APPENDIX N

CRITIQUE OF COLLEGE AND VICE PRESIDENTIAL SELF-STUDIES

College of Agriculture, Forestry and Life Sciences (CAFLS)

Eighty-eight faculty and staff responded to a series of questions about the effectiveness of Clemson’s 1995 reorganization (no students responded apparently because the survey was done during Finals week of Fall 2000). Over two thirds of the respondents (69%) were negative or neutral (on a 5 point scale) when asked to analyze the impact and effectiveness of operations in their unit after reorganization. 88% were negative or neutral in response to the reorganization adding flexibility and adaptability. 83% were negative or neutral about post-reorganization cost effectiveness. 72% were negative or neutral about being more competitive for students and funding. 95% were negative or neutral about increased trust among colleagues and across campus. 88% were negative or neutral about being better stewards of resources. Findings from the survey cast effectiveness and ability to attain the area’s mission and goals in a similarly negative light. The survey found that 80-90% of the respondents were negative or neutral about organizational structure helping progress toward attaining area goals. But more than 50% were positive about CAFLS assisting the University attain its goals. A synopsis of major changes, which occurred after reorganization especially with respect to departments and curricula, is as follows (quoted from the Self-Study):

“The original structure after reorganization included four Schools, with associated Business Centers. The Directors of these Schools were to coordinate the allocation of PSA and E&G funds to each of the departments in that school. In practice sometimes PSA funding bypassed the department Chair and went directly to the faculty member. The most current plan (January 17, 2001) eliminates Schools but leaves the Business Centers in operation.

At the time of the reorganization there were 21 departments which, by December 2000, have been reduced to 16 through internal reorganization. Three undergraduate degree programs and two MS degree programs have been discontinued, five MS programs have been fused into a single MS in Plant and Environmental Sciences program, and four Ph.D. programs have been fused into one. A new undergraduate major in Environmental and Natural Resources has been approved and a new MS program in Packaging Sciences has been created. The Biology Program and the program in Agriculture Education were merged into a department of Biology Instruction and Agricultural Education. In January 2001, the Board of Trustees approved the creation of the Department of Genetics and Biochemistry effective in July 2001. Microbiology and Molecular Medicine will be taken into the
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Department of Biological Sciences. No degree programs will be lost or gained."

In the CAFLS survey summary of strengths and weaknesses, the self-study concludes that the reorganization produced many more negative effects than positive with the notable exception being an improved financial efficiency gained by centralizing fiscal matters in budget centers. The self-study also concludes that faculty and staff morale is low and that tensions from differing disciplinary cultures brought together unwillingly still impair performance. The CAFLS self-study would seem to strongly indicate that the reorganization has made it considerably more difficult for the units of the new college to satisfy section 6.1.5 must statements. The report recommends that the perceived "firewall" between Public Service Activities (PSA) and Educational & General (E&G) sides of the college must come down. We quote from the report as follows:

"The responses received from those who answered the survey were overwhelmingly negative.

Question 7 of the questionnaire requested comments on the impact of the reorganization. A large percentage of the respondents used terms such as inefficient, with comments as strong as 'unmitigated disaster'. The reasons most often cited were the extra layers of administration that resulted in inefficiency and poor communication. The tension between PSA and E&G which was present before reorganization was perceived as even more strained after the 1995 reorganization and the resulting turf war blamed for poor strategic planning and a precipitous decline in faculty and staff morale. Throughout the responses the reorganization was perceived by PSA personnel as degrading the services provided by PSA and perceived by E&G personnel as degrading the ability to offer quality educational offerings and to negatively affect non-PSA funded research.

The major positive effect cited was the creation of Budget Centers which did have a positive effect on efficiency."

On the positive side, President Barker has recently submitted a new organization chart for CAFLS and announced a wholesale transfer of funding for faculty positions from the PSA to the E&G side. This move advances a "One Clemson" philosophy that views the University as having a single set of goals in which every branch of the University can invest time and energy and expect to be rewarded. Fourteen current CAFLS programs are cited in the self-study that contribute to the institutional goals. The self-study states that all of the college’s area goals and programs align with the University goals.
College of Architecture, Arts and Humanities (CAAH)

The College of Architecture, Arts and Humanities resulted in the combining of two colleges: The College of Architecture and the College of Liberal Arts. The new college structure now includes:

- The School of Design and Building – School of Architecture, Department of Construction Science and Management, Department of Planning and Landscape Architecture
- The School of Humanities – Department of English, Department of History, Department of Languages, Department of Philosophy & Religion, Department of Speech and Communication Studies
- The School of Arts – Department of Performing Arts, Department of Art

1. Effectiveness of Reorganization

The reorganization dramatically altered the college and department administration: the department chairs were shifted to 9-month assignment and college and department support personnel were reassigned to a new centralized administrative unit. Changes at the college level were significant. A few changes were made with some pre-reorganization schools. Departments had the most changes with the department heads becoming chairs and having 9-month assignments. Many staff changes also took effect at the department level with many departments being left “understaffed.”

Many changes took place at the budget level. The biggest change is that it left many inequities with the combining of departments from different colleges with different funding bases. With this change and further budget reductions, “some departments continue to struggle for operating funds.” A pledge to support a “Faculty Bill of Rights” helped. Still, the results of a survey of faculty, staff, and chairs stated that they budget was the college’s greatest weakness.

The “Guiding Principles” concept developed during the reorganization seems to have been a key factor in the success of the College. It provided the basis for the college’s early assessment plans. “As a statement of shared vision, it provides one type of yardstick to assess the college six years into the new structure.” These principles focus on the following:

1. Community
2. Unity within diversity
3. Diversity and multicultural education
4. Focus on learning
5. Applied and contemplative curriculum
6. Balance between general education and education of majors
7. Creative connections among teaching, research and service
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Although these guiding principles still provide an overarching framework for the College, the faculty is now developing a multi-layered strategic plan.

