

Clemson University Salary Reports 2006-2008

Compiled by John C. Bednar, Professor Emeritus, bednarj@clemson.edu

Office of the President

2006 – over \$50,000

Total employees: 8 over \$50,000

Total salaries: \$849,359

Percentage increases above 3%:

President Barker (21.5%) Agency Head

2006: \$30,000 - \$49,999 (Note: Since exact salaries are not reported, the mean has been calculated. For example, if the report states that an employee made between \$46,000 and \$49,999, the figure used for that person is \$47,999.50.)

Total employees: 6 from \$30,000 to \$50,000

Total salaries: \$231,997

206 Total Personnel Cost (without fringe): \$1,081,356

2007 – over \$50,000

Total employees: 9 over \$50,000

Total salaries: \$966,415

Percentage increases above 3%:

President Barker (4.9%) Agency Head

Clayton Steadman (12.0%) Lecturer

Renee Roux (15.4%) Attorney IV

Erin Swann (11.3%) Attorney III

Sandra McKinney (13.3%) Executive Assistant II

Linda Allen (14.6%) Administrative Coordinator II

2007: \$30,000 - \$49,999 (Note: Since exact salaries are not reported, the mean has been calculated. For example, if the report states that an employee made between \$46,000 and \$49,999, the figure used for that person is \$47,999.50.)

Total employee: 7 from \$30,000 to \$50,000

Total salaries: \$403,994.50

2007 Total Personnel Cost (without fringe): \$1,370,409.50

2008 – over \$50,000

Total employees: 14 over \$50,000

Total Salaries: \$1,670,121

Percentage increases above 3%:

Clayton Steadman (7.1%) Lecturer Non-teaching

Angela Leidinger (26.8%) Lecturer Non-teaching

Renee Roux (20.0%) Attorney V

Erin Swann (24.2%) Attorney V

Elizabeth McInnis (4.0%) Assistant Academic Program Director

2008: \$30,000 - \$49,999 (Note: Since exact salaries are not reported, the mean has been calculated. For example, if the report states that an employee made between \$46,000 and \$49,999, the figure used for that person is \$47,999.50.)

Total employees: 13 from \$30,000 to \$50,000

Total salaries: \$511,993.50

2008 Total Personnel Cost (without fringe): \$2,182,114.50

.....

Office of the Provost

2006 – over \$50,000

Total employees: 45 over \$50,000

Total salaries: \$3,964,185

Percentage increases above 3%)

Janice Murdoch (4.0%)	Dean
Brett Dalton (6.0%)	Lecturer
Robert Halfacre (20.4%)	Visiting Professor
Barbara Speziale (13.0%)	Associate Dean
Robert Barkley (4.0%)	Lecturer
Stanley Smith (4.0%)	Academic Program Director
Linda Nilson (4.0%)	Lecturer
Lamont Flowers (4.7%)	Academic Program Director
Jane Gilbert (10.5%)	Administrative Manager I
Lois Petzold (7.7%)	Lecturer
James Williams (10.0%)	Lecturer
Brenda Goodman (12.5%)	Administrative Coordinator I
Susan Whorton (10.0%)	Lecturer
Jeffrey Neal (7.0%)	Lecturer

2006: \$30,000 - \$49,999 (Note: Since exact salaries are not reported, the mean has been calculated. For example, if the report states that an employee made between \$46,000 and \$49,999, the figure used for that person is \$47,999.50.)

Total employees: 59 from \$30,000 to \$50,000

Total salaries: \$2,243,969.50

2006 Total Personnel Cost (without fringe): \$6,208,154.50

207 – over \$50,000

Total employees: 49 over \$50,000

Total salaries: \$4,647,448

Percentage increases above 3%:

Provost Helms (15.0%)	Provost
David Grigsby (12.5%)	Professor
Janice Murdoch (26.2%)	Dean
James Rafert (15.3%)	Dean
James Cross (23.8%)	Professor

