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Project Challenge:
The provost’s team at a research university in the Midwest is currently evaluating faculty sabbatical and professional development leave policies across the institution. As such, the member approached the Council with the following research questions:

I. Methodology & Research Parameters

- **Evaluation Criteria for Leave Requests**: Do other institutions have formalized policies for evaluating faculty leave requests? Do the criteria for granting sabbaticals and professional development leaves vary by academic discipline?

- **Evaluating the Sabbatical/Professional Development Leave Experience**: How do other universities assess the work faculty produce while on sabbatical? Are these expectations and assessment criteria consistent across departments?

- **Return on Investment**: How do universities ensure that faculty use leave time responsibly? What levers do institutions have to assure faculty and productive while on sabbatical?

- **Funding Sources**: Are individual departments responsible for providing the financial resources for faculty release time, or does central administration fund sabbaticals and professionals development leaves?

**Sources:**
- Education Resources Information Center (ERIC) [www.eric.ed.gov](http://www.eric.ed.gov)
- National Center for Education Statistics [www.nces.ed.gov](http://www.nces.ed.gov)
- Inside Higher Ed [www.insidehighered.com](http://www.insidehighered.com)
- Internet, via search engines and multiple university Web sites

**Research Parameters:**
As requested, the Council focused its research on:

- Four-year institutions similar in size, research activity, and college structure to the member university
- Public and private institutions in states other than California and New York
- When possible, universities with Responsibility Centered Management (RCM) budget models
# I. Methodology & Research Parameters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Total/ Undergraduate Enrollment</th>
<th>Responsibility-Centered Management (RCM) Budget Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University A</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>4-year, Public</td>
<td>Research University (high research activity)</td>
<td>21,000/17,300</td>
<td>RCM with regards to sabbatical funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University B</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>4-year, Public</td>
<td>Research University (high research activity)</td>
<td>21,300/15,500</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University C</td>
<td>WV</td>
<td>4-year, Public</td>
<td>Research University (high research activity)</td>
<td>28,000/21,000</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University D</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>4-year, Private</td>
<td>Research University (high research activity)</td>
<td>24,500/18,000</td>
<td>Transitioning to RCM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University E</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>4-year, Public</td>
<td>Research University (high research activity)</td>
<td>25,000/19,000</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University F</td>
<td>WI</td>
<td>4-year, Public</td>
<td>Research University (high research activity)</td>
<td>29,300/24,400</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University G</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>4-year, Public</td>
<td>Research University (high research activity)</td>
<td>17,500/14,300</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: National Center for Education Statistics; University Leadership Council interviews
II. Executive Overview

Key Findings:

1. **All institutions interviewed thus far have formalized, university-wide policies for evaluating sabbatical leave requests from faculty.** Eligibility criteria are usually consistent across departments and typically include the following:
   - Faculty must serve at the institution full-time for at least six years before submitting an application for sabbatical (this usually coincides with the tenure clock, meaning that faculty must achieve tenure in order to be eligible for sabbatical)
   - Faculty may take one semester leave at full pay or two semesters leave at 50-60 percent of their annual salary
   - Faculty are not eligible for another sabbatical leave until they have served an additional six years of continuous full-time service
   - Faculty must agree to remain at the university for a minimum of one academic year upon completion of the sabbatical leave
   - Before faculty are ultimately granted leave by the provost, sabbatical proposals must be approved by a department and/or college review committee (as with promotion and tenure review, the committee is usually made up of tenured faculty from the department).

Contacts note that some colleges and departments scrutinize sabbatical proposals more than others; however, in general, the evaluation process for granting leave is the same for all faculty.

2. **Four of the seven profiled universities rank sabbatical proposals based on how important the work is to the overall mission of the individual college or department.** The application process is the most competitive at the University E, where less than half of applicants are granted professional development leave each year. University D is the only institution that will allow all faculty with approved proposals to take sabbatical regardless of the department’s ability to cover the loss.

3. **While all contact institutions require faculty to submit a report summarizing what they accomplished on sabbatical, most contacts admit that department chairs and deans rarely review the documents in much detail.** Reports are usually between one and five pages in length and range in the level of sophistication depending on the department culture. (Due to the fact that scientists have experience writing detailed grant proposals, those faculty tend to submit more comprehensive summaries than their counterparts in the humanities.) Contacts explain that, in many cases, the benefits or outcomes of a faculty member’s time on leave are not apparent until several years after the completion of the sabbatical. Therefore, such reports provide little insight into the exact return on investment.

4. **Most institutions technically take a faculty member’s productivity during past sabbaticals into consideration when that faculty member applies for subsequent leaves.** However, several contacts note that it is rare for faculty to be denied sabbatical based on their performance seven years ago.

5. **Sabbatical funding models vary significantly across the profiled institutions.** For instance, at the University F, salary savings accrued from faculty taking full-year leaves at half-pay are collected centrally and then used to cross-subsidize faculty leaves in colleges across campus. At University C, all academic units are individually responsible for funding the salaries of faculty on sabbatical, as well as any additional costs associated with hiring adjunct professors to cover teaching duties.
III. University A

Faculty Fellowship Leave Program:

The university-wide fellowship program at University A grants leave time to faculty in order to enhance teaching efficacy, research, and creativity. It differs slightly from traditional sabbatical programs in that there are a set number of spaces allocated to each of the colleges based on the number of tenured/tenure-track faculty in the unit (e.g., because Arts & Sciences faculty make up half of the overall faculty population, that school receives half of the fellowship slots each year).

