President’s Commission on the Status of Black Faculty and Staff

Report to the President

PRELIMINARY FINDINGS

1998-1999
Clemson University is committed to affirmative action and equal employment opportunity. The policy of equality extends to both the employment practices and administration of programs and activities within the university. It applies (1) to persons seeking employment and those employed, and (2) to persons who wish to participate in and benefit from programs and activities, along with those who are now participants….

Discrimination based on race, religion, sex, national origin, age disability or status as a disabled veteran or veteran of the Vietnam era is prohibited. It is the policy of Clemson University that no person shall be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or in any way be subjected to discrimination in, any programs or activity of the University. It is the policy of the University to recruit, hire, train and promote employees without discrimination.
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Executive Summary

During the summer of 1998, the president of Clemson University, in response to requests from the Clemson University Black Faculty and Staff Association, and with the approval of the Faculty Senate and the Classified Staff Association, created the President’s Commission on the Status of Black Faculty and Staff. The Commission is charged with documenting the status of black faculty and staff and advising the President and Administrative Council with specific recommendations for increasing diversity and enhancing the quality of life among blacks in the University’s workforce.

To address its charge the Commission adopted the following strategic tasks:

- Describe the legal and policy environment at the national, state, and local (Clemson University) level.
- Provide qualitative and quantitative descriptors of the status of blacks at Clemson University.
- Describe the activities and programs developed and implemented at the university level and within administrative units used at Clemson to comply with the standards set forth in the policies.
- Describe the strengths and weaknesses in the system to accomplish change in the status of blacks at Clemson University.

The Commission is focused on the entire workforce, which is divided into academic administrators, non-academic administrators, faculty, and staff. During the 1998-1999 academic year, the Commission collected and analyzed baseline information on the desegregation of higher education and the presence of blacks in Clemson University's workforce. Key reference points for workforce trends are the years 1981, 1987, 1996, and 1998. Ten-year trends (1989 through 1998) are also included in the...
Commission’s initial work.

During its first year, the Commission limited its activities to the legal environment and the presence of blacks in the different employment categories. The Commission found:

- Between 1981 and 1998, the total number of blacks in the Clemson University workforce declined by 5%. During that same time period, the total number of whites in the workforce increased by 11%.

- The total number of black faculty increased from 17 in 1981 to a total of 41 full-time faculty members in 1999. Total white faculty remained unchanged during that period.

- The distribution across faculty ranks differs for blacks and whites, with a smaller proportion of the black faculty being full professors.

- Among support staff, blacks decreased from 21% of the total in 1981 to 16% of the total in 1998, representing a 20% decrease in the number of black support staff between 1981 and 1998. During that period, the number of white support staff increased by 12%.

- There was a dramatic decrease in the number blacks employed as secretarial staff from 1981 through 1998.

- The number of black non-academic administrators decreased from 17 in 1981 to 5 in 1998; none of the 5 in 1998 was at the vice presidential level.

- There were 10 academic administrators in 1998. One was a dean and the others were directors

The Commission identified several successes and challenges. Successes include:

- Met the goals established in the EEO plan at the assistant and associate professor levels.
• Met the goals established in the EEO plan for non-academic administrators, service maintenance, technical and para-professional positions.

Challenges include:

• Continue to recruit black faculty at entry-level positions and provide an environment for that faculty to gain tenure and ultimately be promoted to the rank of professor.

• Retain and increase the number of blacks at the professor level by: (a) creating institutional supports which may enhance the promotion of black associate professors, (b) recruiting black senior professors from other universities, and (c) increasing Clemson’s contributions to the national pool of black Ph.D.’s who want to enter the Professorate.

• While there are considerably more blacks at the staff level than faculty level, the number of blacks in top management and administrative positions should increase.

• Additional effort is necessary to achieve EEO goals in several staff classifications.

The Commission made several observations, raised questions to be answered, and generated objectives that will provide a specific focus for future research and deliberation.

During the summer of 1999, the Commission’s executive committee will review the questions and tasks mentioned in the report within the context of the objectives identified, and develop a plan of action and responsibilities for the 1999-2000 academic year. The observations and questions generated during the Commission’s first year of operation will provide the standard for assessing its annual progress, plus permit the executive committee in association with the full Commission to ascertain annual progress and create the basis for making agenda decisions in succeeding years. Projects to be considered for the Commission’s 1999-2000 agenda include:
• A series of focus group sessions to solicit black faculty and staff perceptions of quality of life issues at Clemson.

