



AGENDA

Date: May 10, 2022

Time: 2:30 p.m.

Location: Edgar Brown Union Student Senate Chambers

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

2. SPECIAL ORDERS

- a. Land Acknowledgement Statement

3. REPORT

- a. Robert H. Jones, Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs & Provost
- b. Standing Committees
 - i. Finance and Infrastructure Committee; Chair Karen Kemper
 - ii. Policy Committee; Chair Svetlana Poznanovik
 1. PCR 202216 General Education Committee Principal Lecturer
 2. PCR 202202 Review of Academic Administrators
 - iii. Research and Scholarship Committee; Chair Hugo Sanabria
 - iv. Scholastic Policies Committee; Chair Peter Laurence
 - v. Welfare Committee; Chair Lindsey Shuller-Nickles
- c. University Committees/ Commissions
 - i. Committee on Committees; Chair Mary Beth Kurz
- d. Faculty Representative to the Board of Trustees; Brian Powell
- e. President's Report

4. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

5. NEW BUSINESS

- a. Appoint Dr. Rodrigo Martinez-Duarte as ex-officio member of Research Committee
- b. FSR 202202 General Education Principal Lecturer

ADJOURN

ANNOUNCEMENTS:

1. Convention of the Delegates Meeting: Thursday, May 12, 2022, 3:15pm
2. Faculty Senate Advisory Committee Meeting: Tuesday, May 24, 2022, 2:30pm
3. Faculty Senate Executive Committee Meeting: Tuesday, June 7th, 2022, 2:30 p.m.
4. Faculty Senate Meeting: Tuesday, June 14th, 2022, 2:30 p.m.



POLICY COMMITTEE REPORT

Standing Agenda Item 202216: General Education Committee Composition

The Policy Committee has considered this matter under the charge of general university policy review and faculty participation in university governance and submits this report for consideration by the Faculty Senate.

Background

This agenda item was committed by President Kristine Vernon during the regular meeting of the Executive Committee in May. In Spring 2019, the Faculty Senate approved Faculty Senate Resolution 201904, which created the rank of principal lecturer in the *Faculty Manual* and made other resultant changes. These changes included adding principal lecturer as potential members to many committees, such as the Undergraduate Academic Eligibility Committee. These changes were reflected in the August 1, 2019 *Faculty Manual*. Unfortunately, in FSR 2019-04, the addition of principal lecturer to the eligible members for the General Education committee was omitted.

Discussion and Findings

The General Education committee allows senior lecturers to be members. As principal lecturer is a senior rank to senior lecturer, it is appropriate to allow faculty in both ranks to potentially serve. The Policy Committee discussed the matter and concluded that the intent of the FSR 201904 was to include the new lecturer rank in the same service opportunities as the rank of Senior Lecturer. The committee also concluded that the omission of the rank of principal lecturer from the General Education Committee was an oversight and not intentional. Therefore, the Policy Committee agreed that the inclusion of principal lecturers as potential members of the General Education Committee in the *Faculty Manual* is appropriate.

Conclusion and Recommendations

Discussion was closed and the committee approved a motion to create a report of the committee's position with a recommendation to:

1. Propose a resolution to amend the *Faculty Manual* to allow principal lecturers as potential members of the General Education Committee, consistent with allowance for senior lecturers to be members of this committee.



POLICY COMMITTEE REPORT

Standing Agenda Item 202202: Review of Academic Administrators

The Policy Committee has considered this matter under the charge of general university policy review, faculty professional ethics; the appointment, tenure, and promotion of faculty, and faculty participation in university governance and submits this report for consideration by the Faculty Senate.

Background

This agenda item is derived from recommendations from PCR 201906 adopted by the Faculty Senate on November 9, 2021. The recommendations included revisiting language in the *Faculty Manual* that describes the review process for academic administrators. The report recommended reviewing criteria and evaluation forms to determine best practices and research peer and near-peer policies regarding similar survey instruments and evaluation criteria.

Discussion and Findings

The Policy Committee reviewed the General Policies for Review of Academic Administrators in the *Faculty Manual*.

