

MEMORANDUM

TO: CFA

FROM: Steering Committee

RE: Revised Sabbatical Committee Membership Charge

DATE: December 5, 2018

Background: According to TCNJ policy (the Policy Framework), all campus policies should be reviewed every five years. The [Sabbatical Committee Membership Policy](#) has not been reviewed since 2013.

In September, 2018, Steering charged CFA with review of the Sabbatical Committee Membership Policy. Upon further thought and investigation, Steering finds that the “Sabbatical Committee Membership Policy” title does not comprehensively reflect the content of the policy-- that is a) the procedure to be used for appointing members to what is now called the Sabbaticals Council or b) the necessity for a Council member to recuse him/herself when applying for a Sabbatical. Steering would like CFA to consider rescinding this policy and recommending that the policy and related procedures be incorporated into the [Sabbaticals Council’s Charge](#). Steering would also like CFA to consider requiring that the Sabbaticals RFP contain a link to the Sabbatical Council’s Charge so that sabbatical applicants will clearly know that they are ineligible to serve on the Sabbaticals Council.

Steering therefore rescinds the charge it issued in September to CFA on Sabbatical Committee Membership. The revised charge is given below.

Charge: In accordance with the timeline below, Steering asks CFA to

1. Consider whether the College is best served by a separate policy or by incorporating the material in the current policy into the [Sabbaticals Council’s Charge](#)
2. If CFA considers it best to have a separate policy on Sabbatical Committee Membership, then CFA should review the current policy and its title. In its review, CFA is asked to carefully consider the current language of the policy and any new language that may be written to ensure that the policy is clear.
3. In addition CFA should consider requiring that [Sabbaticals RFP](#) reference the Sabbaticals Council Charge.

Testimony Tier: Tier II from Faculty

The issue requires moderate testimony from the campus community. The assigned council or committee should consult with relevant individuals and groups in developing a preliminary recommendation. The completed preliminary recommendation should then be made available to the relevant stakeholder groups, and testimony should be solicited in the form of written feedback (through a survey and or e-mail).

Timeline: CFA should review and this policy with the goal of completing a preliminary recommendation by March 2019.

TCNJ Governance Processes

Step 1–Steering issues a charge

Step 2-Governance prepares a Preliminary Recommendation

Once the appropriate standing committee or council has received the charge, it should start by collecting data needed to make a preliminary recommendation. It should receive input from affected individuals and all relevant stakeholder groups prior to making a preliminary recommendation. For issues that have broad implications or that affect a large number of individuals, initial testimony should be solicited from the campus community at large. For some issues, sufficient initial testimony may come from input through committee membership or solicitation from targeted constituent groups. When, in the best judgment of the committee, adequate clarity of the principles contributing to the problem are known, a preliminary recommendation should be drafted and disseminated to the campus community.

Step 3–The Relevant Stakeholders provide Testimony

Once a preliminary recommendation has been completed, the standing committee or council should seek testimony from the campus community. The testimony should be gathered in accordance with the Testimony Tier (see below) assigned to the issue by Steering. For issues that require public testimony from the campus community, the chair of the standing committee or council should approach the president of the appropriate representative bodies to schedule the next available time slot at a meeting of that body. Testimony should be gathered in a way that allows stakeholders to weigh in fully on the issue. Members of the standing committee or council that wrote the preliminary recommendation should be present to hear and record the testimony.

Step 4–Governance prepares a Final Recommendation

Once the standing committee or council has received appropriate testimony, it should revise the preliminary recommendation into a final recommendation. Once the final recommendation is complete, the standing committee or council should use sound judgment to determine whether or not more public testimony is required. If, in its feedback to the original preliminary

recommendation, a stakeholder representative body requests to review an issue again, the committee or council is bound to bring it back to that body. If a full calendar year has passed since the formal announcement of the preliminary recommendation, the committee must re-submit a preliminary recommendation to the campus community. When the committee or council has completed the final recommendation, it should forward it to the Steering Committee. The final recommendation should be accompanied by a cover memo that summarizes the initial charge, how testimony was gathered and the nature of that testimony, and how the committee responded to that testimony, including a description of how the preliminary recommendation evolved as a result of testimony.

Step 5–Steering considers the Final Recommendation

Step 6–The Provost and/or President and Board consider the Final Recommendation

Step 7–Steering notifies the Campus Community Testimony

For a complete description of all steps and of the testimony tiers, see Governance Structures and Processes, 2017 Revision, pages 21–24.