In summary, the “restructuring has been mixed, with the positive effects of the change generally outweighing the negative. There has been real loss, but also many gains.” However, there is also room for improvement. These changes were suggested:
- Create an equitable plan to establish reasonable operating budgets
- Re-evaluate the “Guiding Principles” to better align with University’s goals
- Assess the current funding and criteria for Platform for Collaboration grants
- Continue to access advising efforts in the departments and implement changes to improve
- Continue efforts to increase minority students and faculty
- Evaluate the effectiveness of the Schools, particularly the School of Arts

Most of these changes, particularly budgetary issues, are underway.

2. Effectiveness of College

The college’s leadership has completely changed in the past two years, which has left the current leadership relatively inexperienced. A major concern has been the perception that the reorganization has left the departments severely understaffed and under-budgeted. These factors along with the addition of other duties assigned to the department chairs have been a growing concern and source of discontent.

The college is governed by bylaws, which seem to work adequately. Numerous councils and various groups represent areas of the organization on specific matters. Even with this widespread use of the organization in governance, the faculty still perceive the agendas as being “top down” and the meetings themselves as a set of announcements or lectures by administration.

Communication within the organization seems adequate with the use of newsletters, email lists, web sites, and other forms of communication. Staff cited communication as their strongest concern stating that they do not believe that they are having “their voices heard and taken seriously.” Faculty have noted a similar concern.

Space and facilities is an area noted as “a critical concern” for several programs. Old facilities and the growth of new programs have left a need for space and improved existing space. The lack of new equipment, computers and support technologies is considered a weakness in the college effectiveness. Plans are underway to make improvements but only if funding is acquired.

Enrollment has been strong in the college and the departments are working well to handle the numbers. Several issues must still be addressed but, again, funding is an issue.

The following have been noted as recommendations for change:
• Make Chairs' contracts twelve-month and provide training and professional development support
• Increase staff support and fund staff development
• Increase operating budgets and travel money
• Bring faculty salaries up to 100% of peer averages
• Consider a policy of spousal hires

3. Alignment of College with University Goals
The college's plan addresses some of the University goals as more pertinent to its mission than others, but with the exception of athletics, it addresses every area. It takes special interest in leading the University in these areas:
• Excellence in teaching
• Intersection of teaching, research and service
• Enrichment of campus life through programs of events and performances in the arts and letters
• Increased international activities for its students
• Increased multicultural awareness
• Maintenance of an attractive, safe environment
• Enhancement of the university's national reputation through student performances at Carnegie Hall, success in obtaining a Phi Beta kappa chapter, and faculty accomplishments

College of Business and Behavioral Sciences (CBBS)

1. Effectiveness of Reorganization
1. The joining of the social and behavioral science programs with economics and commerce and industry support the general education requirements of the university.
2. Realignment of Associate Dean positions and staff brought into a clearer focus the Dean's organization in support of the college's academic programs, research endeavors, and service activities. The results have been excellent according the self-study report.
3. Communication between the units in CBBS is still a challenge due to location of buildings on campus.
4. Few financial savings as a result of reorganization have occurred.
5. Specific pedagogical changes in CBBS cannot be directly traced to the organization.
6. Graphic communications has been a success story in the reorganization.
7. The position of the department chair has been weakened by the changes implemented during the reorganization.
8. Limited success in interdisciplinary teaching and research.

2. Effectiveness of College
Enrollment growth is stressing faculty resources, thereby negatively affecting new program development, faculty research, quality student advising, and overall college development. Progress is being made in limiting enrollment; however, the college budget is significantly below peers and more faculty are needed. New programs that are badly needed cannot be added without additional resources and other initiatives are limited due to the demand on current faculty members.

The college budget is inadequate to support faculty travel and other operating costs to maintain its competitive status for outstanding faculty and students.

Undergraduate student advising is a concern based on student assessments. A new advising center has been opened and staffed for the 2001-2001 in an effort to address that concern.

Faculty and staff salaries are significantly below peers and national averages. This is a critical issue in retaining the best faculty as well as in attracting future faculty.

Space is a major concern. The college does not have adequate laboratory space for psychology and graphic communications. The business programs are housed in a building that was built in 1939 and the last renovation was in 1979. Enrollment growth and quality of the space is a major concern. Physical separation of college units is a serious problem, which detracts from the ability of researchers to communicate informally. Additional space is needed for classrooms and offices.

The college needs to expand its presence in the Greenville community; however, on-campus demands limit this possibility. Graduate programs need to grow; however, undergraduate demands and noncompetitive stipends limit this possibility. College will exceed its financial goal for the current capital campaign. College supports a variety of outreach activities in public, professional and university service.

3. Alignment of College with University Goals.

The faculty of CBBS are recognized as outstanding teachers. The College includes four Alumni Distinguished Professors, as well as faculty who have been recognized for excellence in teaching at the university, state, and national levels.

Despite heavy teaching loads and lack of appropriate research space, CBBS faculty have increased sponsored research in accordance with the goals set by the Vice President for Research.

CBBS has been engaged in outstanding public service and outreach activities. Current programs that exemplify this activity include the Small Business Development Center, the Spiro Center for Entrepreneurial Leadership, The Center for Economic Education, and the Center for Policy and Legal Studies, and the Center for International Trade.
CBBS has programs that have been recognized at all levels as outstanding. The business degree programs are accredited by AACSB International, which grants this status to only a quarter of business programs. The CHE recognized our degree programs in Industrial Management as excellent, including the only undergraduate degree program in business to be so designated.

CBBS faculty have been leaders in service learning activities. Both undergraduate and graduate students are also engaged in research activities that enhance their educational experience.

CBBS, in conjunction with CES, pioneered the first freshman learning community in the University in 2000. This program is specifically designed to increase freshman retention and to strengthen students' sense of identity with the college and the university.