• A scientific survey of the University’s black workforce.

• An examination of the University’s recruitment and hiring policies and processes.

• An analysis of the tenure and promotion processes and policies for faculty.

• An analysis of the role of training in the retention and promotion of black staff.
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I. Introduction and Background: Social and Political Milieu

A. Overview

Access by blacks to higher education can be described as a constant battle to remove barriers. Although social class and gender influence access, barriers presented because of race are the most persistent. Throughout the history of this country, in all geographic areas, there have been forces that sought to restrict blacks from participating in higher education. Barriers have been supported and enforced by state governments and they have been created by individual educational institutions.

In the South, the barriers were legislated by individual states, with South Carolina passing the first of these prohibitive laws in 1740. The government of this state, as well as the other slave states attempted to control all access to knowledge and intellectual activity. The force used to maintain these barriers tended to be, in many instances, lethal. Educational and intellectual activities were driven underground. Insurrections by blacks led to governmental policies that drove educational and intellectual activity even further underground. To gain access to knowledge, blacks and their allies resorted to guerilla tactics. Teaching, learning, and intellectual discourse were carried out in secret.

After the Civil War, blacks began to gain access to higher education on southern soil. Black students entered the University of South Carolina for the first time in 1868. Several of these individuals eventually received degrees from the University; however, the State discontinued its funding of the institution and it closed in 1878. It was during
this time, however, that blacks and their allies began to establish accessible colleges and universities. It was also during this time that Clemson Agricultural College was established in the upstate of South Carolina for white males.

When Clemson Agricultural College opened its doors in 1889, it is reasonable to assume that blacks were present as members of the workforce. It is also assumed that at that time they were hired to do menial tasks and they did not participate in academic and intellectual activities. Participation in these areas did not begin until the first black student enrolled in January of 1963. Black faculty appeared in the 1970’s and the first dean of a college came in the late 1990’s. As of 1999, there have been no black vice-presidents nor has there been a black president of the institution.

B. Breaking the Color Barrier

The history of Clemson University mirrors the legacy of, and struggle for, civil rights and equal opportunity in America, particularly the South. Despite the vestiges of historical oppression and discrimination, seventy years after Clemson University opened its doors, Harvey Gantt, on January 19, 1963, became the first African American student at Clemson University after overcoming the following challenges:

- Applied to Clemson in 1961—denied.
- Applied to Clemson in 1962—denied.
- Sued the state of South Carolina for admission.
- Won the right to attend Clemson University in 1963 by the 4th Federal Circuit Court of Appeals, but Clemson University appealed the decision to the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court denied the hearing and upheld the 4th Circuit Court decision.
As stated earlier, it was several years before the first black faculty member and black administrator was hired.

C. Charge

During the summer of 1998, the president of Clemson University, in response to requests from the Clemson University Black Faculty and Staff Association, and approval by the Clemson Faculty Senate and the Classified Staff Association, created the President’s Commission on the Status of Black Faculty and Staff. Each member of the 13-member Commission was appointed to a three-year renewable term.

At the Commission’s first meeting in September 1998, the President emphasized the importance of access and diversity to the campus and future of the State of South Carolina. He indicated a need to re-assess progress in promoting access and equity for black faculty and staff.

The President’s specific charges to the Commission on the Status of Black Faculty and Staff include the following:

- Discern the status of black faculty and staff;
- Collect data and information;
- Identify barriers and constraints that might limit equal opportunities and advancement among black faculty and staff;
- Hold biannual open meetings/forums—“conversations”;
- Submit periodic reports; and
- Submit an annual report to the president, administrative council, faculty and classified staff.
To effectively examine these issues, the Commission established two working committees to represent the various institutional constituencies. These committees were charged with the tasks of developing work plans to address areas of inquiry established and endorsed by the Commission.

**D. Definitions**

The following definitions are being used by the Commission to facilitate data collection and analysis:

- **Status of Blacks**: The extent to which blacks are present and are retained, and have equal access to resources and other quality of life indicators.

- **Quality of Life**: Satisfaction with task requirements, training and information to carry out tasks, good communication with administration, equitable job evaluations and promotion opportunities, equal access to resources.

- **Workforce**: Categories used by the Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) categories.

