by a reminder to Chairs that their input is important and will be confidential. The results are not yet in. Based on the results of this survey, we may wish to discuss with Chairs the strengths and weaknesses of such student evaluations, and the requirement to consider alternative sources of information on teaching. We may also wish to survey Chairs of TPR Committees in the future.

Bridge Program: Alan Grubb has been evaluating the admission and performance of students who enter Clemson University through the Bridge Program, compared with traditional students. He has been compiling information on admission standards, grades, graduation rates, etc., from Debra Jackson, Robert Barkley, Sue Horton and others, and has submitted a preliminary report.

New articulation agreements: SP has been asked whether Clemson University can enter into articulation agreements with two-year colleges in which those colleges offer courses that will receive 3xx credit at Clemson University. Clemson does not currently allow this, nor do most other universities, based on an informal professional survey by Robert Barclay. David Tonkyn has received arguments for and against this change and reviewed SACS documents, but was unable to schedule a meeting with University Counsel for review.

Student and Employee Policy for email Communication: At the Provost’s request, Jan Murdoch forwarded this proposed new policy on emails on March 20, for FS vetting:

Email is considered an official method of communication at Clemson University. Official email communications are intended to meet the academic, research and public service needs of the user community including students, faculty, staff and administrators. The University has the right to expect that such communications will be received and read in a timely manner. To enable this process, the University ensures that all members of the university community can be reached through a standardized, university issued email account throughout their tenure at Clemson University. If a user chooses to forward their email to an account other than those issued or supported in partnership by Clemson University, Clemson University cannot be held responsible for the timely delivery or reliability of the user’s access to the service.
**Completed**

**Banner:**  We were asked last May by outgoing Faculty Senate President Dan Warner to consider the perhaps unintended effects of implementing Banner, the new student records system, on Clemson’s redemption and withdrawal policies. Banner does not have an option to enforce current University policies limiting student withdrawal and redemption hours. We received input from Jeff Appling and met with the Banner Project Manager and the Registrar’s Office, and made two recommendations: to remove the cap on withdrawal hours, to avoid costly custom software development and bring Clemson in line with other schools; and to change the cap on grade redemptions from 10 credit hours to 3 courses. Both were approved unanimously at the May 8, 2012 Faculty Senate Meeting.

We also agreed to fast-track any other issues that arose from the implementation of Banner, and met again in July with the Banner Project Manager and Registrar’s Office, to discuss three more. First, Banner did not have a way to force students to meet with their advisors prior to registering for classes, and we were asked whether this requirement might be relaxed. We had a spirited discussion and, without taking a vote, made it clear that at least some faculty feel strongly that it should be continued. Students are now registering through Banner for the first time, and we observe that a way has been found to ensure that students meet with their advisors prior to registering for classes. We also discussed the changes that Banner would bring to purchasing and class room scheduling across campus.

**Retention Committee:**  We endorsed a request from Vice-Provost Jan Murdoch to eliminate the Freshman-Sophomore Retention Committee that she chairs. This was approved at the September 11, 2012 Senate Meeting by a two-thirds majority.

**Latin Honors requirement:**  We discussed whether the new Latin honors criteria were too high, and whether their implementation should be delayed a year. We voted not to reconsider the standards themselves, but to support the delay so that students who entered Clemson University in the fall of 2009 could graduate under the standards set in that year’s Undergraduate Announcements. In September, the Senate asked us to look into it further, and it was a major point of discussion at the Council on Undergraduate Studies meeting on Sept. 14. There we learned that the Undergraduate Announcements are explicitly NOT a contract with the students (page 8), that there had already been a 2-year extension to the criteria, and that the SDPR forms had shown the new standards for several years. Given this information, we did not support delaying implementation, and recognized that Provost Helms has the final decision.

**Contextualization in grading:**  We were asked to explore whether faculty should provide rankings of students in addition to letter grades, as a possible response to grade inflation. At the Oct. 9 Senate meeting, we proposed to drop this issue unless and until someone actively raises it, and there were no objections.

**Ad hoc Committee on Application of Graduate Credits to an Undergraduate Degree:**  Bob Horton was the SP representative to this committee, and had sent us the text below which was sent to the Council on Undergraduate Studies. We reported this to the full Faculty Senate at its Oct. 9th meeting and there were not comments.

