2014-2015 Policy Committee Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mary Beth Kurz</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>E&amp;S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Luo</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>AFLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Laurence</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>AAH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megan Che</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>HEHD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Warner</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>E&amp;S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay Ochterbeck</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>E&amp;S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gypsey Teague</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Libraries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lance Howard (del)</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>AAH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judson Jahn (del)</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>BBS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Fran McGuire   | Guest, FM Edit. Cons. |

Part II:

**Completed**

1. Definition of “college” for purposes of the manual, included in 1415 Faculty Manual
2. Changes to ensure that changes to the FM requires approval of 2/3 of the members at a meeting held with quorum, referencing the constitution.
3. To make more explicit the line between regular faculty (not administrative positions) and Faculty (as defined in the constitution)

Part III: The faculty

**Completed**

1. Professor of Practice as a new special rank (included in 1415 v2 FM)
2. Lecturer defined as having a “primary teaching role”; included in the 1415 Faculty Manual
3. Centennial award committee structure documentation - asked for and received Faculty Senate endorsement of the committee structure, like we did with the Schaffer Award in distinguishing between items that should be restricted to regular or (all) faculty or Faculty. There are 15 of these items.
4. Section B, page 3: Editorial: references a different part of the FM after revisions to Part X. Indicated so we do not lose track of it.
5. Section B, page 3: Part X section D no longer contains the Consulting Policy. Dooley asked we consider adding it back in. Instead, it is being hosted on the Provost’s web pages since this policy is not under the control of FS. This change removes the reference to Part X
6. Section B, page 3: Editorial? Using the words “department” instead of “departmental” regarding qualifications for Faculty appointments

Last updated April 28 2015
7. Section C, page 3: Two related changes. The first removes redundant information, the second creates a new transitions and is clearly editorial.

8. Section D, page 4: This change is highly related to the Jan 5 memo from the Provost regarding the Grievance Board outcome and the wording for “standards” for promotion to full professor. Here, we are clarifying some language (“creative accomplishments” instead of “creative publications”) and increasing the parallel structure between the statements for Associate Professor and Professor. We are also strengthening the documentation of the role of the department in determining criteria for tenure and promotion. The memo from PC to the Provost and the original memo may be useful in understanding the larger context.

9. Section F, page 8: The Endowed Chair and Titled Professors have been rearranged and restructured to accomplish the following:
   a. Create a section explicitly describing how to handle dept chairs as candidates or holders of these positions
   b. Create term limits as defaults for positions effective Aug 1 2015.
   c. Insist that appointment letters after Aug 1 2015 have details about terms, reviews and requirements for retention.
   d. Clarify how reviews are done / triggered for “grandfathered” positions

10. Section G, page 11: Delete the TERI section since this is an HR / State law issue, not a FM issue.

11. Section I, page 12: Streamline the process related to retired faculty and space. Clarifies that this is a department issue.

12. Section J, page 12: only include those awards with FS involvement.

13. Items moved to Part IV and removed / modified in Part III

**Discussed but not moving forward**

1. University Professors – From the Policy Committee: Are we just trying to get more endowed / titled professors that are not funded already? Is the idea to recognize the really-star achievements? Why not endow more money for professorships? Or expand the Centenniel award – there are mechanisms to do what this seems to be trying to do. We like the intent, but we want to use an existing mechanism and want to know how we can help.

2. CITI staff as faculty rank? In Jan 20 2015 meeting, the Policy Committee determined that it is inappropriate for individuals who are hired as staff to receive automatic special faculty ranks. Some issues are that staff positions do not have the same search and screening process and that CITI does not have department bylaws or TPR committees.

**Pending**

1. Lecturers
   - Lecturers who are not in any dept? Who evaluates them?

Last updated April 28 2015
2. postdocs - what is the appropriate place for them to be? Not grad students – special ranks, staff???? Defer to 2015-2016 Faculty Senate for further investigation, especially in Collaboration with Research Committee, HR, Post-docs themselves

Part IV: Personnel Practices

Completed

Part IV has been reorganized with the following outline: (page numbers may not match the pdf document with changes tracked)

A. Policies and Procedures for the Recruitment and Appointment of Faculty..............Error! Bookmark not defined.
   A.1. Procedures for Faculty Appointments...............................Error! Bookmark not defined.
   A.3. Terms of Appointment........................................Error! Bookmark not defined.
B. Policies for Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion ........Error! Bookmark not defined.
   B.2. Tenure Policies .........................................................Error! Bookmark not defined.
   B.3. Promotion Policies ..................................................Error! Bookmark not defined.
C. Procedures for Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion....Error! Bookmark not defined.
   C.1. Guidelines for Department TPR documents ........Error! Bookmark not defined.
   C.2. Department-level Procedures .......................................Error! Bookmark not defined.
   C.3. College-level Procedures .............................................Error! Bookmark not defined.
   C.5. Notification of Reappointment and Non-ReappointmentsError! Bookmark not defined.
E. Post-Tenure Review .....................................................Error! Bookmark not defined.
F. Resignation, Termination, and Dismissal ........................Error! Bookmark not defined.