**E. Assumptions**

The Commission assumes the following:

- Members of the Clemson University community can develop a vision of equality that is shared by the entire community.

- It is possible, using appropriate indicators, to describe the status of blacks at Clemson University.

- There are strategies that Clemson University should implement that will have a positive impact on the status of black faculty, staff, and students.

If people know what is expected of them, if they think it is fair and ethical, they
F. Questions and Tasks

1. Questions

The Commission generated several questions during the 1998-99 academic year. These questions are the basis for the Commission’s work plan for the next three years.

- What specific external and internal mandates, practices, and policies propelled Clemson University to achieve desegregation and move to integration and toward diversity?

- On issues related to diversity, how can Clemson University create, reach consensus, and achieve a shared vision?

- How can Clemson University provide institutional investments and supports to achieve a shared vision of diversity, access, and equity?

- To what extent do external pressures influence the status of black faculty and staff (quantitatively and qualitatively)?

- What is the perception of the quality of life at Clemson University among black faculty and staff?

- Do black faculty and staff members believe they are genuinely part of the Clemson University community?
2. Tasks

Based on the Commission’s charge, its assumptions, and the key questions, the Commission adopted the following tasks for the next three years.

- Describe the legal and policy environment at the national, state, and local (Clemson University) level.
- Provide qualitative and quantitative descriptors of the status of blacks at Clemson University.
- Describe the activities and programs developed and implemented at the university level and within administrative units, including resource allocations, used at Clemson to comply with the standards set forth in the policies.
- Describe the strengths and weaknesses in the system to accomplish change in the status of blacks at Clemson University.

As each of these tasks is performed, the key questions presented above will be addressed.
II. Approach

A. Focus

As indicated in the Commission’s charge, the focus is on the entire workforce, dividing it into groups that coincide with EEO category codes. The following are the categories and codes used.

- Academic Administrators..........C1 and C2
- Non-academic Administrators......E1
- Faculty..................................C3 – C6
- Staff.....................................E2 – E7

Specifically, the Commission’s first year of study included a review of desegregation in higher education, the emergence of affirmation action, and the presence of blacks in the University’s workforce. Workforce trends over time were examined, with special attention placed on the years 1981, 1987, 1996, and 1998. The Commission chose these years because of the changes in policies and practices that occurred during these times. In 1981, Clemson implemented programs and activities, as instructed by the State in its agreement with the federal government, to come into compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The State was released from the agreement in 1986 and in 1987, the “South Carolina Plan for Equity and Equal Opportunity in Public Institutions of Higher Education – 1986-87 and Beyond” was adopted. In 1996,
Clemson University was operating under a newly reorganized administrative structure. In most instances, trend analysis covers the ten-year period from 1989 through 1998.

It should be noted that all of the available indicators of the status of blacks at Clemson are quantitative. The Commission will study the numbers and the trends associated with these quantitative measures. However, if it is to make meaningful recommendations in the future, the Commission must understand the systems that produce the numbers. Then efforts in future years will be made to discern cause and effect relationships.

**B. Organization**

In order to achieve the stated objectives and goals of the Commission, members were organized into two working committees: faculty and staff/administration. Each working committee developed a plan of action for its respective areas of inquiry. During its first year, the Commission followed the timeline presented in Table 1. The work of the Commission during its first year entailed creating a baseline of common information by examining (1) the legal and policy environment for desegregation and racial diversity in higher education and (2) Clemson’s record in hiring and retaining blacks in its workforce.
Table 1. Commission Timeline, 1998 – 99

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Sep</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>May</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clarify Missions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop First Year Workplan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement Working Committees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff/Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review Literature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff/Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collect &amp; Analyze Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff/Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop Preliminary Report &amp; Future Workplan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
III. Observations

A. Legal and Policy Environment

The employment and matriculation of African Americans at Clemson University must be viewed through the prism of the civil rights movement. Through mass protest, legal challenges, and policy changes, the system of separating the interaction of the races in all social and economic institutions was dismantled. Clemson and other public institutions of higher education in the South were forced to respond to federal judicial, statutory, and administrative decisions mandating desegregation. Judicial, legislative, and administrative mandates define the milieu for Clemson’s transition to a desegregated and diversified student body and workforce.

