FACULTY SENATE POLICY COMMITTEE
ANNUAL COMMITTEE REPORT (2012-13)
BILL PENNINGTON, CHAIR

Committee Members: Rob Baldwin, Megan Che, Scott Dutkiewicz, Mary Beth Kurz, Peter Laurence, Fran McGuire, John Meriwether, Monica Patterson (FS Program Coord.)

New Business

Faculty Manual Revision to include the President’s Commission on Sustainability.
To be inserted as VII.C.10 (page 55)

10. President’s Commission on Sustainability. The Commission will be the coordinating body for efforts to make the University a model of affordable, fiscally responsible, environmental sustainability for public institutions of higher education. Membership of the Commission consists of members of the faculty, members of the staff, students, and other nonvoting members. Three faculty representatives shall be appointed by the Faculty Senate from the Faculty at Large and shall have a three-year staggered term limit. Each member shall be from a different College (to include the Library). Appointees may include Emeriti faculty. Appointees shall have a demonstrated knowledge, interest, and ability in the subject of sustainability and shall not be sitting on the Senate at the time of nomination or appointment. Staff in operational areas, students and ex-officio members are appointed for one year terms by the individuals or organizations outlined in the Commission’s charter (http://www.clemson.edu/administration/commissions/sustainability/documents/charter.pdf). The chair of the Commission is appointed by the President for a one year renewable term.

Completed Business

The following changes were approved by the Executive Advisory Committee and the Faculty Senate, and have been submitted to the Provost:

    Part II, Section D - Alleged violations of the Manual – clarifies role of the Faculty Senate in determining whether a violation has occurred, and the role of the provost in determining resolution of violations.
    Part IV, Section E - Annual Performance Evaluations – merges FAS and old Forms 1-3 methods of evaluation to provide a fully on-line evaluation system.
    Part III, Section E. # 9 – Post-Doctoral Research Fellows – Removes one-year limit and identifies criteria for renewal.
    Part III, Section F – Endowed Chairs and Titled Professors - Specifies Alumni Distinguished Professorship are based on teaching and dedication to Clemson University and its students.
    Part V. Section I. # 9 and 10 – Grievance Hearings – Clarifies deadlines for decisions by the Hearing Panel and the Provost.
    Part VII, Section B, e. (page 47) – Change in the composition of the Calhoun Honors College Committee
    Part III E (6) – Lecturer – Details the policy to follow when there is a discrepancy in recommendations for promotion to senior lecturer;
    Part III E (8) - Senior Lecturers – Clarifies the administrative duties limit for senior lecturers as well as the characteristic of senior lecturers
Part IV, B (2) - Selection of Other Academic Administrators – Details the policy to follow when faculty-recommended interim chair candidates do not receive Dean approval.

Part IX. Professional Practices, Section D. Teaching Practices, #11 (Evaluation of Teaching by Students)
Part VII D (4) – The Freshman/Sophomore Committee – At the request of Dr. Jan Murdoch the Senate approved the deletion of this committee.

Part X C (new # 2) – Public Health Service Financial Conflict of Interest Policy – A link to this policy is provided.

The Policy Committee also discussed and ruled on an allegation of a Faculty Manual violation. The committee ruled that a violation had occurred, but felt that the manual was not completely clear with regard to the section being violated (see Pending Business 11).

Ongoing and Pending Business

1) Policy Committee discussed creation of a new named professorship, i.e. “University Professor”, and establishment of In-Rank promotion criteria to allow Full Professors to request an external review process with the intent of qualifying them for a raise. We also discussed President Barker’s establishment of a Presidential Endowed Chair (Juan Gilbert was the first recipient of this award.).

The discussion of the new named professorship is ongoing, and we have suggested that President King and Senator Pennington continue to work on this next year as an ‘ad hoc’ committee. The intent is to explore whether this position might be merged with the Alumni Distinguished Professorship. This will depend on the willingness of the Alumni Association and the Board of Trustees to share ownership of this position. We will also suggest creation of a student scholarship, endowed by the Board. Each recipient of this scholarship would be selected by one of the new Alumni Distinguished Professors.

The need for an In-Rank Promotion for Full Professors was diminished by the commitment of the University to accept Huron’s compensation plan which is based on elevation to and subsequent maintenance of market-based salaries for all faculty.

Continuing discussion of President Barker’s Presidential Endowed Chair is focused on the role of the Faculty in the selection process, and also on inclusion of this position in the faculty manual.