The above reorganization resulting in moving many sections of text; those moves are considered editorial and might only mentioned in passing with the indication “moved”. If there is also a change in text or meaning, that is noted below.

Changes in references to specific sections are not explicitly noted in this list.

Language changes:
The words “retention”, “renewal of appointment”, “(Re)appointment” are less preferred to “reappointment”. We intend to update the document throughout, and all of these changes may not be explicitly noted herein.

Changes are marked with comments containing numbers that correspond to these items below.

Last updated April 28 2015
1. Transitions / introductory material to orient the reader.
2. Move of text from Part III to Part IV, especially related to Lecturers and Senior Lecturers. No change in language, just a (big) move in location.
3. Clarifications of lecturer and senior lecturer appointment, reappointment and promotion policies and procedures.
5. Page 1, Section A, first line: Limits the ranks to those listed in the FM.
6. Page 2, Section A1A. Specifies that appointment above assistant professor rank has some interaction required with the TPR committee
7. Page 2, Section A1b. Linked to Part III change to require dept bylaws guidance for special ranks
8. Page 5, section A3: Since terms of appointments for special ranks may be 3 years (senior lecturers) or determined by the letter of appointment, it is not appropriate to describe special appointments as having brief association with the university. It is more accurate to say that they are of limited faculty functions and time durations
9. Page 5, section A3: senior lecturers require notice before July 15 of their penultimate year; reappointment for lecturer should indicate progress to promotion to senior lecturer
10. Page 5, section B. Several locations indicate that the department TPR committee and department chairs conduct independent reviews – this brings this point to a more prominent position.
11. Page 5 Section B: the department faculty are the primary judge of the qualifications of its members (page 1, section A, 4th paragraph), so TPR guidelines should be developed by departmental faculty.
12. Page 6, section B1: differentiate reappointment review from annual review (Form 3) and provide description of the intent of the review for various ranks
13. Page 6, section B1: Indicating that periodic review of senior lecturers should include the penultimate year because of the link to reappointment.
14. Page 6, section B2: tenure clock credit should happen at appointment, not tenure time.
15. Page 8, section B2b: limits the “normal” number of tenure extensions to 2 unless otherwise approves
16. Page 9, section C1: indicates again, like 11, that the dept faculty are the primary judge of the qualifications of its members. As such, while the dean and provost have interest in TPR guidelines, and the provost is charged with ensuring that department guidelines satisfy the FM guidelines, neither the dean nor the provost can dictate these guidelines. Instead, we would expect that the dean or provost would engage in discussion with departments whenever a difference in opinion about TPR guidelines exist.
17. Page 11, section C3: There is a contradiction between the constitution and the FM about college TPR committees that should be rectified.
18. Page 11, section C3 and C4 (page 12): the dean (provost) should communicate differences in opinion to dept chair and TPR committee (and dean in the case of C4) regarding reappointment, promotion and tenure.
19. Page 12, section C4: allows the president to define a procedure regarding grants and denial of tenure and promotion.

20. Page 14, section D1: indicate that the Provost’s office will distribute dates for annual review, consistent with FM guidelines.

21. Page 14: section D1, number 1: faculty members set goals, but chairs assign duties.

22. Page 21: section F: need to work with HR for wording BUT moves termination for medical reasons to the dismissal section and removes causes for dismissal.

23. Welfare Committee requested change to the tenure clock policy. This was incorporated into the draft of Part IV in Feb 2015

**Discussed but not moving forward**

24. Kinly Sturkie described some concerns from the CoES and CBBS deans that the form 3 process may be burdensome. The committee discussed pros and cons of reducing explicit dean-level approval of form 3 rating provided by department chairs. Kinly will take the committee feedback to the CBBS dean for further discussion.

25. From Kelly Smith: “It needs to be clarified in the FM whether lecturers can vote in college elections (for senate elections in particular).”

**Pending**

26. PTR – rolling horizon for PTR – MBK has draft and comments. Deferred (again) not because it is a bad idea, but to understand how this relates to State Law regarding PTR

**Part V: Grievance**

**Complete**

1. Change to the location at which Petitions are submitted (Part V, Sections A, G and H)

**Pending**

2. In Sept 11 2014 meeting, John Meriwether presented two issues that may require faculty manual edits.
   a. issues related to Title IX and the appropriate places in the Grievance process that Access and Equity should become involved. The Grievance section of the Faculty Manual probably should recommend that potential petitioners interact with the Office of Access and Equity at certain points in the process. Mary Beth Kurz has drafted language and sent the draft to Jerry Knighton. General Counsel’s office asked to wait until after a consultant visit took place.
Jerry Knighton and Renee Roux provided feedback about how the Grievance process and the Office of Access and Equity should interact, in their opinions. Renee Roux asked if the external consultant that the General Counsel has engaged can provide opinion as well; MB suggests the external consultant contact the current GB chair and Cathy Sturkie. The committee discussed the following changes to Part V that might alleviate some concerns.