Every academic administrator reporting to the Provost, directly or indirectly, shall be evaluated, independent of reviews **for the purpose of continued administrative** appointment, in each year by the immediate supervisor **and** subject to periodic review for the purpose of continued appointment at least every five years.¹

This report is focused on the periodic review for the purpose of continued appointment.

A. Discussion and Findings relative to Criteria and Evaluation Forms

PCR 201906 directed the Policy Committee to revisit language in the *Faculty Manual* reviewing criteria and evaluation forms to determine best practices and research peer and near-peer policies regarding similar survey instruments and evaluation criteria.

¹ *Clemson University Faculty Manual* (2021) Chapter VIII§E4 (pp. 98-101)

The *Faculty Manual* indicates²:

The evaluations for the purpose of continued appointment shall employ the appropriate standard Clemson University form for the evaluation of administrators (provided in **Error! Reference source not found.**). The standard Clemson University form will be distributed to all members of the constituent group as well as the peers of the academic administrator (those other academic administrators who report to the same supervisor). In all instances of an administrator's review, a comment period of 21 calendar days during the academic year shall be provided. The completed forms shall be submitted to the chair of the evaluation committee.

This portion of the *Faculty Manual* highlights two concerns: the appropriateness of the form used, and the nature and structure of the comment period.

1. Review Form

The forms for the evaluation of academic administrators includes 5-point quality response Likert Scale that asks respondents to rate the following 19 categories: Administration of academic programs; Extension and outreach programs; Seeking external funding; Alumni and constituent relations; Human resources; General administrative support; Academic standards; Advocacy for the Unit; Encouragement of effective teaching; Encouragement of research; Support for the mission of the Unit Handling of promotion and tenure matters; Communication and listening skills Dedication / Commitment Administrative style; Delegation and follow through Conflict resolution; and Fairness / Equity Advocacy for support staff.

The form also includes 3 free text answer spaces for the respondents to provide their perception of the strengths, weaknesses, and recommendations to improve the performance of the administrator.

Finally, the form also allows the respondent to rate the overall effectiveness and the enthusiasm of the respondent for the continued appointment of the administrator under review.

Typically, this form is created using Qualtrics and distributed electronically.

There is no provision for the addition of questions by the review committee.

The Policy Committee addressed the question as to whether a standardized and fixed form should be used. A review of polices related to the periodic review of academic administrators at selected benchmark³ institutions revealed a variety of

² *Clemson University Faculty Manual* (2021) Chapter VIII§E4a, iv (pp. 99)

³ University of Delaware <https://sites.udel.edu/generalcounsel/policies/deans-duties-and-evaluation/> and <http://www1.udel.edu/provost/chr-ad/review.html>
Auburn University

timelines and forms. In general, instructions that have longer intervals between reviews appeared to have less restrictions on the form of survey instruments used.

In the case of Clemson University, in which the periods between reviews between different academic administrators varies, the effort to curate and manage several survey instruments, and to compare across administrators, seems to be onerous. However, the Policy Committee appreciates that the role of the academic administrators varies across units. The free text questions provides adequate opportunity for constituents to provide feedback beyond the standard evaluative questions and encourages review committees to request feedback on specific points of interest.

The Policy Committee recommends that the *Faculty Manual* be amended to indicate that only the evaluative questions provided on the approved review form be used. Demographic questions can be added or amended based on the will of the review committee, with the approval of the immediate supervisor.

The Policy Committee recommends that the forms in Appendix E of the *Faculty Manual* be amended to indicate which questions are demographic (and can be changed) and which are evaluative (and cannot be changed).

The Policy Committee recommends that the evaluative questions in Appendix E of the *Faculty Manual* be updated, using an *ad hoc* committee to propose these updates.

2. Comment Period

The Policy Committee finds that the language is unclear regarding the nature and structure of the comment period; are 21 days to be allowed between the distribution of the evaluation forms and their due date to the review committee chair, or is some other forum with a 21 day window required by the review committee for soliciting feedback?

The Policy Committee recommends that the *Faculty Manual* be revised to ensure that a window of 21 calendar days be provided for the return of the forms from constituents and peers after their distribution.