Robert Halfacre (4.0%)	Visiting Professor
Marvin Carmichael (7.6%)	Lecturer: Non-teaching
Robert Barkley (24.3%)	Lecturer: Non-teaching
Frankie Felder (7.4%)	Associate Dean
Linda Nilson (22.1%)	Lecturer: Non-teaching
Diane Smathers (4.0%)	Professor
Daniel Wueste (3.5%)	Associate Professor
Lamont Flowers (3.5%)	Academic Program Director
Elizabeth Lomas (13.3%)	Student Services Manager I
David Fleming (4.5%)	Research Associate
Jeffrey Neal (9.6%)	Lecturer

2007: \$30,000 - \$49,999 (Note: Since exact salaries are not reported, the mean has been calculated. For example, if the report states that an employee made between \$46,000 and \$49,999, the figure used for that person is \$47,999.50.)

Total employees: 68 from \$30,000 to \$50,000

Total salaries: \$2,587,966

2007 Total Personnel Cost (without fringe): \$7,235,414

208 – over \$50,000

Total employees: 61 over \$50,000

Total salaries: \$5,689,087

Percentage increases above 3%:

Provost Helms (15.5%)	Provost
Debra Jackson (20.7%)	Professor
Frederick Baus III (4.0%)	Academic Program Director
Jane Gilbert (32.3%)	Lecturer: Non-teaching
Alfred Bundrick (4.0%)	Academic Program Director
Teresa Fishman (73.3%)	Assistant Academic Program Director
Debra Sparacino (34.7%)	Associate Academic Program Director
Brenda Smith (16.1%)	Executive Assistant II
Jerome Reel, Jr. (5.0%)	Visiting Professor
Robert Bennet (6.0%)	Student Services Manager I
Brian Cass (22.0%)	Information Resource Consultant II
Audrey Bodell (5.7%)	Student Services Manager I
Christopher Wood (55.8%)	Administrative Manager I
Rebecca Pearson (5.7%)	Student Services Manager I
Cathy Sturkie (16.1%)	Program Coordinator I

2008: \$30,000 - \$49,999 (Note: Since exact salaries are not reported, the mean has been calculated. For example, if the report states that an employee made between \$46,000 and \$49,999, the figure used for that person is \$47,999.50.)

Total employees: 86 from \$30,00 to \$50,000

Total salaries: \$3,211,957

2008 Total Personnel Cost(without fringe): \$8,901,044

.....

Office of University Advancement

2006 – over \$50,000

Total employees: 29 over \$50,000

Total salaries: \$2,363,574

14% received raises above 3%.

\$30,000 – \$49,999

Total employees: 56

Total salaries: \$1,835,980.50

Total personnel cost (without fringe): \$4,199,554.50

2007 – over \$50,000

Total employees: 49 over \$50,000

Total salaries: \$3,999,856

43% received raises above 3%

\$30,000 - \$49,999

Total employees: 56

Total salaries: 2,271,971.50

Total personnel cost (without fringe): \$6,271,827.50

2008 – over \$50,000

Total employees: 58

Total salaries: \$4,671,243

14% received raises above 1%

\$30,000 - \$49,999

Total employees: 61

Total salaries: \$2,419,969.50

Total personnel cost (without fringe) \$7,091,212.50

Notes:

From 2006 to 2008 ...