During the 1950s, a landmark United States Supreme Court ruling overturning segregation by race eventually ushered in the numerical inclusion of African Americans at Clemson. The Sweat v. Painter and McLaurin v. Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education opened the door for dismantling segregation. In Brown v. Board of Education, the 1954 Supreme Court overturned the 1896 Supreme Court’s ruling in Plessy v. Ferguson. Plessy had upheld a “separate, but equal” doctrine that Brown found unequal for African Americans and unconstitutional. Brown struck down the dual southern racial system and lead to a chain of events that changed the composition of educational and other social and economic institutions in South Carolina and the region.
In the turbulent 1960s, President Lyndon Johnson urged the United States Congress to enact legislature so that the executive branch of the federal government could enforce *Brown*. The 1964 Civil Rights Act, in particular Titles II and VII, which forbids racial discrimination in public accommodations and employment based on race and sex, emerged from those efforts. Title VI of the act prohibits race discrimination in any program receiving federal funds. Further, the act created the Equal Employment Opportunities Commission and charged it with enforcing the anti-discrimination laws through prevention of employment discrimination and resolution of complaints. In 1965, in an effort to secure compliance, President Johnson issued Executive Order 11246 requiring federal contractors to take “affirmative action” to ensure equality of employment opportunity regardless of race, religion, and national origin. Later, President Richard Nixon expanded affirmative action by imposing “goals and timetables” and, in Revised Order No. 4, extended the employment areas covered.

Discrimination in education has been at the forefront of breakthroughs in civil rights. Because education is the gateway to intellectual, social, and economic advancement, equality and quality in education has been a seminal area for achieving an inclusive society. Not surprisingly, many predominantly white colleges and universities, in the wake of affirmative action measures in the late 1960s and 1970s, began to take modest steps to desegregate their student bodies, faculties, and staffs.

In 1970, the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund sued the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW), charging that HEW’s Office of Civil Rights had failed to enforce Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Initially, the
suit charged that the federal government had not begun proceedings to cut off financial
aid to ten states (most were southern states) found to be maintaining racially segregated
public systems of higher education. In 1973, in what had become known as the “Adams
Case,” a U.S. District Court ruled that HEW’s Office of Civil Rights had to begin
proceedings against states that had not submitted acceptable five-year plans for
desegregating their higher education systems by attracting more black students and
faculty members.

In 1980, the court required the United States Department of Education to obtain
five-year desegregation plans from eight additional states; South Carolina was among
those states. The Department of Education accepted South Carolina’s plan in 1981. In
1986, South Carolina’s five-year desegregation plan for higher education expired. In
1987, the federal District Court ruled that the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational
Fund lacked the standing to continue to pursue the case, dismissing the suit. In 1988, the
U.S. Department of Education declared that South Carolina’s public colleges and
universities were in compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. In 1989,
the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia reversed the 1987
dismissal of the case, forcing the Education Department to monitor the desegregation of
public colleges and universities in 18 southern and border states. But in 1990, the
appeals court ruled that the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund could not sue
the federal government to force states to desegregate their higher education systems,
dismissing the case.

While the federal Department of Education monitored state plans and the Adams
Case was in litigation, a major challenge to affirmative action was unfolding. In 1978, the United States Supreme Court set parameters for educational affirmative action. In a ruling on the affirmation action policy and practice of reserving 16 places for blacks at the Medical School at the University of California at Davis, the United States Supreme Court struck down the use of quotas. In Bakke v. Regents of the University of California, Associate Justice Lewis from Richmond, cast the deciding vote (5-4) as the Court ruled that setting aside a specific number of places for admissions is illegal, especially in the absence of proof of past discrimination. Race or minority status could be a factor for promoting diversity; however, it could not be the deciding one. Affirmative Action for correcting past and continuing racial discrimination was not allowed. In 1992, the Supreme Court in United States v. Fordice, a Mississippi case affecting South Carolina and 18 other southern and border states, ruled that states that once operated college and university systems that were racially segregated have an affirmative duty to eliminate all traces of their de jure systems in order to become in compliance with the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution.

Bakke recognized that academic freedom includes allowing colleges and universities to create racially and ethnically diverse campuses, but that using race as the sole factor in decision making is impermissible. Bakke affirmed the role of diversity in colleges and universities. However, in the years following Bakke, opponents and proponents have wrestled with its premise. In 1996, the Fifth Circuit Court in Hopwood v. State of Texas ruled that institutions of higher education do not have a “compelling interest” in enrolling a diverse student body. South Carolina is not within the borders of the Fifth Circuit, meaning the state is only obligated to follow principles set out by the
Supreme Court in *Bakke*, although the state’s public colleges and universities could be open for a challenge.