<http://www.auburn.edu/academic/provost/policies-guidelines/>, [Administrator Review Guidelines](#)
Kansas State University
<https://www.k-state.edu/pa/resources/admineval/deptheads.html>
University of Nebraska-Lincoln
<https://svcaa.unl.edu/documents/adminreview.pdf>
University of Arkansas
<https://provost.uark.edu/policies/140720.php>
Oklahoma State University-Main Campus
<https://adminfinance.okstate.edu/policies/index.html> and [Annual Performance Appraisal of Academic Administrators](#)

Furthermore, the sentence “*In all instances of an administrator’s review*, a comment period of 21 calendar days during the academic year shall be provided” introduces confusion when considered out the context of review of continued appointment.

The Policy Committee recommends that the *Faculty Manual* be revised to either remove the phrase “In all instances of an administrator’s review” or change it to “When performing a review for continued appointment as an academic administrator.”

The Faculty Manual indicates⁴:

Each academic administrator will be subject to periodic review for the purpose of continued appointment at least every five years. The sections below [later in this Chapter] describe any deviations from the interval of this review for each academic administrative position.

For example, “The Provost shall formally review the performance of deans before the end of the dean’s third year in office and every fifth year thereafter.”

3. Definition of years of service for academic administrators

While the *Faculty Manual* describes the timeline by which academic administrator reviews must be complete (i.e. before the end of the dean’s third year in office and every fifth year thereafter), the FMC is often asked if this is a calendar year or academic year window.

The FMC has been asked about mechanism to delay the time by which academic administrator reviews must be completed. The Policy Committee agrees that the current mechanism to request exceptions to policy in the *Faculty Manual* are sufficient to address this concern.

The Policy Committee recommends that the completion of reviews for the purpose of continued time as an academic administrator be based on the appointment date of the academic administrator. A potential solution would be to indicate that any academic administrator appointed between May 16 and September 30 will be considered to be in their first year of service in that appointment while academic administrators appointed in the rest of the year will be considered to start their first year of service in that appointment on the subsequent May 16. This mimics the start of the probationary timeline for untenured regular faculty who start after October 1, described in Chapter V, C3b, iii and iv.

The Policy Committee recommends that the Faculty Manual be amended to emphasize the ability of immediate supervisor to begin a review before the latest year listed.

^{4 4} *Clemson University Faculty Manual* (2021) Chapter VIII§E4a, iii (pp. 99)

4. Timeline for review for academic administrators

The Policy Committee recommends that specific windows for the review of academic administrators be defined to avoid busy times related to faculty tenure, promotion and reappointment processes.

For example, perhaps academic administrators who report directly to the Provost must have:

- review committees formed and charged by November 1
- materials due to the review committee by November 1
- forms distributed to constituents by November 15
- forms to the review committee due by December 15
- reports to the Provost by February 1
- notification to the constituents by March 1.

Perhaps all other academic administrators (except President and Provost) must have:

- review committees formed and charged by January 31
- materials due to the review committee by January 31
- forms distributed to constituents by February 15
- forms due by March 15
- reports to the immediate supervisor by April 15
- notification to the constituents by May 1.

These two changes mean that there can be a calendar produced that describes when every academic administrator's reviews must be conducted, at the individual level.

The Policy Committee recommends that such a calendar be established and published on the Provost's Website for all academic administrators to which this policy applied, and such a requirement be codified in the *Faculty Manual*.

B. Discussion and Findings relative to the Review Process for Academic Administrators
PCR 201906 directed the Policy Committee to revisit language in the *Faculty Manual* that describes the review process for academic administrators.

The *Faculty Manual* indicates⁵:

- v. The role of the review committee is to provide formative feedback for the improved performance of the academic administrator under review; and make recommendations regarding the continued appointment of the academic administrator to the supervisor. To fulfill these roles, the committee will elect its chair; determine a timeline for operations consistent with guidance from the supervisor of the academic administrator under review and the *Faculty Manual*; ensure that the evaluation form is distributed appropriately; and summarize the results of the evaluation forms.

⁵ *Clemson University Faculty Manual* (2021) Chapter VIII§E4a, v (pp. 99)

- vi. The chair of the evaluation committee will submit the summary, formative feedback, and recommendations to the immediate supervisor. The immediate supervisor, in consultation with their supervisor, will make a determination about the continued appointment. The conclusion will be communicated to the academic administrator under review and the constituent group by the immediate supervisor.