- 1. Personnel costs in the office of the President increased slightly more than 100%. (\$1,100,758.50 more in 2008). The number of employees increased from 14 to 16 to 27.**
- 2. Personnel costs in the office of the Provost increased slightly more than 30% (\$2,692,889.50 more in 2008). The number of employees increased from 104 to 117 to 147.**
- 3. Personnel costs in the office of University Advancement increased 69% (\$2,891,658 more in 2008). The number of employees increased from 85 to 105 to 119.**
- 4. None of these figures includes fringe benefits (32.8%, the percentage used in grant proposals).**
- 5. The combined total personnel costs in the office of the President, the office of the Provost, and the office of University Advancement come to \$20,446,342 in 2008, compared to \$11,489,065 in 2006. Almost double.**
- 6. When fringe benefits are added in 2006, the total is \$15,258,255. In 2008 the total is \$27,153,248.**
- 7. Average percentage raises for employees from 2006 to 2008 were 3% in 2006, 3% in 2007 and 1% in 2008.**
- 8. In 2006, 17% of the higher category employees in the President's office received raises of more than 3% (only the President himself: 21.5%). In 2007, 67% received raises of more than 3%. In 2008, 36% received raises of more than 1%.**
- 9. In 2006, 14% of the higher category employees in the Provost's office received raises of more than 3%. In 2007, 33% received more than 3%. In 2008, 28% received more than 1%.**
- 10. In 2006, 14% of the higher category employees in the office of University Advancement received raises of more than 3%. In 2007, 43% received more than 3%. In 2008, 14% received more than 1%.**
- 11. In FY 2008, in the President's office there is 1 person making over \$200,000 a year and there are 6 people making over \$100,000. In the Provost's office there are 4 people making over \$200,000 a year and 14 people making over \$100,000 a year. And in the office of University Advancement, there are 2 people making over \$200,000 a year and 12 people making over \$100,000.**
- 12. Remember: percentage raises are incrementally higher according to the base. In other words, 3% of \$20,000 is \$600. 3% of \$200,000 is \$6,000. In 2008, the Provost got a \$36,251 raise!**

Observations:

It is obvious from the data before you that, over the past three years, while the Clemson University Family in general has experienced painful budget cuts, close to or below-cost-of-living pay increases, stringent reductions in programs and personnel, freezes in filling or outright elimination of vital positions in many departments, reductions in academically related travel, and many other reminders of the economic crisis gripping not only our community but the country as a whole ... the President's office, the Provost's office and the Office of University Advancement clearly have not. Without any significant increase in the size of the student body or the faculty ... in fact, quite to the contrary as far as the faculty and staff are concerned ... the offices of the President, the Provost and University Advancement have burgeoned, apparently prospering in these desperate times, and increasing their budgetary expenses dramatically.

Moreover, beyond this raw and very public data, considerable monies are provided to the Administration of Clemson University every year from the Clemson Foundation without any detailed publishing of from whom and for what those funds were raised and are spent. A full and open accounting of these funds, particularly those related to the offices of the President and the Provost, is necessary in order for our community to have full transparency concerning the fiscal operations of Clemson University. Without it, we simply do not have the information required to formulate sound opinions about the financial well-being of our institution and the fiduciary conduct of our top administrators. In appearance, large sums of money spent on and/or by our administrators are being hidden from us. In other terms, we do not enjoy the knowledge which, in the spirit of our state's laws and the stated goals of our Administration concerning transparency, we are supposed to have as members of this Family.

It is time for a full accounting. As this brief overview suggests, there are troubling signs in the Administration of Clemson University that mirror the conduct of those who have paid themselves outrageous bonuses as their institutions fail financially. And even more questionable decisions lead from the President's office directly to the Board of Trustees. Why, for example, is the daughter of a member of the Board working in the President's office as an attorney? Why has she received such high raises over the past two financially difficult years (11.4% and 24.2%)?? And why is President Barker's son currently employed in the Office of University Advancement? The vast majority of Clemson Family employees do not enjoy this kind of relationship. And why are former members of the Faculty Senate or their spouses employed in the Administration? Does that suggest the possibility of inappropriate or undue influence over the Senate leadership when it comes (or came) to criticism of the Administration? And why are these salary reports, small portions of which are in front of you, dated October 1st and only made available in January? Does the Administration not want this information made available in a timely manner?

Sadly, the list goes on. It is time for a full accounting. It is time for the bare facts and hard truths to surface. It time for all of us to have access to them and to face them as a family. It is time for this community to assume its full collective fiscal responsibility. No one in any position of leadership at Clemson University ... from the Board of Trustees to the President and on down ... can expect the Clemson Family to stick together as a family, to make the collective sacrifices that close-knit families have to make if they want to survive, if it is not provided with all of the information pertinent to that survival ... by the family leaders whose duty it is to keep them informed. Family members left in the dark will only feel greater anger and frustration and bitterness when all of these questions are eventually answered.

Than you.