CBBS contributes to Clemson's distinctiveness through its combination of business and behavioral sciences. This organizational structure is unusual, but appropriate given the interrelationships of the disciplines. This structure provides increased opportunity for collaboration among faculty and students across disciplines.

The College also has the new Center for International Trade that is enhancing international opportunities for South Carolina businesses, as well as research opportunities and international experience for Clemson faculty and students.

CBBS is engaged in many collaborative activities. The Spiro Center has particularly worked with CES (College of Engineering and Sciences) faculty on technology transfer issues. The college is also collaborating with CES on the freshman learning community. The Department of Sociology collaborates with CAFLS (College of Agriculture, Forestry and Life Sciences) on Landscapes for Learning. Many of the faculty are engaged in the Communications across the Curriculum activities, including a current project on having students write poems to change their perspectives about course content.

The consensus of the Self-Study is that CBBS and its academic programs, research efforts, and outreach activities have been and continue to be highly consistent with and supportive of the University goals.

College of Engineering and Sciences (CES)

The CoES Self-Study committee gave an excellent summary and overview of the questions that they were asked to address. The Principal Committee on Organization and Administration concurs with this evaluation which is outlined below.

1. Effectiveness of Reorganization
Strengths
1. Multidisciplinary research collaboration has increased.
   - Large team efforts have led to increased external funding.
   - Easier development of interdisciplinary research teams is a strategic advantage.
2. Multidisciplinary educational collaboration and curricular innovation are encouraged, e.g.
   - Fresh look at general education requirements.
   - A common freshman year across engineering and science is under consideration.
3. Expectations for departments, faculty and students are more uniform in the larger colleges.
4. Appreciation for and understanding of faculty working in other disciplines has increased.
5. New levels of interdisciplinary cooperation, appreciation, and understanding for students.
6. Public and legislators perceive that the University is improving value to taxpayer.
7. Most faculty find new structure offers significant advantages.

Weaknesses:
1. Some loss in departmental leadership effectiveness i.e., nine-month department chairs are not as effective as 12-month heads.
2. Reduction of support staff hampers faculty productivity.
3. University-level organization hampers college effectiveness
   - Lack of effective management of facilities (responsibility not clearly assigned)
   - Lack of university-wide public service leadership/coordination
4. Continued difficulty in working across college lines to foster collaboration.
5. Lack of connection to Life Sciences (in another College).

2. Effectiveness of the College

Strengths:
1. Strong academic programs as witnessed by recent reviews by the Accrediting Board for Engineering and Technology and Commission of Higher Education.
2. Effective undergraduate recruitment program has improved SAT scores and numbers.
3. Good support for course/laboratory needs.
4. Strong industry connections as evidenced by large co-op and internship programs, grant support and targeted recruitment by major companies.
5. Encourages and fosters interdisciplinary programs, such as:
   - Center for Advanced Engineering Fibers and Films
   - Brooks Sports Science Institute
   - Master of Fine Arts in Computing
   - Materials Science and Engineering program
6. International programs for students (internship and study abroad programs).
7. Technology integration into instruction as exemplified by Laptop Program, Smart classrooms, and course management systems (Collaborative Learning Environment (CLE) and WebCT).
8. Minority mentoring with national recognition and excellent retention rates.
9. Improving student quality as witnessed by SAT scores and acceptance of graduates into graduate/professional degree programs along with industry demand for graduates
10. Increased research activity and quality as witnessed by number of research awards, volume of research expenditures, and number of scholarly publications.
11. Involvement of undergraduates in research, notably through Senior Departmental Honors programs and Summer REU programs.
12. Strong college support for top-quality faculty hires, yielding outstanding new faculty.
13. Strong college support for research as exemplified by effective college research office and support for proposals (especially infrastructure proposals) which require matching.
14. Excellent communication between the Dean's office and the Department Chairs.
15. Strong support for Departmental fund raising by the College.

Weakenesses:
1. Difficulty in retaining top young faculty members and key staff.
2. Excessive dependence on temporary faculty and teaching assistants.
3. Increasing class sizes due to enrollment increases.
4. Inadequately prepared students from high school and TEC colleges (transfers).
5. Inadequate staff support hampers faculty productivity.
6. Computer and other office equipment under-funded, impacting faculty productivity.
7. The administration is not sensitive to accounting needs at the departmental level.
8. Graduate student (especially domestic) recruitment difficulties.
9. Inadequate attention to distance education as part of public service mission.
10. Consulting not properly reflected as contribution to public service mission.
11. Communication down to faculty and staff often ineffective.

3. Alignment of College with University Goals

Strengths
1. The College Strategic Plan, formulated around a vision of programs achieving national recognition for excellence, is well aligned with the University's goals in teaching and research.
2. The strategic plan is being used to guide allocation of college resources.

Weaknesses
1. Infrastructure, particularly for research, is generally not nationally competitive
2. Graduate student enrollment and quality is limiting research capabilities
3. Space availability is limiting expansion of research; but University has recently committed to added research space.
4. Recent enrollment increases have outstripped resource availability
5. Public service per se does not play a major role in college activities or plans

Response by the College
The University's addition of a Vice President for Research corrects a weakness identified during the CoES Self-Study. The college has received a commitment for
120,000 square feet of research space. Reorganization within CoES has merged departments into two Schools. The School of Materials Science and Engineering and the School of the Environment were developed.
College of Health, Education and Human Development

The College of Health, Education and Human Development (HEHD) has undergone major administrative change over the past seven years. Colleges, Schools and Departments have appeared and disappeared, consolidated and broken apart again in a number of different configurations. HEHD currently consists of:

School of Education
School of Nursing
Department of Family and Youth Development (FYD)
Department of Parks, Recreation and Tourism Management (PRTM)
Department of Public Health Sciences
National Dropout Prevention Center
Joseph F. Sullivan Center (Wellness Center)

1. Effectiveness of Reorganization and alignment with University goals

The administrative structure of HEHD very much reflects Clemson's land-grant responsibilities for teaching, research, and public service. The primary impact or effect of reorganization on the College was the enhanced communication and possible collaboration among the units of the College. Further, the grouping of the seven areas provided the potential for enhanced research collaboration and communication in areas with very similar community-service missions. While the administrative restructuring in the College of HEHD has not been universally positive, collectively the logic of this structure is paying off in performance and collaboration. The current HEHD structure includes units responsible for working with people from conception through later life in the teaching, research and public service areas.