Other challenges to affirmative action include the following:

- University of Maryland—where a scholarship program reserved for black students was ruled unconstitutional.
- University of California system—where its Board of Regents in 1995 voted to phase out affirmative action in admissions, hiring, and contracting.
- Bowling Green State University—where a white job applicant sued the university claiming rejection based on race.

Furthermore, in recent referenda in California and Washington State, voters abolished affirmative action policies and practices in the public sector.

South Carolina’s response to the desegregation and affirmative action policies for higher education is defined by state policies that emerged in the 1980s from plans submitted during the Adams Case monitoring by the United States Department of Education. The state’s objective is to demonstrate a commitment to equality and racial diversity in public colleges and universities through an access and equity program. From 1981 to 1986, the state’s access and equity plan was the response to a federally mandated desegregation directive for higher education. The South Carolina Commission on Higher Education (CHE) was charged with implementing the plan. In addition to enhancing public historically black colleges, the plan included the desegregation of student enrollments and faculties, staffs, and governing bodies at all public colleges and universities. Beginning in 1985, CHE began to support campus plans and strategies for desegregation by providing funds to support graduate study, minority recruitment and
retention, other race grants, and other initiatives to enhance the state’s public historically black institutions.

In 1989, CHE began to offer campuses financial incentives to develop and implement access and equity plans. Financial awards were distributed to public colleges and universities to implement access and equity plans that would:

- Flow from the institution’s mission and address the recruitment and retention of minority students and employees.
- Meet specific institutional requirements related to the characteristics of students and faculty.
- Be carefully conceptualized.
- Be linked to efforts for improving quality.

In 1991, CHE amended its guidelines to emphasize and recognize campus plans that promote campus climates and academic settings that encourage participation and achievement by African American students. Although CHE monitors the record on college campuses to desegregate their student bodies, the South Carolina Human Affairs Commission is charged by the South Carolina General Assembly with approving and monitoring state agency (Clemson University is a state agency) affirmative action plans for employment. Annually, the Human Affairs Commission issues a report to the General Assembly titled, “The Status of Equal Employment Opportunity in South Carolina Government.”

As an outgrowth of external pressures, Clemson University has policies and procedures in place to promote affirmative action and equal opportunity, while discouraging discrimination. In 1997, President Constantine Curris reissued several
policies pertaining to equitable treatment as part of the University’s overall program to ensure illegal discrimination does not occur. The policies pertain to Individuals with Disabilities, Affirmative Action/Equal Employment Opportunity, Sexual Harassment, HIV Disease and AIDS, and Racial Harassment. The Affirmative Action/Equal Employment Opportunity policy states:

Clemson University is committed to affirmative action and equal employment opportunity. The policy of equality extends to both the employment practices and administration of programs and activities within the university. It applies (1) to persons seeking employment and those employed, and (2) to persons who wish to participate in and benefit from programs and activities, along with those who are now participants…. Discrimination based on race, religion, sex, national origin, age disability or status as a disabled veteran or veteran of the Vietnam era is prohibited. It is the policy of Clemson University that no person shall be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or in any way be subjected to discrimination in, any programs or activity of the University. It is the policy of the University to recruit, hire, train and promote employees without discrimination. (Clemson University, “Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Policy,” September 1, 1997.)

Further, the University policy recognizes the legacy of Jim Crow and racism.

…It is the intention of the University to take affirmative action to remove any disparate effects of past discrimination until parity is reached. This is to extend to all levels and phases of personnel administration such as recruitment or recruitment advertising, testing, training, promotion, transfer, leave, compensation, selection for supervisory positions, and administration of employee reduction-in-force benefit programs. (Ibid.)

The University’s policy statement represents a commitment to affirmative action.

To accomplish this objective, the University has developed an Affirmative Action Plan, which establishes employment goals and benchmarks for reaching these goals. The University also endorses the policy of eliminating the remaining vestiges of prior segregation. It further endorses the specific goals adopted toward this end, including those actions and goals contained in the Affirmative Action Plan. The achievement of the goals and the interim benchmarks, as specified in the Affirmative Action Plan, has been adopted as the official policy of the institution. Paramount to the success of the University’s affirmative
action plan is its administration. The Office of Access and Equity was established in September 1980 to coordinate and direct the affirmative action program for faculty, staff and students. (Ibid.)