This portion of the *Faculty Manual* highlights two concerns: the development of the formative feedback (as opposed to the summary of the results of the evaluation form) and the nature of the communication of the conclusion regarding continued appointment to the constituent group.

In a later portion of the *Faculty Manual*⁶, the materials to be provided to the review committee are delineated as consisting of (1) a plan for personal professional growth; (2) a vision statement for the unit's future; and (3) a summary of activities and accomplishments including research, teaching and public service since the last review. Further, it is explained that "In all instances the administrator evaluation committee will provide a written report based on faculty or staff opinion as solicited by the approved Clemson University form."

5. Topic of report for the review for academic administrators from review committee

The Policy Committee recommends that the nature of the written report from the review committee be expanded from being based on faculty or staff opinion as solicited by the approved form to being (1) a summary of the input received from the form; (2) the committee's interpretation of that input relative to the materials submitted by the academic administrator; and (3) recommendations to the immediate supervisor relative to the continued appointment of the academic administrator and recommendations to improve the administration of the unit.

6. Responsibilities of the immediate supervisor

The Policy Committee recommends that the *Faculty Manual* specify that the conclusion of the review process be communicated to the constituent group by a formal communication with a deadline.

7. Input to the review committee

The materials to be provided to the review committee are delineated as consisting of (1) a plan for personal professional growth; (2) a vision statement for the unit's future; and (3) a summary of activities and accomplishments including research, teaching and public service since the last review.

The Policy Committee recommends that the review committee be provided the report of the immediate previous review, if any, by the immediate supervisors.

⁶ *Clemson University Faculty Manual* (2021) Chapter VIII§E4d, i-ii (pp. 100-101)

The Policy Committee recommends that the review committee be empowered to request additional input mechanisms, including but not limited to additional surveys, focus groups, etc, to be approved by the immediate supervisor.

C. Discussion and Findings relative to the Review Committee Composition for Academic Administrators

PCR 201906 directed the Policy Committee to revisit language in the *Faculty Manual* that describes who can comprise the review committee for academic administrators and how many direct reports (in the case of Dean level and above) are on the review committee.

The *Faculty Manual* states⁷:

4. a. [material omitted]
 - vii. Due to the varying sizes of different University constituent groups, different guidelines for selecting the membership of review committees are described here.
 - (1) The immediate supervisor of the academic administrator under review will determine the size and composition of the evaluation committee.
 - (2) The review committee structures shall not preclude any faculty or staff member in the constituent group from providing advice directly to the immediate supervisor.
- b. Guidelines for selecting the membership of review committees for University-level academic administrators
 - i. The administrator under evaluation shall choose a member of the committee from the constituent group.
 - ii. The immediate supervisor shall choose a member of the committee from the constituent group.
 - iii. At least four regular faculty members shall be selected during a meeting of the Faculty Senate Advisory Committee. These members may be nominated by any faculty member.
 - iv. At least one special faculty member shall be selected during a meeting of the Faculty Senate Advisory Committee in consultation with members of the special faculty.
 - (1) If no special faculty representative can be elected, such as might occur if no person agrees to be nominated, the committee will consist of the other members described here.
 - v. The academic administrators reporting to the administrator under evaluation shall elect at least one of their members as their representative.
 - (1) If no administrator representative can be elected, such as might occur in a small unit or if no person agrees to be nominated, or if there are no academic administrators reporting to the administrator under evaluation, the committee will consist of the other members described here.
 - vi. At least one staff member shall be selected by the Staff Senate.