Because of the restructuring of the College, there is greater coordination of academic programs and public service activities. In addition, the faculty and staff feel that the units have become more adaptable and flexible, slightly more cost efficient in offering programs and services, attracted higher quality students and are more successful in acquiring research funds since the reorganization.

On the other hand, some units in the College have not fully integrated with the direction and orientation of their new structure. Although this perception is a minor feeling among the faculty, it remains a concern that must be addressed with sensitivity and insight.

2. Effectiveness of College

The mix of Schools and Departments in HEHD has provided a framework for effective support of the College's teaching, research and public service mission. In three teaching areas, faculty set goals with, and are evaluated by, department chairs, but in Nursing and Education, faculty planning and appraisal is conducted by a Director. This system appears to be effective; however, the sheer number of faculty within the School of
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Education may cause some hardship for the Director of this unit. The effect of this administrative flattening on faculty is still being analyzed.

The administrative organization of the College represents an effort to eliminate redundancy in administration and provide a structure for maximum collaboration and communication. This organization appears to be quite effective. Several collaborative research teams have been developed and research activity within the College has increased significantly over the past two years. In addition, the dialogue and sense of unity has increased significantly since the initial reorganization. There is a strong integrative planning effort underway in the College to bring all Strategic Planning and Assessment efforts inline with the University Goals.

It may be that HEHD is assuming that the audience for the Self-Study is adequately aware of how an academic college functions, but there is not enough information supporting the organization chart to judge whether this particular College is set up to function effectively. The brief discussion of the administrative structure is not accompanied by enough process description to determine, for example, the responsibilities of the eight program coordinators in Education or how the National Dropout Center or Sullivan Center function within the College. Does the Advising Center actually advise all of the College's students or does it train or provide support for faculty advisors? The Associate Dean is "responsible for research and curricular matters," but how is this responsibility operationalized? Program responsibility and authority is inadequately covered in this document.

Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost Area

The self-study of this Division was completed in the Fall of 2001. This later date allowed for the review of the existing collegiate self-studies that were completed in Spring 2001. Because of the evolving organizational and administrative structure at Clemson, the availability of these documents allowed this particular self-study to more closely focus on the state of organization and administration at the University and to likewise offer more concrete recommendations on how to improve the administrative structure and organization.

The Division of Academic Affairs (headed by the provost/vice-president for Academic Affairs) presently consists of the following 13 Colleges, Schools, Offices, Divisions or Centers:

- The five Colleges
- Undergraduate Studies
- Graduate School
- Division of Computer and Information Technology
- Office of Off-Campus, Distance, and Continuing Education
- Office of Teaching Effectiveness and Innovation
- Houston Center for the Black Experience
- University Libraries
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• Provost Business office

Note that all of these areas except the last three produced separate self-studies that are available in the Self-Study Library.

1. Effectiveness of Reorganization
   The self-study gives a detailed account of the Division’s evolution from nine colleges in 1994 through the existing structure of five colleges and the various other areas noted above. Besides the major changes involved with the colleges' numbers, the other most significant change was the decision by President Barker to split off the University Research Office from this Division and create an entirely separate Division of University Research. From the broad perspective of university administration, the three mission areas of academics, research and public service all became represented at the vice-presidential level as a result of this decision.

Advantages and disadvantages of the reorganization process are summarized as follows:

**Advantages:**
1. Reduction in number of Colleges and the subsequent streamlining of communication and increased collaboration.
2. New interaction among faculty.
3. Evaluation and rewriting of Collegiate Bylaws along with Promotion and Tenure Guidelines.
4. Increased emphasis on collaboration across College and University lines.

**Disadvantages:**
1. Reduction in the number of Colleges placed power in the hands of fewer people resulting in fewer and less diverse opinions on important matters.
2. A climate for teamwork and collaboration had to be developed, encouraged and rewarded.
3. College Business Office loads increased and created discontent among staff.
4. Schools were created in some colleges and this inadvertently created another layer of administration between the faculty and the dean.
5. Geographical separation of departments in the new colleges has hampered interaction among faculty.
6. Specific problems in the College of Agriculture, Forestry and Life Sciences with respect to the Public Service and Agriculture Division required a revision in structure in 2001. This reorganization was specifically aimed at enhancing collaboration and spreading the role of public service across the university.
7. The name change from Department head to Department Chair caused confusion and problems throughout the university resulting in a rapid turnover and instability in this key administrative position. These problems were identified in the College self-studies and consequently in late 2001, the role, remuneration and professional development of this group has been addressed.
2. Effectiveness of Division

The effectiveness of this division was evaluated by: 1 an organizational analysis (organization chart, review of the Strategic Plan and Road Map, and review of Policies, Procedures and Guidelines in the division) and 2. a review of the measures of effectiveness (use of assessment data, student outcomes, faculty success, communication, governance and policy setting, and resource allocation and budgeting). Based on these evaluations, recommendations were made that either directly or indirectly related to the organization and administration of this division.

The Strategic Plan and its Academic Road Map are well underway as the University plans to budget to a plan rather planning to a budget. Academic planning has been initiated at the department level and will be completed by Spring 2002 as all departments are visited by the three Vice-Presidents. This top-down and bottom-up approach has far-reaching consequences as all departments are challenged to align themselves with the newly defined University Vision, Mission and Goals. This planning process is probably the most well defined and outcomes-oriented process that Clemson has undertaken and at this writing, at least ensures that everyone will have the opportunity to participate.