Beyond the Affirmative Action/Equal Employment Opportunity Policy, Clemson University also has a Racial Harassment Policy. The policy states that:

It is the policy of Clemson University to conduct and provide programs, activities and services to students, faculty and staff in an atmosphere free from racial harassment. Racial harassment is any behavior that would verbally or physically threaten, torment, badger, heckle or persecute an individual because of his/her race. Racial harassment of University faculty, staff, students or visitors is prohibited and shall subject the offender to appropriate disciplinary action. (Clemson University, “Racial Harassment Policy,” adopted March 1988, reissued and revised September 1997.)

President Curris writes, in a September 15, 1997, memorandum to university administrators, at the time the policies for equitable treatment were reissued:

Clemson University supports the principles set forth in these policies, not only because they are dictated by law, but because each member of the faculty, staff and student body deserves to be treated with dignity and respect.

The Commission will determine the extent of the University’s commitment to these laudatory policies through an examination of its compliance infrastructure and the resulting record.

In summary, the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (Title VI and VII) established the right to equal access to employment and educational opportunities for all Americans. In 1978, the NAACP began to pressure the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) and the Office of Civil Rights to speed up the process of desegregation. In 1981, the United States Department of Education accepted South Carolina’s plan for desegregation.
The desegregation plan, titled “South Carolina Plan for Equity and Equal Opportunity in the Public Colleges and Universities” (1981), outlines the agreement between the federal government and South Carolina. According to the plan, South Carolina, under the direction of the Commission on Higher Education agreed to:

- Decrease racial identifiability of governing boards of its public colleges and universities.
- Decrease racial identifiability based on student headcount enrollment.
- Decrease racial identifiability based on the faculty and administrators employed.

South Carolina’s revised desegregation plan, titled “South Carolina Plan for Equity and Equal Opportunity in the Public Institutions of Higher Education 1986-1987 and Beyond” (1985), reaffirmed the State’s commitment to the principles in the 1981 desegregation plan. The revised plan included the following objectives:

- Improve access to public institutions of higher education for black students.
- Reduce any disparities that exist between the retention and graduation rates of black and white students enrolled at the traditionally white institutions.
- Increase the number of other race students enrolled at the traditionally black institutions and the traditionally white institutions.
- Promote equity and equal employment opportunities in the public institutions of higher education.
B. Clemson’s Record

In this section, the Commission presents its analysis of Clemson University’s workforce in reference to black participation. Statistics for four specific years (1981, 1987, 1996 and 1998) are presented, as well as several graphs showing ten-year trends (1989 through 1998). The trend analysis begins with 1981 data because that is the year the U.S. Department of Education accepted South Carolina’s desegregation plan for higher education. Information is presented for the entire workforce and then for faculty, staff, and administrators.

1. Total Workforce

In 1981, blacks comprised 15% of the total Clemson workforce. In 1998, the percentage was 13% -- a decrease in share of 3%. For whites, the percentages were 86% in 1981 and 85% in 1998 -- no change. Even though there was a 11% increase in the total workforce (3,382 to 3,757) from 1981 through 1998, the number of jobs held by blacks decreased by 5%, while the number of jobs held by whites increased by 11%. Data for each of the target years are presented in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>494 (15%)</td>
<td>2888 (85%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>3382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>451 (13%)</td>
<td>3051 (86%)</td>
<td>52 (1%)</td>
<td>3554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>475 (13%)</td>
<td>3212 (85%)</td>
<td>79 (2%)</td>
<td>3766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>471 (13%)</td>
<td>3214 (86%)</td>
<td>72 (2%)</td>
<td>3757</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: South Carolina Human Affairs Commission.)

2. Faculty

Table 3 reveals that of the 911 teaching and research faculty at Clemson in 1981, 17 were black. None of the faculty was listed as “other.” In 1998, there were 998 faculty of which 40 were black. (According to data obtained from Clemson’s Office of Access and Equity, in the 1998-1999 academic year, the total number of black faculty included 41 full-time professors at various ranks, 5 academic administrators with faculty rank, and 6 part-time professors. Of these 52 faculty members, 22 are tenured, 19 are non-tenured, and 11 are non-tenure track.)