*Undergraduate Enrollment in Graduate Courses*

Clemson University undergraduates may request to enroll in graduate courses at Clemson only if they have senior standing and have a cumulative grade-point ratio of 3.0 or higher. Enrollment of undergraduates in any graduate course is subject to approval by the department offering the course and by the Graduate School. The total course workload for the semester must not exceed 18 hours, and undergraduate students
may not enroll in a total of more than 12 semester hours of graduate credit at Clemson University. The credits and quality points associated with senior enrollment in graduate courses will be part of the undergraduate record. Undergraduates seeking to enroll in graduate courses must complete form GS6, Request for Senior Enrollment, and GS6BS/MS, which is available at www.grad.clemson.edu/forms/GeneralForms.php.

Application of Graduate Credits to Undergraduate Degree
At the discretion of the degree-granting program, a degree-seeking undergraduate student may apply graduate level coursework—whether earned at Clemson or elsewhere—towards an undergraduate degree. Graduate courses taken at regionally accredited institutions other than Clemson University are eligible to be evaluated for transfer credit. Students may not receive credit for both the 400 and 600 levels of the same course.

Changes in International Student Travel: We met with the Vice Provost for International Affairs, Sharon Nagy, about proposed changes to allow study abroad programs in selected regions of countries that are otherwise considered unsafe by the US State Department, CDC or WHO. These changes had been proposed before she arrived, and she made modifications before sending them to CUGS and others. We expressed our concerns that the International Affairs Office, and not individual faculty members, should take primary responsibility in detecting any changes to such regions that would affect the safety of our students and faculty.

General Education changes: On several occasions, we discussed with Perry Austin and Student Senators their ideas on reforming the General Education requirements at Clemson. Perry forwarded to us the Final Report of the Student Senate General Education Revision Task Force, which we then sent to the Senate for information and guidance. It was decided to invite the Student Senate to present this report at the first meeting of the 2013-2014 Senate, so that curricular reform might be on the agenda at the outset.

Calhoun Honors College Committee: We approved changes to the Faculty Manual provision regarding the make-up of the Calhoun Honors Committee, which had been requested by Dr. Bill Lassiter, Director of the Calhoun Honors College. These were modest and intended to reflect changes in the Honors College personnel and programs. These were approved at the Nov. 18, 2012 Faculty Senate meeting.

Permanent fall break: We considered a request that the University institute a permanent Fall Break, separate from mandated election holidays, as a solution to the problems that arise when the only break is in early November, near the end of classes. This was not supported.

Informing students of alternate sources for required materials: We were asked to consider a case in which a faculty member had used Blackboard to notify students that required course materials could be obtained more cheaply outside of the University Bookstore. This could lead to a significant reduction in sales to Barnes and Noble, with whom the university has a contract for on-campus sales, but provide savings to the students. We cannot address the legal aspects, but thought that students were savvy in finding cheaper sources of books, etc., and that discretion rather than a new policy on faculty should suffice.

Financial exigency/closure: Jeremy King asked a number of Faculty Senate committees to look at the new AAUP financial exigency/program closure guidelines. We examined them and proposed that the Faculty Senate request that the University Counsel propose a specific revision to the Faculty Manual, which we could then discuss. It was suggested that Dan Warner may have worked on this with Clay Steadman when he was Counsel.
Reversal of substitution decision: Jeremy King asked that we consider a case in which Jan Murdoch apparently overturned a departmental decision to deny a course substitution. The student had appealed unsuccessfully to his academic Dean before asking Dean Murdoch. It appeared that she overreached her authority, but when we contacted her, she expressed surprise at this interpretation. She pointed out that her signature is the final one on the form, and she has understood this to mean she has final authority. In addition, she sometimes had information regarding the students that was not available to faculty. She suggested that Faculty Senate formally seek to change this policy if it wishes. We did not pursue this.

Scholarships and Awards Committee: Wayne Goddard has represented Scholastic Policies on this committee. No action items were transmitted to the committee.

Online Education Faculty Advisory Board: John Leininger has represented Scholastic Policies on this new committee, and kept us informed on its activities and plans.

Council of Undergraduate Studies, including Banner Subcommittee: David Tonkyn has represented Scholastic Policies on this committee and brought up several SP items for general discussion (e.g., Latin Honors, applying graduate credits to undergraduate degree, evaluation of Bridge Program and articulation agreements.)