With respect to policies, procedure and guidelines, this division has made great strides in the past two years in identifying procedures and processes that were not well-documented and publishing them in an Academic Affairs Policies, Guidelines and Procedures Manual. This should be a valuable resource for improving the organizational functions of this Division. It is also noted that the deans are now becoming more actively engaged in developing policies and sending them to the various policy committees of the Faculty Senate. These efforts improve communication between the faculty and the administration and help to bring about consensus.

The use of assessment data is the backbone of this division's self-study. Self-studies are part of the assessment data, and as noted above, the fact that this self-study was written after the college self-studies were written, gives this report more background for analyzing the problems. Therefore, it offers constructive and broader-based solutions for the various colleges and areas which report to the provost. This self-study's strength is that incorporates the basic findings of the college self-studies and gives a more up-to-date perspective that can be compared across the colleges and to the earlier college self-studies. Another value of this self-study is that it offers numerous recommendations on how to improve the programs in these colleges. It is a well-developed capstone report on the state of Clemson's administrative problems and solutions.

The other areas which report to this division (Library, Office of Off-Campus, Distance, and Continuing Education, Office of Teaching Effectiveness and Innovation, Division of Computing and Information Technology, Graduate School, Undergraduate Studies, and Houston Center) are likewise addressed in this report with references back to self-studies that were done earlier in most of these areas (all except the Houston Center and the Library which had a Library Summit--see Library Summit report in Self-
Study Library). Many of these are service-oriented areas for the division and the organizational and administrative roles are apparently well defined. Undergraduate Studies includes Admissions, Financial Aid, the Registrar, Cooperative Education, and the Honors College and as such fills an important niche in the Academic Affairs division. The review of all these areas includes a critical look at the problems and opportunities in each.

Other measures of effectiveness of the division are student outcomes, faculty success, communication, governance and policy setting, and resource allocation and budgeting.

The student outcome section outlines the need for improving the advising opportunities for undergraduates and the pending development of the Academic Advising Center. A new Assistant Dean for General Education and Curriculum will coordinate and oversee general education offerings and their assessment. This person will also coordinate with the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Assessment to coordinate course approval notifications, assessments, and use of assessment results so that timely notifications of new programs is made to SACS is made to SACS in the future.

Measurement of faculty success at Clemson has been facilitated by the development of the Faculty Activity System (FAS). Although there have been developmental problems and resistance among faculty, FAS is becoming an accepted part of Clemson’s faculty culture and certainly facilitates the administration’s need to document the innate productivity of the Clemson faculty to the various bodies (ex. Legislature, Commission of Higher education) that require it.

Various awards (Alumni Professorships, Class of 1939 Award, etc.) are available for high achieving faculty and recently, because of the Strategic Plan and Road Map, performance funding became available to faculty who could document how their performance specifically promoted the mission and goals of the University. This effort was designed to enhance faculty salaries so to be in line with the vision of a top 20 public University.

Communication issues are well examined and with respect to organization and administration, the timing and approach to meetings for the Administrative Council, Deans, and Vice-provosts demonstrates an effective approach to maintaining good communication within the administration. Likewise, communication with the faculty and University community is detailed and demonstrates this relatively new administration’s desire to keep the campus informed.

The effectiveness of policy setting methodology is reviewed briefly but makes reference to the Academic Affairs Policies, Guidelines and Procedures Manual that the interim Provost has initiated and which will assist in preventing problems which have occurred previously. A particular problem has been the ambiguities associated with grievances and the need for the deans to work with the Faculty Senate to clarify these
problems so to reduce the number of grievances in the future. Likewise the need to streamline the procedures for post-tenure review is recognized since there is a lot of unnecessary work now generated under the present system.

A brief review of resource allocation and budgeting details how the system works. Notable, however, is that the existing system did quantify a shortfall in operating funds of $48 million. The development of this figure by the budgeting process provided a positive feed loop to the Road Map and its subsequent value in defining Clemson’s needs and reallocations.

As noted above, this section on effectiveness has specific recommendations for each of the areas in the division and closes with an array of bullets (far too numerous to even attempt a synopsis herein). All areas are covered except there are no headings for the Library, DCIT, OTEI, and the Houston Center. Recommendations for these areas occur under the other areas.

3. **Alignment of Division with University Goals**

The Academic Affairs goals and the recommendations in the previous section are referenced with respect to the University Goals in a detailed list. There is no question that this division is well aligned with the University goals. Indeed, it is the centerpiece division for the Vision, Mission and Goals of the University.

**Vice President for University Advancement**

The Division of Advancement consists of six (6) units:

1. Alumni Relations, Visitors Center, and Historic Properties
2. Conference and Guest Services
3. Development
4. Finance and Administration
5. Public Affairs
6. Federal Relations

1. **Effectiveness of Reorganization**

The University-wide reorganization of 1995 had a mixed effect on this organization. Many areas benefited from the changes; others did not. One example was the merging of Alumni and Development under one position – Chief Alumni and Development Officer. This continued until 1999, when the position of Chief Development Officer was recreated. This change allowed both the Development and Alumni programs to stand alone, as they did before the reorganization. As a result of the split, both programs are better managed, effective and accountable.

Other areas have seen mixed results as well and have undergone changes to better their effectiveness. Public Affairs acquired several areas that were not “good fits” and seriously hampered the organization. This resulted in still other changes that led to
some areas reporting to other VP areas and the complete reclassification of others into auxiliaries because the areas were not meeting their budget needs. Still, changes need to be considered in one area (Post Office) that continues to be a problem under the current structure.

Also, a major setback for this service-related area had to do with understanding whom to work with in the new structure. Many college contacts were lost, and thus new relationships had to be established. Clients outside the University did not understand the reasons for the change, and many felt that they had lost representation by losing a college designation. This was a major obstacle that had to be overcome for this organization to fulfill one of its primary duties: the raising of funds from alumni and industry. It has been overcome with time and good communication.