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>17 (2%)</td>
<td>894 (98%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>19 (2%)</td>
<td>925 (94%)</td>
<td>38 (4%)</td>
<td>982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>42 (4%)</td>
<td>923 (90%)</td>
<td>56 (5%)</td>
<td>1021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>40 (4%)</td>
<td>893 (89%)</td>
<td>65 (7%)</td>
<td>998</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: South Carolina Human Affairs Commission.)
Figure 1 shows trend data for the last ten years. From 1989 through 1992 there was a steady increase in the number of black faculty. Since 1996, though, there has been little or no change in the number of black faculty.

**Figure 1. Black Teaching/Research Faculty Numbers – Ten Year Trends**

![Graph showing trend data for black faculty numbers from 1989 to 1998.]

(Source: South Carolina Human Affairs Commission.)

In Table 4, all academic ranks for the target years are presented. When viewed by rank, the number of black professors increased from 0 in 1981 to 5 in 1998. In 1981, there were 5 black associate professors and in 1998 there were 16. (Note: the South Carolina Human Resources Commission did not collect data by rank in 1986 and 1987.) There is a marked difference in the distribution among the ranks between black and white.
faculty. In 1981, within the black faculty, there were no full professors; among white professors, 32% were full professors. In 1998, within the black faculty, 14% were full professors; among white professors, 41% were full professors. In Table 4, information is presented for all academic ranks for the target years.
Insert

Table 4. Teaching/Research Faculty (Selected Categories), by Race, by Academic Rank - 1981, 1996, and 1998

here
3. Staff

In 1981, there were 459 black staff members (EEO E2 through E8) at Clemson.

In 1998, there were 369—a decrease of 20%. For whites, in the same categories, there were 1,718 staff in 1981 and 1,922 in 1998—a 12% increase. The total number of support staff increased by 6%. Data for each of the target years are presented in Table 5.

Table 5. Support Staff (E2 – E8):
Black White, Other -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>459 (21%)</td>
<td>1718 (79%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>2177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>355 (17%)</td>
<td>1688 (82%)</td>
<td>13 (1%)</td>
<td>2056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>358 (17%)</td>
<td>1765 (83%)</td>
<td>15 (1%)</td>
<td>2138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>369 (16%)</td>
<td>1922 (83%)</td>
<td>18 (1%)</td>
<td>2309</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: South Carolina Human Affairs Commission.)

Ten-year trends in the presence of blacks within the staff categories of secretarial, skilled craft, and maintenance areas are shown in Figure 2. Blacks lost ground in secretarial positions and in the skilled crafts; the service maintenance areas remained almost unchanged.
Figure 2. Black Staff in Selected Categories – Ten Year Trends


*The data for secretarial positions may be subject to different interpretations because of the reclassifications that have occurred.

(Source: South Carolina Human Affairs Commission.)
Table 6. Support Staff (Selected Categories),
by Race, by Academic Rank -
4. Non-Academic Administrators

Blacks as non-academic administrators (EEO E1) comprised 9% of the total in 1981, and in 1998, they were 5% of the total - a 4% decrease in share. Whites went from 91% in 1981 to 94% in 1998 - a 3% increase. During that period there was a 46% decrease in the total number of jobs in this category. (Note: white numbers from 1981 to 1998 fell 44%; black numbers fell 71%.) The jobs that fall into this category include all of the vice presidents except the chief academic officer (provost) and the vice president for agriculture. Blacks do not hold any of the non-academic vice president positions. Data for non-academic administrators are presented in Table 7.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>17 (9%)</td>
<td>174 (91%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>3 (3%)</td>
<td>100 (97%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>11 (7%)</td>
<td>138 (93%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>5 (5%)</td>
<td>97 (94%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: South Carolina Human Affairs Commission.)
5. Academic Administrators

In 1981, one (1) of the 103 academic administrators was black. Blacks went from being a little less than 1% of the total in 1981 to 6% in 1998. During that period, whites decreased from 99% to 93% of the total. The total number of academic administrators increased by 75% from 1981 through 1998. The top positions in these categories are the president, provost, vice president for agriculture, and academic deans. In 1998, there was one black academic dean employed. The other black academic administrators were employed as associate deans and directors. Data for academic administrators, by race, for 1981, 1986, 1996 and 1998 are presented in Table 8.

