



PRESIDENT: Thompson Mefford

## AGENDA

---

**Date:** December 14<sup>th</sup>, 2021

**Time:** 2:30 p.m.

**Location:** Zoom

**Teams:** [Digital Meeting Materials](#)

---

### 1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

- a. Faculty Senate Meeting Tuesday, November 9<sup>th</sup>, 2021

### 2. SPECIAL ORDERS

### 3. REPORT

- a. Robert H. Jones, Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs & Provost  
Standing Committees

1. Finance and Infrastructure Committee; Chair Andrew Brown
2. Policy Committee; Chair Lauren Duffy
3. Research and Scholarship Committee; Chair Brian Powell
4. Scholastic Policies Committee; Chair Lindsay Shuller-Nickles
5. Welfare Committee; Chair Andrew Pyle
  - i 202101 HERI Report
  - ii 202105 Faculty Manual Compliance with FMLA and FSAP
6. Clemson Experimental Forest Committee; Chair Betty Baldwin

- b. University Committees/Commissions

1. Committee on Committees; Chair Mary Beth Kurz
2. Faculty Representative to the Board of Trustees; Brian Powell
3. President's Report

### 4. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

### 5. NEW BUSINESS

**ADJOURN**

**ANNOUNCEMENTS**

1. Faculty Senate Executive Committee Meeting: Tuesday, January 4<sup>th</sup>, 2022, 2:30 p.m.
2. Faculty Senate Meeting: Tuesday, January 11<sup>th</sup>, 2022, 2:30 p.m.
3. Convention of the Delegates Meeting: Thursday, January 13<sup>th</sup>, 2022
4. Faculty Senate Advisory Committee Meeting: Tuesday, January 25<sup>th</sup>, 2022, 2:30 p.m.

*The Welfare Committee: investigates and reports to the Faculty Senate relevant matters for faculty welfare.*



CLEMSON® UNIVERSITY  
**FACULTY SENATE**  
**WELFARE COMMITTEE**  
CHAIR: Andrew Pyle

## **WELFARE COMMITTEE REPORT**

Standing Agenda Item 202101: HERI Report

---

### **Background**

In the 2021-2022 Senate year, the Welfare Committee was charged with reviewing and reporting on the results of the “Undergraduate Teaching Faculty: The HERI Faculty Survey 2016–2017.” HERI stands for “Higher Education Research Institute” (UCLA). This report summarizes the highlights of a national survey of college and university faculty about undergraduate teaching. “Faculty” included part-time faculty and those who work with graduate students (GTAs). Participating universities distributed the survey locally and could add modules focusing on campus climate, spirituality, and STEM. Sexual orientation and gender identity questions, once in an optional module, were moved to the core instrument. The results reported in the 2016–2017 report are based on responses from 20,771 full-time undergraduate teaching faculty members from 143 four-year colleges and universities.

Results of the survey are reported by categories that include gender, type of institution, rank, salary, and religious orientation (if any). The report itself consists of 21 pages of introductory discussion and analysis, followed by 97 pages of the primary data, which includes responses to all survey questions and demographic data.

### **Discussion**

The Welfare Committee has reviewed and discussed the HERI survey results and summarize its most important findings below.

*Discrimination:* Discrimination is a source of stress for female faculty of color and female STEM faculty especially. Women are about 50% more likely than male peers to feel that discrimination is a source of stress. This gap is largest and the feeling most pronounced at public universities. White faculty are least likely of all groups to cite discrimination as a source of stress. Across all institution types, women in STEM fields are more likely than all other groups to feel stress from discrimination, but women in non-STEM fields at public universities also report stress from discrimination at a comparable level.

*Fair Treatment:* Male and white faculty more likely to agree that women and faculty of color are treated fairly. About two-thirds of all respondents believed their universities placed high priority on developing a sense of community among students and faculty, with that percentage higher at private universities. About half of faculty believe their institutions place a high priority on recruiting women and faculty of color, as well as on promoting racial and ethnic diversity generally.

*Scholarly Recognition:* Faculty of color and women perceive an uneven playing field with regard to assessment and recognition of their research; they believe their research is not viewed as legitimate as the research of white, male peers. Substantially more Black, Asian, Latino/a, and Native American faculty perceived a need to work harder than peers for legitimacy than white faculty perceived such a need (by about 30%). Women perceived the need to work harder than did males by about 20%.