Other areas within the division felt little or no effect. Understanding the new structure and whom to contact were the only apparent effects. Today, lines of responsibility are clear, resulting in better communication and accountability.

2. Effectiveness of Division

This division is a strong, functional organization. Every area within this division stated its ability to "work well as a team." Communication within the division is adequate in keeping everyone informed of the direction and purpose of the division. All units know their mission and objectives. The current organization of Development encourages a minor level of discord. Specifically, this pertains to coordination of how College Development Officers, who report to College Deans, but who are jointly evaluated by the Chief Development Officer, should work with the central development officers and the Chief Development Officer. This matter is being addressed and should be resolved internally and thus is not a result of reorganization.

3. Alignment of Division with University Goals

The division's goals fit very well with the University mission and goals. Each area has specific goals/objectives/strategies and has demonstrated how those efforts fit with the University's goals. Also, there is a high level of accountability to University goals.

Financial Affairs Division

The Division of Financial Affairs provides much of the organizational and physical infrastructure that allows Clemson to pursue its goals. It is by necessity one of the most collaborative units on campus, with responsibility for the facilities, personnel, and budgets that support all teaching, research, and service. Led by the Chief Business Officer, Financial Affairs is organized into eight departments:

- Clemson University Business Systems (CUBS)
• University Budgets and Financial Planning
• Comptroller
• Environmental Health and Safety
• Office of Fiscal Affairs
• Office of Human Resources
• Sponsored Programs Accounting and Administration
• University Facilities

1. Effectiveness of Reorganization

The recent change of the title of the Chief Financial Officer to Chief Business Officer seems to positively reflect the purpose of the unit, which is much broader than finance and budgets. It is surprising, then, that the name of the division was not also changed to the Division of Business Affairs, which would also seem to better reflect the diverse portion of the infrastructure for which this unit bears responsibility.

This breadth of function shown in the Division structure positively reflects and supports the intensely collaborative purpose and philosophy of the University. The focus of the Division organization seems to be on streamlining, standardizing and decentralizing financial and personnel functions, providing effective oversight and control of systems, policies, and resources while allowing the University departments the autonomy they need to administer their own programs. The relatively flat and broad structure of Financial Affairs effectively represents the service nature of the Division—that it exists to support and facilitate the mission of the University, not as simply a monolithic business entity that the academic units must answer to.

The scope of responsibility of Financial Affairs appears to be the right size, administratively. This aggregation of reporting departments is large enough to allow the CBO to monitor and avoid institutional redundancy or inter-department conflict in these support areas but small enough to allow for effective communication and oversight. This structure also provides each of these eight functional groups a link only one level away from the President and Board, underscoring their importance to the goals of the University.

2. Effectiveness of Division

The Division of Financial Affairs Self-Study clearly spells out the responsibility and authority the unit has for the function of the institution. The CBO and directors of the eight administrative departments below him have each been able to plainly articulate the scope of accountability in their areas before and after restructuring. Given a concern about an administrative support issue on campus, it is apparent that Financial Affairs can communicate which unit is responsible for it. Although the range of services within this Division is very wide and not all obviously "financial", there is no apparent confusion or conflict about where each function fits into the overall mission.

Again, despite the stresses and workload issues resulting from a flattening of the administrative organization of the University, the restructuring process has obviously
provided this Division with more clarity and focus about why each administrative position exists and what it is expected to do. However, the clarity of the definition of areas of responsibility and authority as understood by the CBO and Directors is stronger than the reality of its implementation farther down the organizational chart. They have not yet accomplished the “buy-in” from all of the outlying department staff in their Division to take on the decision-making they must each do in order to truly decentralize at an optimal level, but the Division is working on evaluation, training, and reward systems to bring day-to-day department accountability in line with the ideal.

Financial Affairs is sharply aware of the crucial role that allocation of resources (monetary and other) plays in the function of the University and has created an administrative framework (and is working on shaping a culture) that effectively reflects that awareness. This framework is tied together by both technology (the painfully implemented but rapidly improving CUBS system) and communication (both internally and with every other unit across campus).

Vice President for Public Service and Agriculture (PSA)

This self study treats five divisions organized under the PSA umbrella. They are:
1. South Carolina Agriculture and Forest Research System (SCAFRS)
2. Cooperative Extension Service (CES)
3. Livestock and Poultry Health (LPH)
4. Regulatory and Public Service Programs (RPSP)
5. The Strom Thurmond Institute (STI)

Each of these divisions is profiled and a historical background is provided. The same questions about the impact of the 1995 reorganization of Clemson University are treated in each division.

1. SCAFRS – The reorganization and a subsequent national initiative among 70 universities, “21st Century Land-Grant Universities: Action on Issues”, sponsored by the W.K. Kellogg Foundation allowed the SCAFRS to focus its mission and goals more effectively. According to the Self-Study, Clemson now serves as a model for public service accountability among Land-Grant universities.
2. CES - The same reorganization had a dramatic negative impact on the delivery of both county and state extension programs by removing the CES director from academics. Now reporting to the dean of CAFLS, extension faculty were compelled to refocus on tenure and promotion rather than responding to State or local needs for their expertise.
3. LPH was unaffected by the reorganization.
4. RPSP profited from the reorganization by sharpening its focus on three PSA goals: agrisystem productivity and profitability, economic and community development, and environmental conservation.
5. STI responded to the reorganization by flattening its structure, redesigning its teams and creating new ones, and by increasing allocations to outreach. The result has been a better connection between STI and PSA and a more clarified mission.

With the exception of CES, each of the divisions in PSA reports advantages gained from the university restructuring and a sharpened ability to satisfy the SACS 6.1.5 must statements. When asked in a survey to evaluate their unit’s ability to function effectively after reorganization, well more than half of all respondents responded in the neutral or positively. The same overall response was reported to a question about their unit’s ability to function more effectively in fulfilling its responsibility as described by Clemson’s purpose. The report concludes with interview excerpts from PSA Vice President John Kelly, CAFLS Dean Wehrenberg, and Interim Provost Helms. Indirectly, each addresses the must statements of 6.1.5. The new CAFLS/PSA organizational chart (1/17/01) is seen as a substantial step in aligning CAFLS and PSA with institutional goals and mission and allowing units to clearly delineate lines of responsibility and authority.