Table 8. Academic Administrators (C1 and C2):
Black White, Other -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>102 (99%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>10 (6%)</td>
<td>163 (94%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>14 (7%)</td>
<td>175 (92%)</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>10 (6%)</td>
<td>167 (93%)</td>
<td>3 (2%)</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: South Carolina Human Affairs Commission.)
IV. Successes and Challenges

Beginning with its first meeting in September 1998, the Commission members began to collect, study and analyze existing data from several university offices, including Access and Equity, Human Resources, The Houston Center, and Institutional Research. The Commission also collected information from several state, regional, and national sources. The first year of the Commission’s work was devoted to gaining baseline information for framing and focusing data collection and analysis.

The work of the Commission during 1998-99 reveals some Clemson successes and challenges. The following is a profile of selective indicators of the status of African American faculty and staff at Clemson University and the challenges that must be addressed.

Clemson’s successes include:

**Faculty**
- Met the goals established in the EEO plan at the assistant and associate professor levels.

**Staff**
- Met the goals established in the EEO plan for non-academic administrators, service maintenance, technical and para-professional positions.
Clemson’s challenges include:

**Faculty**

- Continue to recruit black faculty at entry-level positions and provide an environment for that faculty to gain tenure and ultimately be promoted to the rank of professor.

- Retain and increase the number of blacks at the professor level by: (a) creating institutional supports which may enhance the promotion of black associate professors, (b) recruiting senior black professors from other universities, and (c) increasing Clemson’s contributions to the national pool of black Ph.D.’s who want to enter the Professorate.

**Staff**

- While there are considerably more blacks at the staff level than faculty level, the number of blacks in top management and administrative positions should increase.

- Additional effort is necessary to achieve EEO goals in several staff classifications.
V. Concluding Statement

The Commission concludes its first year poised to conduct further research consistent with its charge. In outlining Clemson University’s social and political milieu, the Commission has been able to identify the key terms, assumptions, and questions (see p. 4) for focusing its research strategy. The Commission’s first year has largely devoted to creating a baseline of information so that all members would be able to participate in its work by drawing on a common information base.

Baseline information begins with an overview of the legal and policy environment that shaped Clemson’s response to the desegregation movement in higher education. The baseline approach was also extended to reviewing and analyzing trend date, beginning with 1981, on the presence of blacks in the University’s workforce. Consequently, this preliminary report is a point of departure for in-depth research and analysis in the coming years. The report represents a clear indication of the direction the Commission will take in its second year and beyond.

During the several years, the Commission will pursue its charge by following an objective and systematic research process. The six questions and four tasks identified in this report provide the Commission with focus and direction for fulfilling its charge. Concurrent with the collection of data to provide in-depth answers to each of the questions posed, the Commission will pursue several objectives. Among the objectives
are the following:

- Ascertaining the access of black faculty and staff to resources that enhance the quality of their Clemson University experience.
- Determining the availability of opportunities for professional development and their usefulness for black faculty and staff.
- Assessing the impact of the tenure and promotion process on the recruitment, retention, and promotion of black faculty.
- Determining the rate and causes of turnover among black faculty and staff.
- Determining the availability and usefulness of staff training, including the impact on the upward mobility of individuals.
- Identifying and assessing the process for recruiting, and retaining black administrators.
- Benchmarking the status of blacks at Clemson with those of peer institutions, members of the Atlantic Coast Conference, and selected other universities.

These objectives will provide a specific focus for future Commission research and deliberation. For example, during the summer of 1999, the Commission’s executive committee will review the questions and tasks mentioned in this report, within the context of the objectives above, and develop a plan of action with associated responsibilities for the 1999-2000 academic year. The observations and questions generated during the Commission’s first year will provide the standard for assessing its annual progress, plus permit the executive committee in consultation with the full Commission to ascertain annual progress and create the basis for making decisions about its agenda in succeeding years. Projects to be considered for the Commission’s 1999-2000 agenda include:

- A series of focus groups to solicit black faculty and staff perceptions’ of the quality of life at Clemson;
- A scientific survey of the University’s black workforce;
- An examination of the University’s recruitment and hiring policies and
processes;

• An analysis of the tenure and promotion policies and processes for faculty; and

• An analysis of the role and impact of training on the retention and promotion of black staff.
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