

7-31-2007

That the Faculty Development Committee be Removed from the Educational Leave Process

Clara Krug
Georgia Southern University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/faculty-senate-index>

 Part of the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Krug, Clara, "That the Faculty Development Committee be Removed from the Educational Leave Process" (2007). *Faculty Senate Index*. 381.

<https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/faculty-senate-index/381>

This motion request is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate Documents at Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Index by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@georgiasouthern.edu.

Approved by the Senate: 9/19/2007

Not Approved by the Senate:

Approved by the President: 10/17/2007

Not Approved by the President:

That the Faculty Development Committee be Removed from the Educational Leave Process

Submitted by Clara Krug

8/31/2007

Motion:

That the Faculty Development Committee be removed from the Educational Leave "Process" and no longer serve as "a review committee appointed by the Provost" (#4) and "university level committee" (#5) reviewing applications.

That each "college level review committee" (#2, #3) that reviews applications in this "Process" be comprised of at least three faculty members and that these committee members have two-thirds or more of their workload in teaching.

Rationale:

The Faculty Development Committee is a committee of the Faculty Senate.

Response:

9-12-2007: From the Senate Executive Committee: This will be split into two motions for the September 19, 2007 meeting.

The first of these is the first paragraph in the current motion, and includes the beginning of the submitted item up through the numbered item #4 in the linked document.

The "new" item is the second paragraph under "Motion" in the submitted item, and the rest of the linked attachment about college level committees reviewing the educational leave applications.

President's Response:

9-28-2007 From Dr. Grube: Following review of the recommendation adopted by the Faculty Senate at the September 19, 2007, Faculty Senate meeting, as provided in your memo of September 20, 2007, I have approved the motion below.

MOTION: The Faculty Senate moves that each "college level review committee" (#2, #3) that reviews applications in the Educational Leave process be comprised of at least three faculty members and that these committee members have two-thirds or more of their workload in teaching.

In the section entitled "Process" in the Educational Leave Policy approved by the Senate at its October 25, 2005, meeting, Step #2 specifies that "[a]n educational leave policy recommended by the Department Chair is forwarded to a college level committee." Step #3 states that "[t]he college level committee forwards proposals along with its recommendations to the Dean for consideration." However:

Not all colleges have such a committee. Instead, the Dean or another college level administrator receives applications from the Department Chair. This means that only one person at the college level may read applications and that the Dean may sign his/her approval of an application twice, once as chair of a college level committee that does not exist and once as Dean.

Minutes:

Motion: That the Faculty Development Committee be removed from the Educational Leave Process.

Clara Krug (CLASS) Chair, Faculty Development Committee moved that the committee be removed from the Educational Leave process for the following reasons:

1. The Committee has no budget for such leaves.
2. The Committee's recommendations are not binding
3. The Committee's participation delays funding decisions by several weeks.

She noted the committee's confusion about why it is involved in the process.

The motion was seconded.

Richard Flynn (CLASS) noted that the committee is appointed by the Provost, and that the Educational Leave Policy does not specify that the Faculty Development Committee serve as the University-level committee. He questioned the need for the motion, and asked if we were being asked to revise the Educational Leave Policy to remove the review committee appointed by the Provost.

Clara Krug (CLASS) replied that the Faculty Development Committee wished to be removed from the process for the reasons stated: “having no budget, making it a longer time frame for the applicant, not having any of our recommendations or non-recommendations be binding.”

Michael Moore (COE) asked how many applications we have every year. Clara Krug (CLASS) responded that in the two semesters in which she has been involved, they had twelve in the spring and seven in the fall.

Linda Bleicken (Provost) pointed out that when a department chair and dean sign off, they are taking responsibility for the budgetary issues that are involved

Clara Krug (CLASS) agreed, saying it is more appropriate that the committee of faculty lie at the college-level because that is where the budgetary wherewithal exists.

Marc Cyr (CLASS) Senate Moderator asked if Krug was saying that we should have a faculty committee review only at the college-level, not at the university-level, that the applications should go directly from the college committees to the Provost.

Clara Krug (CLASS) noted that the Educational Leave Policy doesn't permit eliminating the university-level review committee, but noted the difficulty of faculty from different disciplines understanding the applications.

President Grube asked whether Krug was talking about abolishing the university-wide committee or whether the Development committee wished to be relieved of that duty. He asked whether the concept of the university committee still remains even if the Faculty Development Committee, for whatever reason,

wishes to withdraw from the Educational Leave process.

Clara Krug (CLASS) answered that this would have to be the case because of the policies that were approved on October 25, 2005 by the Faculty Senate.

Michael Moore (COE) said he opposed the motion because it reduces faculty involvement in the process.

Richard Flynn (CLASS) noted that the Senate didn't appoint the Faculty Development Committee as the committee in this process. The best the Senate can do is recommend to the President and the Provost that the Faculty Development Committee no longer be involved.

Marc Cyr (CLASS) said that what we had was an informal arrangement in which the committee was on loan to the Provost, and that the motion asks us to call in that loan.

President Grube noted that having an elected or appointed university-level committee separate from the Senate for the purpose of reviewing leave is not an unusual arrangement.

Mary Marwitz (CLASS) said that the present policy became operational only in the spring of '07, and that the new layer of committee review by the Faculty Development seemed redundant.

Moderator Marc Cyr (CLASS) called for a vote on the motion that the Faculty Development Committee requests that it be removed from the educational leave process and no longer serve as a review committee appointed by the Provost, and university level committee reviewing applications.

Attachment(s): Revision to the Educational Leave Policy
Revision to the Educational Leave Policy

The Faculty Senate approved the current version of the Educational Leave Policy at its October 25, 2005 meeting. The Faculty Development Committee (FDC) has submitted a two-part motion related to that policy to the Senate Executive Committee. The FDC provides the following rationale.

The FDC requests that the FDC be removed from the Educational Leave "Process."

In the section entitled “Process,” Step #4 states that “Educational leave proposals recommended by the Dean are forwarded to a review committee appointed by the Provost.” Step #5 states that “The university level committee forwards proposals along with its recommendations to the Provost.”

The FDC has served as this university level committee. However:

1. It has no funds in its budget for educational leave.
2. Its recommendations to approve or not approve applications are not binding. It is the Provost (Step #6) who notifies applicants of his/her final decisions. The process does not include a step in which the Provost notifies the FDC of his/her decisions. These decisions may differ from those of the FDC.
3. Its participation in the process adds several weeks to the time frame and, therefore, prolongs the amount of time necessary to finalize decisions and to notify faculty members of the Provost’s decision.
4. Its review of applications for Cycle 2 of Professional Travel Awards and applications for Summer Awards and the Provost’s requirement that the FDC select the two recipients of the “Excellence Award” in early March means that it cannot consider applications for educational leave for Fall Semester until after Spring Break, the third week in March.

The FDC requests that the college level review committee that reviews applications be comprised of at least three faculty members and that these committee members have two-thirds or more of their workload in teaching.

In the section entitled “Process,” Step #2 specifies that “[a]n educational leave policy recommended by the Department Chair is forwarded to a college level committee.” Step #3 states that “[t]he college level committee forwards proposals along with its recommendations to the Dean for consideration.” However:

Not all colleges have such a committee. Instead, the Dean or another college level administrator receives applications from the Department Chair. This means that only one person at the college level may read applications and that the Dean may sign his/her approval of an application twice, once as chair of a college level committee that does not exist and once as Dean.

The proposed college level committee could replace the FDC (a committee comprised of faculty members elected by their peers) in the review process.