Vice President for Student Affairs

The following areas are covered by Student Affairs:

- Campus Recreation
- Career Center
- Counseling and Psychological Services
- Development
- Fire and Emergency Medical Services (EMS)
- Housing Administrative Services
- Judicial Services
- Multicultural Affairs
- Municipal Court
- Parking Services
- Police
- Residential Facilities
- Residential Life
- Student Health Services
- University Union and Student Health Services
- University Housing

An Information Technology Office and Budget and Finance Office are service departments within the Division and serve only the other departments within this Division. This is a broad array of responsibilities and functions. As such, it is difficult perhaps to discern a unifying plan for the area. Furthermore, according to the Self-Study, the Division was not specifically reorganized at the time of the overall collegiate 1994 (sic) reorganization. However, the report does summarize all the changes that have
taken place in the various departments before and subsequent to 1995. They are listed in a chart style format which, although detailed, fails to focus on the overall strengths and weaknesses in the Division. Also in chart format, the Self-Study gives a listing of the Division's contributions to the University's (2010) goals. Likewise, a unifying purpose is lost with this format. Nevertheless, with this format as a reference, highlights of the effectiveness of reorganization, the effectiveness of the Division and the alignment of the Division with the University Goals are as follows.

1. Effectiveness of Reorganization and Division
1. The Budget and Finance unit was formed into three budget centers.
2. Consolidated Career Planning and Placement into Career Center. Career center began to offer placement services to education majors.
3. Creation of Counseling and psychological Services by combining psychological services and counseling center.
4. Implementation of a new customer service-based operation in Fire and Emergency Medical Services.
5. Increased diversity training opportunities for campus community.
6. Financial savings of $100,000.00 through elimination of the Student Development Director position and combining these programs in other Departments.
7. Increased number of recreational services through collaboration efforts without additional cost to the department.
8. Focus on prevention activities in Fire and EMS.
9. Creation of off-campus living guide through judicial services.
10. Increased diversity training.
11. Encouraged service and outreach programs through residential life.
12. Opening of Hendrix Student Center assisted in improving the overall quality of student life on campus.
13. Adopted a long-range enrollment plan for residential life.

2. Alignment of Division with University Goals
1. Outreach programs in residential life.
2. Strengthen sense of community and increase diversity on campus.
3. Counseling and Psychological Services promotes high graduation rate through assisting in increasing freshman retention.
4. Michelin Career Center helps enhance recruiting and retention efforts.
5. Enrich campus life through future planned improvements to Fike Recreation Center as a center of campus activity.
7. Off-campus living guide.
8. Through Multicultural Affairs, strengthen the sense of community and increase the diversity with all programs and services.

Executive Secretary to the Board of Trustees

The following units presently report to the Executive Secretary of the Board:
• Office of Access and Equity
• Office of the Board of Trustees
• Office for Institutional Effectiveness and Assessment
• Office of Institutional Research
• Office of Internal Auditing

In this capacity, the Executive Secretary Office plays a major overarching role in facilitating Clemson's mission. The independence of this office in these areas is critical to the credibility of the services and analyses performed.

1. Effectiveness of Reorganization

According to this unit’s report, most reorganization changes occurred subsequent to the mid 1990’s official reorganization. At the time of these changes, neither the Office of Access and Equity, the Office of the Board of Trustees, nor the Office of Internal Auditing was restructured. The two major changes were the addition of the Office of Institutional Research and an admitted de-emphasis of the Office of Assessment (addition of “Institutional Effectiveness” to the title came later). According to the report, Institutional Research was moved out of the Provost’s Office to this area because of a response to faculty concerns about objectivity of reporting and faculty relations. The de-emphasis of the Office of Assessment was corrected by President Barker in 1999 as he developed his goals for the University and realized the need for planning and assessing his goals (later to become University Goals). Accordingly, he “re-invigorated” the Office and added “Institutional Effectiveness” to the title to reflect those responsibilities.

Strengths:

The reorganization in itself was merely a catalyst for identifying independent areas in the University, which play a major role in defining and quantifying the University’s effectiveness and relationships within and outside the University. Subsequent reorganization continued these efforts.

Weaknesses:

There are none according to the self-study document. However, because of this unit’s breadth of responsibility, the integrity of the staff in this area must be protected and maintained. Although integrity of the area is NOT an issue at this time, it is suggested that all Offices in this area continue to be sensitive to feedback from the various intra- and extra-mural groups with which they interact and that provide and/or use data.

3. Effectiveness of the Unit

The five leaders of the Offices met and reviewed the effectiveness of their own Offices, the other Offices and then the effectiveness of the whole Unit. Measures of success were defined as follows: (1) knowledge of applicable standards; (2) effective relationships with other units on campus; (3) effective communication of assessment results to University officials including the President and the Board of Trustees; and (4) adequate processes in place to ensure follow-up after assessment.
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A review of the various ways each of these five offices is effective in carrying out its mission indicated that, overall; each has more than adequately addressed these measures of success. Without question, the work in some of these areas can be easily misinterpreted and, in the worst cases, resented by the various units on campus, which must comply with standards. Access and equity, assessing effectiveness at the various levels in the University and internal auditing all conjure up potential resentment and misunderstandings. However, a common theme in this unit's Self-Study is the attempt by all these Offices to create a climate of understanding for the necessity of these various compliance issues. In other words, these offices have adopted a collaborative rather than authoritative role in their interaction with University units. The theme is not "what have you done wrong?" but instead, "how can we help you make your unit and Clemson a better university?" Likewise, these offices have developed an array of workshops, manuals and other self-help methodologies for the University's units, which are affected, by the array of issues with which they must comply.