2) Discussion with Grievance Board representatives, Janie Lindle and Camille Cooper, regarding possible revisions to FM Part V, Grievance Procedures, resulted in decision for Policy Committee to strengthen the wording providing the Grievance Board with discretionary power to control the number of witnesses called and evidence submitted for Category II cases. This will hopefully decrease the time needed to hear these cases. University Counsel has expressed some concern that the less serious Category II cases take up more time than the more serious Category I cases. It was also decided that the submission of the grievance complaint should be made simultaneously to both the Provost and the Faculty Senate to avoid the appearance that the Provost is in control of the Grievance Process. The timetable for the Provost should also be reduced from the current 20 days to 10 days.

3) The LGBTQ Task Force has been approached about inclusion of their charter in the Faculty Manual. They were very open to the idea.
4) A great deal of discussion of the Post Tenure Review process took place with the intent of providing more immediate remediation activities for faculty receiving two or more unfavorable ratings (these are defined as “fair”, “marginal” or “poor”) on their Annual Performance Review. A proposal was submitted to the Executive Advisory Committee which would have established a “rolling” five year window. The occurrence of a second poor APR within any five consecutive years would trigger Phase II review, involving external review.

Sticking points included the call for remediation as soon as the faculty member was tagged for Phase II review, which would then be followed by further remediation if they were found “unsatisfactory”. There was concern about having two remediation steps, and also concern about having to go through remediation, then being found “satisfactory” under Phase II review. This might be addressed by replacing the first remediation with an “encouragement” toward faculty development, but no remediation unless required by the Phase II outcome.

The suggestion was made to abandon this revision in favor of one that would simply trigger Phase II review for any faculty member receiving two unfavorable APRs within any five-year period. After some consideration it was decided that the suggested revision, which would require modification of the current fixed window, was too extensive to be completed during this Senate year. The next Policy Committee is encouraged to take on this revision.

5) Discussion of the role and treatment of postdoctoral associates generated three main issues:
   a) Should post-docs be special faculty
   b) No matter what they are should they and/or other special faculty have grievance rights
   c) No matter what they are, what are the requirements/conditions for dismissal and/or termination beyond any grant-specific guidelines.

It has been suggested that these options be handled by the Policy, Welfare, and Research committees, respectively. Alternatively, a select or ad hoc committee could be formed to address these issues.

6) Program Termination/RIF: While not as pressing as it was a few years ago, a clear policy should be established when we are not in crisis mode. Work on this policy should be done in cooperation with the General Counsel. (Pennington and Steadman made good progress on this in the past).

7) IP policy: Two years ago the Policy Committee (Pennington) met with Johanna Floyd and Becca Hanus regarding several issues with the current policy (or lack thereof). It was promised that the IP committee would discuss our concerns and get back to us, but this never happened. Crucial that senate remain engaged on this issue. Revision of the policy is ongoing.

8) Department Bylaws/TPR Guidelines: The Senate should offer itself as a resource to departments who would like to ensure that department policies are consistent with the requirements established in the Faculty Manual. This may reduce Faculty Manual violations and Grievances.

9) General Policy Concern: Many general policies on campus (computer use, IP, Mission Statement, etc…) that affect faculty are implemented with minimal faculty input. The Senate should work to ensure that faculty
have the opportunity to comment on new university policy, and encourage faculty to take the time to offer thoughtful feedback.

10) Tenure Policy: There is ongoing concern about the meaning of “separate” as it pertains to chair and TPR committee recommendation to their dean. Some chairs seem to be relying on old versions of the Faculty Manual. It may be useful to send a memo to chairs summarizing the changes to the FM each fall.

11) It has been suggested that the description of the Provost’s handling of tenure and promotion decisions be modified to follow that for Deans (see below, especially the underlined passage), but this has not been acted upon.

**Faculty Manual Part IV.D. (paragraph 6, page 21)**

The dean reviews the complete file, makes a separate recommendation on the “Request for Personnel Action” form, and writes a report which includes a rationale for supporting or opposing the recommendations of the peer committee and department chair. The dean may establish committees within the college to provide assistance and advice in such reviews. The dean shall promptly inform the candidate in writing of his or her recommendation and its rationale, and the faculty member may elect to include a letter of response in the materials forwarded to the Provost. If the dean’s recommendation differs from those of the peer committee and/or the department chair, the differences shall be discussed with them prior to informing the candidate. Except in cases of penultimate year tenure review, the candidate is offered the opportunity to withdraw at this stage. In all other cases the complete file is forwarded to the Provost.