The proposed revision to APM 700, leaves of absence, which would create a presumption of resignation and spell out procedures for notifying the academic employee of that presumption in certain circumstances in which an academic employee is absent from his/her duties without having secured a leave of absence. The attached transmittal letter from Vice Provost Susan Carlson summarized the proposed provisions.
CAP does not see itself as the primary responder to this APM 700 amendment, but it has discussed the proposal. No significant problems came to light.

We do wish to raise a question about whether it is necessary to specify the time when the clock starts ticking on the 30-day absence clause. We have in mind a situation where, e.g., someone disappears during the 9- or 11-month employment cycle some days or weeks before the absence becomes absolutely evident. The question is, whether the 30 days begins when the absence is first noted by a supervisor or when evidence indicates it to have begun? Perhaps there a case for a wording such as the following:

“In such cases the supervisor shall make appropriately diligent efforts to establish the starting date of the unexplained absence.”
Council of School & College Faculty Chairs (LS: HACS)

November 5, 2012 6:53 PM

No response at this time.
CERJ reviewed the proposed revisions to APM 700 (Leaves of Absence) and sees no problem with the proposed language.
The Faculty Welfare Committee supports the proposed presumptive resignation policy described in APM 700.
No response at this time.
Planning & Budget

November 7, 2012 1:14 PM

No response at this time.
Research

November 14, 2012 10:58 AM

No response at this time.