Strengths:
An apparently well run and effective unit of the University because of its positive attitude as a facilitating, not authoritative area.

Weakness:
None demonstrated. We suggest that staff in this area continue to work on developing good-working relations across the University. Where possible, those whose credentials warrant should have adjunct and active appointments in various academic departments so that they do not lose their perspective.

3. Alignment of Unit with University Goals
For a unit that is somewhat removed from the mainstream of the University's mission in teaching, research and public service, one might be cautious in suspecting that this area could easily get off track. However, this unit is also the "front-door" for the various issues, which the outside world expects Clemson University to project and maintain. Therefore, like many of the facilitating units in the University, the role of this unit is secondary in that the achievement of the goals must be through its collaboration with primary performing units (usually academic and PSA) across the university. Accordingly, each office identified University Goals with which it has a major role in supporting or helping other primary units achieve.

Strengths:
The interaction of this Unit with the University's Vision, Mission and Goals is well defined and apparently undergoes constant review. Despite its removal from the primary functions of the University, the Unit defines its operations and success by its ability to facilitate other areas in achieving the Goals.

Weaknesses: None
Board of Trustees

The Board of Trustees undertook a self-study to determine the impact of the 1995 reorganization on the University as a whole, the University's current organizational effectiveness, and the overall alignment of the University with its redefined Vision, Mission and Goals.

The Board used a three-phase process in its Self-study. For Phase One, the Board members who were not Board members in 1994-1995 were asked to identify nine questions that related to reorganization and intended outcomes. Those nine questions were sent to the remaining Trustees (those who were on the Board in 1994-995) as Phase Two of the Self-Study. Phase Three was a Saturday retreat to address the findings of that survey.

The following objectives were set for the retreat:

- to provide an opportunity to "close the loop" on reorganization.
- to provide leadership in the process of institutional effectiveness.
- to identify the relationship between the University's Vision, Mission statements and Goals and the concepts inherent in planning, assessment and the use of results.

As result of this process, the Board answered the following nine questions with respect to Phase One of the process:

Describe the reasons the University was reorganized in 1994-95.

Describe the events that initiated the process of reorganization.

Identify the Board's specific goals and objectives for reorganization.

Elaborate on the process the Board used to implement reorganization.

Was the reorganization implemented as planned, or were modifications to the plan required? If changes were made, did they improve or detract from the original objectives?

Address the effectiveness of the process by which the University was reorganized.

Describe how reorganization impacted the educational experience for Clemson students.

Identify what the Board learned from the process of reorganization.

Is there anything you would do differently knowing what you know now?
With the above questions as a starting point, the Board identified the unintended consequences, both positive and negative, that resulted from reorganization. Although there are many more positives than negatives, one might question whether some of the positives resulted from reorganization or just events or situations that may have occurred anyway. The list is as follows:

Positive Consequences:
1. TIME Magazine Award as Public College of the Year
2. Collaboration across disciplines
3. Energy
4. Mend relationship between Faculty and Board
5. More money to academics
6. Increase dialogue across campus
7. Collaboration as an assessment in AAH
8. Financial records reporting have been improved
9. Receiving better and more useful data
10. National significance of this bold move
11. NSF (National Science Foundation) Center
12. Faculty Senate found that Board figures were correct
13. Post-Tenure Review atmosphere, a positive change
14. Athletics/Academics balance improved
15. Extend University-wide the public service and extension activities
16. Organization adopted a concept/climate of University trust
17. No real impact on students
18. Environment created that allowed us to be “One Clemson”
19. Two years with no increases in tuition

Negative Consequences:
1. Confusion in the Agriculture Community
2. Perception that Board valued structure over behavior
3. No Credit from State (government)

The Board then developed a list of “Lessons Learned” from the Reorganization.
1. Trumpet our achievements and successes.
2. Talent of faculty and deans on campus.
3. Reduce stress levels re: job security.
4. Efficiency is not appreciated or rewarded by the General Assembly.
5. Faculty Senate leadership is more positive.
6. Ongoing concerns about the groupings in the colleges.
7. Is there a need for 6th college?
8. Drop in pre-medicine applicants.
9. Cut administration too far.
10. Consideration for adding key administrators back:
11. Research
12. Attracting the right person requires title, line responsibility, and salary.
13. Faculty recognize the need for additional support.
14. Faculty heart of the institution.
15. Uniqueness of Clemson’s Board provides the opportunity to make sure these changes can be made. A bold move made possible by the Life Trustees.
16. Going through this change successfully paves the way for future changes

Finally, the Board did an assessment “report” card in the areas of Efficiency, Budget, and Harmony. Each Trustee scored the various categories within these broad areas above with a 1= Goal not achieved, 2=Goal Achieved, and 3=Exceeded Expectation.

While most categories received an average score above 2.0, there were some outliers each way.

Specifically, in the Exceeds Expectation category were the following:

1. Make the University more efficient and stimulate collaboration between the academic units, faculty and students.
2. Restructure the number and organization of colleges so as to increase efficiency and promote interdisciplinary activity.
3. Bring harmony between faculty and administration.
4. Improve the performance and involvement of faculty in ensuring (that) a unique “family” and learning experience.

In the Goal not Achieved category (average score below 2.0), were the following:

1. To combine administrative positions where applicable.
2. Reduce the Clemson budget for annual operating costs.
3. Significantly reduce the administrative positions and budgets.
4. Increase the credit hour teaching load of (administrative) faculty and reduce the hours needed for committee involvement.

Overall, the document does express many of the sentiments that have been elucidated in this overall section. However, the many side effects of reorganization or effects that were not really effects from reorganization tend to muddle the conclusion. Likewise, it is not clear that the third goal (relationship between the University’s Vision, Mission and Goals to the concepts inherent in planning, assessment, and use of results) was ever addressed.