*Job Satisfaction:* Satisfaction with equity of salary and job benefits varies widely by race, gender, and primary responsibility. Less than half of undergraduate teaching faculty (48.4%) are satisfied or very satisfied with the relative equity of salary and job benefits. Satisfaction varies by rank, with higher ranks being more satisfied. Dissatisfaction is highest among lecturers. Those whose activity is primarily teaching are less satisfied than those in service, administrative, or research roles. STEM faculty tend to be more satisfied than those in non-STEM fields.

*Diversity:* Faculty believe they are not well prepared to deal with diversity-related conflict in the classroom. Women recognized more racial conflict on campus than men reported. Black and Latino/a faculty recognized much more conflict than white faculty. More than 80% of faculty believe that it is their role to enhance student knowledge of and appreciation for racial and ethnic groups, but more than half feel unprepared for this challenge. About one-third of faculty introduce readings on racial and ethnic issues into their courses. About 50% of Black and Latino/a faculty introduce such readings but only about 30% of white faculty do and just 22% of Asian/Pacific Islander faculty.

*Mentoring:* Faculty have complex mentoring relationships with undergraduate and graduate students as well as other faculty. Over half of the faculty believe faculty are not prepared to deal with conflict over diversity issues in the classroom. This is something that could be addressed with additional mentorship, training, and faculty development. Additionally:

- Male and female faculty mentor roughly the same number of undergraduate students and have roughly similar mentoring relationship with mentees. Female faculty are more likely to work on educational choices and strategies and serve as role models than their male colleagues.
- Faculty in non-STEM fields report having more graduate student mentees than STEM faculty. Both male and female faculty communicate daily with their graduate student mentees. While non-STEM faculty (male and female) work roughly with the same fraction of mentees, male mentors, compared to female mentors, work with a much larger fraction of graduate-mentees.
- Male faculty are more likely to work with their mentees on research while female faculty focus more on teaching. Newer and non-STEM faculty focus predominantly (73%) on developing student writing skills. More than 60% of faculty mentors focus on employability and seeking advanced degrees after graduation of mentees.

*Tolerance and Respect for Others:* 57.6% of faculty strongly agree that it is their role to teach students tolerance and respect for different beliefs. Junior faculty are more likely to support such roles compared to their senior colleagues. Faculty in non-STEM fields are more likely to agree that they play a role in meeting these goals. The survey found more than 20% difference between non-STEM and STEM faculty in teaching students' racial appreciation and in becoming agents of social change, with non-STEM faculty teaching these items more frequently.

*Problem-Solving:* Compared to previous surveys, this year's survey found faculty feeling pressure to teach students to become critical consumers of what they read or hear. Almost three quarters of faculty report frequently encouraging students to seek solutions to problems and explain them to others.

*Preparedness of Students:* Colleges and universities around the country are enrolling students who are not prepared for college-level coursework. Private and nonsecular institutions tend to do more to facilitate student development through remedial/developmental courses that are taught primarily by adjuncts and lecturers.

*Faculty Development:* Faculty development has become a vital component for their professional growth. Just half of undergraduate teaching faculty participated in teaching related professional development opportunities.

## **Conclusions**

The summarized findings of the report presented here are useful for understanding some large-scale dynamics in higher education, particularly as it relates to the experiences of university faculty as instructors. Faculty senators and university administrators should keep these findings in mind as university- and college-level decisions are made in the future.

*The Welfare Committee: investigates and reports to the Faculty Senate relevant matters for faculty welfare.*



CLEMSON® UNIVERSITY  
**FACULTY SENATE**  
**WELFARE COMMITTEE**  
CHAIR: Andrew Pyle

## **WELFARE COMMITTEE REPORT**

Standing Agenda Item 202105:

Report on the compliance of the *Faculty Manual* with the FMLA and FSAP

The purpose of this report is to evaluate the compliance of the Clemson University *Faculty Manual* (FM) with the federal and state laws associated with the Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA) and with Clemson University's Family Support and Accommodation Plan (FSAP). This report emphasizes the impacts on the process of reappointment during the probationary period for faculty who elect to take time off as part of FMLA and consideration of extensions to the probationary period, and it also highlights several other sections of the *Faculty Manual* to which the FMLA and FSAP are relevant.