- Ensure that grievances with “access and equity” issues are heard in the summer – will ask the Provost for commitment
- Perhaps the GB chair can responsible for evaluating if access and equity should get involved instead of FSO staff
- What do GB at other schools do? That would be useful information

As of 4/23/2015, no further word has been received.

b. Issues related to whether grievances related to salary increments would be better considered in GP I. The consensus was to wait and see if we just move this one item to GP I or if GB wants to streamline the whole process (one category). As of 4/23/15, no information / requests related to this topic has been sent to Policy.

Part VI: Admin Structure – We have a draft from the FM re-write committee

27. From Kelly: “The FM needs some tidying up in terms of what positions are described in there. For example, it does not mention Nadim Aziz's current position (Vice Provost) at all.”

28. Hiring of administrators
   From Kelly: “The section on hiring of administrators will eventually need to be reworked”
   Unappointment of administrative people

29. Program termination / rif

30. Changes in administrative units – merging and splitting colleges and departments:
   From Kelly: “Think about revising the FM to deal with "marriages" and "divorces" of departments and colleges (as we have had happen recently a number of times recently, sometimes at gunpoint). You might start by looking at the AAUP’s new rules on eliminating departments. And keep me posted as this might be an area where a joint task force or something is needed.”

31. Department Chairs vs Department Heads (still pending from 1314 Policy Committee)
   - From Kelly: “I know Policy had some discussions last year about whether we should switch to real department chairs instead of heads called chairs as we have it now. Ask around about the status of this and get back to me. If we are going to pursue this, we will have to get Nadim's office involved in a serious way.”
   - From Monica: “And Diane, Welfare Chair already spoke to Nadim about [this]. She reported at one of the EAC meetings, that Nadim wanted to improve the current system before instituting any major changes to department chair/head structure.
Nadim's faculty mentorship program or faculty fellows might be part of addressing this. I suggest that Mary Beth speak with Diane first and perhaps this is still more of a Welfare issue before it becomes a Policy responsibility. Just a thought.”

- Aug 20, 2013 update: From Diane Perpich: “my remembered sense was that this issue was not going to get traction while the leadership shift is on-going”
- Aug 27, 2013 update: Maybe this should be considered by Jeremy King’s task force on administrative structure
- Policy Committee was deferring but will discuss with Nadim based on Kelly’s request

Part VII: Faculty Participation in University Governance

32. LGBTQ Commission in Fac Manual: MBK met with the Communication and Outreach subcommittee of the LGBTQ Task Force on September 5 2013. She gave them a draft (straw man) section to develop further. This is deferred until the LGBTQ Task Force returns with feedback.

33. Committee membership:
   - Fran: “The issue here is whether committees/administrators can eliminate faculty representation to a committee. There may be occasions when we want to continue membership on a committee even if we are not wanted.”
   - “I’ve come across a printed copy of a 2011 email circulated within Faculty Senate regarding the Media Advisory Board. In 2011 then-President, Dan Warner wrote that he received a "written letter stating that the Media Advisory Board had deleted the Faculty Senate representative a couple of years back." University committees that include faculty in membership are contained in the Faculty Manual and changes to this information should be presented to Faculty Senate. I see that we still have the criteria in question, "one member of the faculty elected by the Faculty Senate”, in our newest Faculty Manual (Part VII. Section G. 2.). However, the MAB webpage indicates something else: http://www.clemson.edu/campus-life/student-media/media-advisory-board.html. Can you confirm for me that Faculty Senate is no longer involved in the MAB process, because we continue to elect a representative and submit this name to the Vice President of Student Affairs to share with the committee chair and administrative support?”

34. Degree to which Scholastic Policies committee is related to Graduate studies in Faculty Manual. In general, this committee is highly tasked according to the FM

35. How much faculty manual dictation do we want in the Faculty Participation in University governance section (part VII), item 16 below

From Monica:

“Please have Policy make a decision on this at their August [2014] meeting, this way we can get Fran's memo out and start collecting information from University level
committees this fall to figure out changes. ... If it is to include committees that require faculty representation (as the title of the section indicates), then will we make it clear that adding such to the FM requires that the committee go through Senate for any changes related to the faculty portion of membership? What will we ask in Fran's memo to campus: for 1-2 sentences on purpose, membership, and membership selection? Should the Senate have a say when a committee requires a Senate or Faculty Rep? For instance, do we need Senators on all of the Scholastic Policy related committees?

I was involved in the (this) 2nd bullet point regarding MAB. Please refer to our latest University Committee Table under Senate Information on our website (attached as “2 faculty reps.pdf”) for all committees for which the Senate is asked to nominate or elect someone. (Fran: Katie used an older draft that says Alternates are "members" of the Senate; this will be deleted again in the next 2 weeks, when UPIC students return to work.)

As of Sept 11, 2014, the committee felt that many of the committees should remain in the faculty manual as a form of documentation and to ensure some transparency.