⁷ *Clemson University Faculty Manual* (2021) Chapter VIII§E4a-c (pp. 99-100)

- (1) These members may be nominated by any faculty or staff member.
- (2) If no staff representative can be selected, such as if no person agrees to be nominated, the committee will consist of other members described here.
- c. Guidelines for selecting the membership of review committees for academic administrators in academic colleges and those units within colleges
 - i. Other sections in this chapter contain additional details as needed.
 - ii. The administrator under evaluation shall choose a member of the committee from the constituent group.
 - iii. The immediate supervisor shall choose a member of the committee from the constituent group.
 - iv. Four regular faculty members shall be elected by vote of the regular faculty in the unit.
 - v. The special faculty of the academic unit (department, school, college, etc.) shall elect one of their number as their representative.
 - (1) If no special faculty representative can be elected, such as might occur in a small department or if no person agrees to be nominated, the committee will consist of the members described here.
 - vi. The academic administrators reporting to the administrator under evaluation shall elect at least one of their members as their representative.
 - (1) If no administrator representative can be elected, such as might occur in a small unit or if no person agrees to be nominated, or if there are no academic administrators reporting to the administrator under evaluation, the committee will consist of the other members described here.
 - vii. The staff of the academic unit (department, school, college, etc.) shall elect one of their number as their representative.
 - (1) If no staff representative can be elected, such as might occur in a small department or if no person agrees to be nominated, the committee will consist of the members described here.

D. Discussion and Findings relative to the Categorization for Academic Administrators

The Policy Committee has received reports that there is inconsistency with the interpretation of college-level and university-level administrators and which administrative position falls into which category.

The *Faculty Manual* defines the constituent group of an academic administrator as follows⁸:

- d. The constituent group of an academic administrator is defined as follows:

⁸ *Clemson University Faculty Manual* (2021) Chapter VIII§E1e (pp. 96)

- i. All faculty of a department for department-level administrators;
- ii. All faculty of the appropriate academic unit (i.e. college or Clemson University) for other administrators;
- iii. All staff affected by that administrator.

However, the *Faculty Manual* does not clearly distinguish University-level academic administrators from academic administrators in academic colleges and those units within colleges, which is required to understand how to form the review committees.

The Policy Committee recommends adding a definition of University-level academic units, academic colleges, and units within colleges, to support formation of review committees and application of the proposed timelines for academic administrator review. The categorization of an academic administrator will be based on the academic homes of the majority of faculty and departments of the majority of students impacted by that academic administrator. For example, consider these cases:

- The Associate Provosts are University-level academic administrators.
- The Deans of the Academic Colleges and Libraries belong to the category of academic administrators in academic colleges and those units within colleges.
- All department chairs and associate deans in the academic colleges and libraries belong to the category of academic administrators in academic colleges and those units within colleges.
- Academic administrators in the Honors College, Graduate School and Undergraduate Studies, serving students across all departments, are University-level academic administrators.

E. Discussion and Findings relative to the Terminology and Organization of Chapter VIII

Further, in its review of Chapter VIII, the Policy Committee recognized that there are some inconsistencies in terminology and room for improvement in the organization in §E4.

The Policy Committee notes that in this chapter, the phrase “evaluation committee” and “review committee” are used interchangeably.

The Policy Committee recommends that a uniform phrase of “review committee” be used throughout Chapter VIII.

The Policy Committee recommends that Chapter VIII, §E4 be reorganized and expanded, consistent with the recommendations above. A potential reorganization may include the following headings:

- 1) Overall Review Process
- 2) Timeline
- 3) Committee composition
- 4) Committee charge and scope
- 5) Materials provided to the committee
- 6) Timeline and feedback forms from constituents and peers

- 7) Nature of report from the review committee
- 8) Responsibilities of immediate supervisor

Conclusion and Recommendations

The Policy Committee concludes that a resolution to amend the *Faculty Manual* is required and issues the following 16 recommendations:

1. ***The Policy Committee recommends*** that the *Faculty Manual* be amended to indicate that only the evaluative questions provided on the approved review form be used. Demographic questions can be added or amended based on the will of the review committee, with the approval of the immediate supervisor.
2. ***The Policy Committee recommends*** that the forms in Appendix E of the *Faculty Manual* be amended to indicate which questions are demographic (and can be changed) and which are evaluative (and cannot be changed).
3. ***The Policy Committee recommends*** that the evaluative questions in Appendix E of the *Faculty Manual* be updated, using an *ad hoc* committee to propose these updates.
4. ***The Policy Committee recommends*** that the *Faculty Manual* be revised to ensure that a window of 21 calendar days be provided for the return of the forms from constituents and peers after their distribution.
5. ***The Policy Committee recommends*** that the *Faculty Manual* be revised to either remove the phrase “In all instances of an administrator’s review” or change it to “When performing a review for continued appointment as an academic administrator.”
6. ***The Policy Committee recommends*** that the completion of reviews for the purpose of continued time as an academic administrator be based on the appointment date of the academic administrator.
7. ***The Policy Committee recommends*** that the Faculty Manual be amended to emphasize the ability of immediate supervisor to begin a review before the latest year listed.
8. ***The Policy Committee recommends*** that specific windows for the review of academic administrators be defined to avoid busy times related to faculty tenure, promotion and reappointment processes.
9. ***The Policy Committee recommends*** that such a calendar be established and published on the Provost’s Website for all academic administrators to which this policy applied, and such a requirement be codified in the *Faculty Manual*.
10. ***The Policy Committee recommends*** that the nature of the written report from the review committee be expanded from being based on faculty or staff opinion as solicited

by the approved form to being (1) a summary of the input received from the form; (2) the committee's interpretation of that input relative to the materials submitted by the academic administrator; and (3) recommendations to the immediate supervisor relative to the continued appointment of the academic administrator and recommendations to improve the administration of the unit.

11. **The Policy Committee recommends** that the Faculty Manual specify that the conclusion of the review process be communicated to the constituent group by a formal communication with a deadline.
12. **The Policy Committee recommends** that the review committee be provided the report of the immediate previous review, if any, by the immediate supervisors.
13. **The Policy Committee recommends** that the review committee be empowered to request additional input mechanisms, including but not limited to additional surveys, focus groups, etc, to be approved by the immediate supervisor.
14. **The Policy Committee recommends** adding a definition of University-level academic units, academic colleges, and units within colleges, to support formation of review committees and application of the proposed timelines for academic administrator review. The categorization of an academic administrator will be based on the academic homes of the majority of faculty and departments of the majority of students impacted by that academic administrator.
15. **The Policy Committee recommends** that a uniform phrase of "review committee" be used throughout Chapter VIII.
16. **The Policy Committee recommends** that Chapter VIII, §E4 be reorganized and expanded, consistent with the recommendations above.



FACULTY SENATE RESOLUTION 202202

Policy Committee Approval: April 2022

Faculty Senate Consideration: June 2022

Topic: "Inclusion of Principal Lecturer as Potential Members of the General Education Committee in the *Faculty Manual*"

Whereas, Clemson University makes provision for faculty participation in planning, policymaking, and decision-making with regard to academic matters; and

Whereas, the University also provides for such participation in matters of faculty welfare and general university concern; and

Whereas, the *Faculty Manual* (Chapter IX§F2e) describes the General Education Committee which includes Senior Lecturers as an eligible membership rank; and

Whereas, Policy Committee Report 202216 recommended that the *Faculty Manual* be amended to allow principal lecturers to be members of the General Education Committee; and

Whereas, PCR202216 and its recommendations were accepted by the Faculty Senate on May 10, 2022; and

Whereas, two amendments to the *Faculty Manual* must be made in order to effect the recommendations of the committee report; it is

Resolved, that *Faculty Manual* Chapter IX§F2e, ii(1) be amended to **insert** the words ", Principal Lecturer," between "regular faculty" and "or Senior Lecturer"; and it is

Resolved, that *Faculty Manual* Chapter IX§F2e, ii(2) be amended to **insert** the words ", Principal Lecturer," between "regular faculty" and "or Senior Lecturer".

This resolution will become effective upon approval by the Clemson University Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost and its inclusion in the Faculty Manual to be published August 1, 2022.

1 ***Final Proposed Language:***

2 i. Membership:

3 (1) Two faculty members elected from each College from the ranks of
4 regular faculty, **Principal Lecturer**, or Senior Lecturer. At least one
5 member must be regular faculty. Members serve staggered nonconsecutive
6 3-year terms.

7 (2) One faculty member elected from the Libraries from the ranks of regular
8 faculty, **Principal Lecturer**, or Senior Lecturer. Member serves a
9 nonconsecutive 3-year term.

10

11