The FMLA entitles eligible employees of covered employers to take unpaid, job-protected leave for specified family and medical reasons with continuation of group health insurance coverage under the same terms and conditions as if the employee had not taken leave. Eligible employees are entitled to:

- Twelve workweeks of leave in a 12-month period for:
  - the birth of a child and to care for the newborn child within one year of birth;
  - the placement with the employee of a child for adoption or foster care and to care for the newly placed child within one year of placement;
  - to care for the employee's spouse, child, or parent who has a serious health condition;
  - a serious health condition that makes the employee unable to perform the essential functions of his or her job;
  - any qualifying exigency arising out of the fact that the employee's spouse, son, daughter, or parent is a covered military member on "covered active duty;" or
- Twenty-six workweeks of leave during a single 12-month period to care for a covered servicemember with a serious injury or illness if the eligible employee is the servicemember's spouse, son, daughter, parent, or next of kin (military caregiver leave).

This report lists four specific parts of the FM that the Welfare Committee has found relevant to the FMLA and FSAP and quotes the text that relates to these policies. For each part of the FM that is included in this report, the committee's evaluation is provided.

- 1) Ch. V (personnel practices), C (Policies for Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion), 3 (Tenure Policies), b (The probationary period), v (Modifications to the probationary period), 2 (Extensions of the probationary period), p 44:

"For events including and related to the birth or placement of children in their immediate family, probationary faculty make written requests to the department chair for an extension of the probationary period, where each request is for a one-year extension of the probationary period. The first two such requests shall be automatically granted. Additional written requests may be submitted but are subject to approval by the TPR committee, department chair, Dean and Provost."

“These requests must be submitted to the department chair. If the request for an extension is received between six months before and one year after the date of birth or placement of a child, it is automatically granted, with timely written notification to the Provost and the probationary faculty member by the department chair.”

In the FSAP we read:

“13. Effect of FSAP on Tenure Clock:

A faculty member’s tenure clock will continue unless the faculty member requests otherwise and the department agrees to stop the clock. Use of an FSAP is independent of the tenure clock. Faculty members should reference the *Clemson University Faculty Manual* for details regarding an extension of the tenure clock.”

**Committee’s evaluation:** FMLA does not directly connect to procedures related to Tenure and promotion. However, it seems like the FM describes procedures that are consistent with FMLA policies. While the FM states that the extension of the probationary period for more than 2 times is subject to the decision of the TPR committee, department chair, Dean and Provost, assuming that the employee is still entitled to unpaid leave beyond the second request, this does not contradict the FMLA.

- 2) Ch. V, E (Annual Performance Evaluation and Salary Determination Procedures), 2 (Procedures for Annual Performance Evaluation) f (The FAS has three separate sections), i (Goals), p 50:

“In cases where members of the faculty are on official university leave where extended leave might affect the faculty member’s goals, their goals are null and void until goals are modified to reflect the impact of the leave.”

**Committee’s evaluation:** This part does not mention FMLA and FSAP, but it seems this fragment accounts for the events included in FMLA. Perhaps it should be mentioned that goals may be updated whenever a modified work plan is put in place under some sort of work accommodation, such as FMLA or FSAP.

- 3) Ch. V G (Post-Tenure Review (PTR)), 2 (Coverage of PTR), a, p 55:

“v. Faculty who give birth, father, or adopt a child during any five-year period may, at their request, receive a one-year extension of the PTR.

(1) The request for an extension must come within two months of the birth or adoption.

(2) The extension will automatically be granted unless the chair or dean can document sufficient reason for denial.

vi. Extension of the Post-Tenure Review period of a faculty member for serious illness, family tragedy or other special circumstances may be granted with the approval of the department chair, dean and Provost.”

**Committee’s evaluation:** Again, the FMLA and FSAP do not specifically relate to post-tenure review, but the Faculty Senate may want to consider whether the extension of the PTR may be granted for more than one year within the 5-year period if childbirth/adoption occurs more than once during this time. Furthermore, the chair or the dean may deny the request upon supplying sufficient reason/documents. These decisions are made independently of questions related to leave and are therefore compliant.

### **Conclusions and Recommendations**

The committee finds that the *Faculty Manual* is compliant with the guidelines found in the FMLA and FSAP. Of note, FMLA and FSAP are systems that operate independently of the guidance found within the *Faculty Manual*. The committee finds that university employees would benefit from additional clarity about the FMLA and FSAP resources that exist. Information about these programs should not live in the *Faculty Manual*. However, the Welfare Committee recommends that the Faculty Senate should take up the question of how best to ensure that supervisors are well trained in how to advise their units to implement these programs as the need arises. The university, possibly via Human Resources, should also improve messaging to employees about these resources and how best to employ them when needed.