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Revised Educational Leave Policy

Submitted by Linda Bleicken

10/11/2005

Motion:

Task Force appointed by the Provost to review/revise Educational Leave Policy seeks endorsement from Faculty Senate.

Rationale:

Following a request for information regarding Georgia Southern University's Educational Leave Policy by Professor Steven Damelin, a task force was appointed by the Provost to review the policy and submit recommendations for possible change. A draft revision of the Educational Leave Policy was presented to Faculty Senate for comment in September. Based on the feedback, the policy was revised. The new revised Educational Leave Policy that has received endorsement of Deans' Council is now presented to the Faculty Senate for endorsement.

Note: additional material has been sent by mail to the SEC.

Response:

I think you have a copy of this, and the text that has been changed or added is in red. There were several suggestions that were made last month when I brought this for discussion, and I bring it forward today I hope for endorsement by this group. Maybe if we just start from the top and work down I can share with you what was changed and why.

- The suggestion was made to add enhanced teaching back into the policy, and so that has been done.
If we drop down to the next red spot, you see that a statement regarding feedback for faculty has been added to the policy. It was suggested that if a proposal were not recommended at any administrative level, the faculty member should be given feedback as to why it was not recommended. Also that section addresses the question of whether a proposal would be forwarded to the next step if it were not recommended at any administrative level. There was also a question about the timeline for reviewing submitted proposals, and so if you look at the next page under timeline, there are some dates that have now been inserted that specify the timeline. And, finally, we were asked whether successful proposals would be made available for review so that someone thinking about submitting one would have that information. We will make those available for review upon request.

Candy Schille (CLASS): Thanks for making all of the changes. Would it be a good idea to have the document state that written feedback should be provided to a faculty member?

Linda Bleicken (Provost): Yes. Unfortunately Dr. Heaston, who was on the committee, is out today because of an illness in her family, and Dean Whitt, who was chairing the committee, is not here. I truly think that is what they intended in the wording of the document.

Candy Schille (CLASS): So, could we just assume that that will be changed to written?

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Do you want to assume it, or do you want to amend the motion?

Candy Schille (CLASS): I would like to move that the language be changed to “written feedback will be provided to a faculty member throughout the process.” The motion to amend was seconded and discussion began on the amendment.

Linda Bleicken (Provost): I think that the intention here was not to provide extensive written feedback, but rather, something that would indicate the proposal has been to this level and has not gone on or it has been to this level and has been passed on. It was really more of a tracking mechanism I believe.

Candy Schille (CLASS): I’m totally cool with that. I just would like to have something written in the case that somebody is turned down; something explaining why, not merely that it has been turned down, but why.

Linda Bleicken (Provost): Well, I have a concern about making a commitment of that sort, because of the different levels that the proposal will go through. It is not simply
going through administrative levels; it is also going through a faculty review committee. It will go through a university-wide one and a college-wide one. I am hesitant to make commitments on behalf of such committees.

David Alley (CLASS): I would just like to echo that comment, because the document says, “throughout the process.” I think just inserting “written” in that particular sentence does not quite work, because that would make each of the five steps or six steps accountable in something other than just we received it, and we signed off on it. So perhaps another kind of revision might work better.

Godfrey Gibbison (COBA): It seems to me, recalling Candy’s comments in the last meeting, that it would also be very good for whoever is reviewing the applications to provide these feedbacks. I remember one of Candy’s comments suggested that two people might apply from the same unit, and you say yes to one and no to the other. Somebody will want to have an explanation. I certainly would want to have an explanation as to why this guy got through and I did not, when we both have the same years of service. So somebody needs to provide some comments that say here is what distinguishes your application from that person’s application, etc. I certainly would love to see that.

Marc Cyr (CLASS): Since the issue seems to be not so much feedback to people who are successful, but feedback to people who are not, could we amend it to say “written feedback will be provided to a faculty member whose application is not successful.”

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Parliamentarian: We already have one amendment on the floor?

Marc Cyr (CLASS): I thought we passed the amendment?

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: No, we haven’t.

Bob Cook (Senate Parliamentarian): No, we are still discussing it, but you have the option of treating it as an amendment to the amendment, or with the occurrence of the proposor since it relates to just the same sentence. She could accept the revision to the second part of the sentence.

Candy Schille (CLASS): Okay.

Bob Cook (Senate Parliamentarian): And maybe save some time.

Candy Schille (CLASS): Yes, I’ll definitely do that. So I’d like it read this way now.
Bob Cook (Senate Parliamentarian): You need to re-read your motion.

Candy Schille (CLASS): Certainly. “Written feedback will be provided to a faculty member whose application is not successful throughout the process.”

Bob Cook (Senate Parliamentarian): If it is not successful, it is not successful.
Candy Schille (CLASS): Right, but you could be turned down by a department head, then you could be turned down by your dean, so I want each of the individuals to be accountable, and I know that is a big hassle, but accountability seems kind of good.
Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Do we need to second that, Bob?

Bob Cook (Parliamentarian): No, because it was a revision of her original amendment, so it has been proposed, seconded, friendly amendment, discussion, and then vote – if there is no discussion.

Mary Marwitz (CLASS): Candy, I’m just thinking about tweaking your language. Perhaps it could read, “should be provided to a faculty member who is turned out at any stage of the process?”

Candy Schille (CLASS): That is nice.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: All right. If I understand things correctly, we currently have that first sentence in red on the first page to read “Written feedback will be provided to a faculty member whose application is not successful at any stage of the process.” Hearing no further discussion, Dr. Humphrey called for a vote, and the amendment carried. We have now replaced the first sentence in red. We are back to the main motion. Is there any further discussion on the main motion of the Educational Leave Policy?

Bill Yang (COBA): I just have a question about the seven-year eligibility. Does this mean that someone could apply at the beginning of the seventh year or at the end of seven years and in the eighth year?

Linda Bleicken (Provost): Faculty would not be eligible to apply until they had completed seven years of service. Does that address your question?

Bill Yang (COBA): Yes. One more comment about the time line. A recommendation is due to the University-level committee by August 1st, but that is during the summer which makes it difficult for the committee to meet.
Linda Bleicken (Provost): Officially, contracts begin on August 1st. I do not really think it would be up to that committee to determine when you would meet, but my sense is that it could be sometime fairly soon after August 1st.

Bill Yang (COBA): Thanks.

John Nauright (CHHS): Just a clarification on the time line. If I understood what you just said, a person applying would have to wait until the completion of seven years of service and apply in the eighth year to go in the ninth year. I would think that somebody who is in the process of completing the seventh year could apply to go in the eighth year.

Linda Bleicken (Provost): I think that the statement here addresses when one would be eligible to have educational leave. You would have had to have completed seven years of service before you could go on educational leave. So I do not think that precludes someone who is at 6 ½ years thinking about a seventh year from doing that. A good point here though would be at what point does the individual have tenure, and I really do not think that there would be a consideration of these proposals at a point prior to someone’s actually having achieved tenure. That is an interpretation on my part, but, once again, unfortunately I am not the one that that did the work on the revisions, so that is my best interpretation for you.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator, hearing no other discussion, called for a vote on the amended motion on Educational Leave. The motion was approved by voice vote.

Linda Bleicken (Provost): Thank you for the endorsement of this policy.

Approved by the President 3/23/2006. Following review of the recommendation adopted by the Faculty Senate at the October 25, 2005, Faculty Senate meeting, as provided in your memo of November 4, 2005, I have approved the amended motion presented by Dr. Linda Bleicken on behalf of the Task Force appointed by the Provost to review/revise the Educational Leave Policy.

11/4/2005: I am pleased to report that the Senate recommends the motion below presented at the October 25, 2005, Faculty Senate meeting by Dr. Linda Bleicken.