*Five Percent Rule* – A maximum of five percent of all tenured/tenure-track faculty (about 35) may be granted sabbatical at any one time. Contacts explain that a college’s unused spots will be redistributed to another unit if the number of worthy proposals exceeds the number of spaces initially apportioned to that school.

*Proposal Guidelines* – Leave proposals are between 750 and 1500 words in length and include the following:

- Sabbatical objectives and background information appropriate to the proposed work
- Activities planned to achieve the objectives (described in some detail) with general timelines for each
- Location and time schedule of activities
- Relation of proposed activity to professional development and benefit to the department/college/university
- Department chair's statement of how the department will staff the applicant’s teaching load and other duties

*Proposal Evaluation and Ranking* – Due to the limited number of spots, review committees and administrators must rank leave requests based on (a) the merit of the proposal and (b) the amount of full-time service to the institution since the last fellowship or since the beginning of employment (if the faculty member has yet to be granted leave). Additionally, preference may be given to projects if:

- They have been previously approved, but could not be implemented for the sake of departmental convenience or circumstantial reasons
- They align with special programmatic needs of the department
- There are special opportunities available to a faculty member at a particular time

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Features of the University-wide Faculty Fellowship Leave Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eligibility:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Tenured faculty (including department chairs) are eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for fellowship leave at the end of each seven-year teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>period at the university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Length &amp; Salary:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• One Quarter = Full Pay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Two Quarters = 3/4 Pay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Three Quarters = 2/3 Pay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Return to Service:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Faculty are expected to teach at the university for at least</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>three quarters after the leave</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
III. University A (cont.)

Sabbatical Proposal Review Process:

The following flowchart depicts the fellowship proposal review process:

1. Faculty Review Committee
2. Department Chair
3. Provost
4. President
5. Board of Trustees

Faculty Review Committee – Composed of at least five tenured faculty from within the unit, the committee is either a special group appointed to evaluate plans for professional leaves, or an existing committee, such as the unit's promotion and tenure committee.

Provost’s Review – The provost’s office is more concerned with ensuring that the fellowship leave will be used for producing scholarly work or to enhance the professional effectiveness of the candidate than understanding the specifics of the proposal.

Ensuring Return on Investment:

Like most institutions, University A has few levers in place to ensure that faculty make productive use of sabbatical leaves:

- **Deadline for Written Report** – Unlike most institutions, which do not specify a deadline for sabbatical outcomes and reflection documents, University A requires all faculty to file a written report of the activities accomplished during the leave within three months of returning to their teaching duties. While the two- to three-page report is sent to all administrators involved in the proposal review process, contacts note that post-sabbatical evaluation is conducted primarily at the department-level. There are no set guidelines for assessment.

- **Effect on Future Leaves** – Failure to submit a report may play a significant role in the granting of future fellowship leaves.

Funding Sources at University A

“No-Cost” Department-Funded Program

As a “no-cost” program, each academic unit is responsible for covering any additional costs associated with a faculty member’s absence. According to the official policy, “No University Fellowship leave may be granted that requires a corresponding addition to the permanent faculty of [University A].” Contacts note that while the provost’s office will not provide any additional funding for faculty lines, the college dean can decide to finance a portion of an adjunct professor’s salary, for example. In general, though, most departments use existing funds or faculty resources to compensate for any loss in teaching (i.e., the duties of the faculty member on leave are usually assumed by the remaining personnel in the department).

The provost will only approve fellowship proposals if the department chairperson has submitted a comprehensive description of how the proposed loss of teaching services will be compensated for (without having a negative impact on the department’s academic quality).
III. University B

Evaluation Criteria for Leave Requests:

As with most profiled institutions, due to local cultures and expectations for scholarly work, the actual criteria for evaluating sabbatical proposals vary by college. Some units, such as those in the sciences, require more detailed proposals than others. Format aside, all leave requests are evaluated according to the projects’ ability to meet the following criteria:

- Enhances the teaching or scholarly work of the academic unit
- Enhances the applicant’s effectiveness as a faculty member
- Adds to the reputation of the institution
- Contributes to knowledge in the subject field
- Provides outstanding public or professional service at a local or national level

Sabbatical Proposal Review Process:

Each committee and administrator reviewing the proposal (see flowchart below) must confirm that the following conditions have been met before forwarding the request onto the next level:

- The proposal has merit (based on above criteria)
- There is a high probability that the faculty member will carry out the proposal
- The department (or college) has sufficient resources to sustain academic activities during the faculty member’s leave

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Features of the University-wide Faculty Sabbatical Leave Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eligibility:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Tenured and non-tenured faculty who have served at the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>university full-time for at least six years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Cannot have been on leave in previous six years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length &amp; Salary:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• One Semester = Full Pay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Two Semesters = 3/5 Pay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return to Service:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Faculty who do not return to the university for one year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of service may be forced to refund the amount of pay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>received while on sabbatical leave</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The Department Faculty Status Committee is usually made up of three tenured faculty from within the unit.

Spotlight: University B’s Methods for Assessing Productivity

Central Oversight

Two years ago, the provost’s office at University B started formally tracking which faculty went on sabbatical and what they accomplished while on leave. According to contacts, the university then instituted two post-sabbatical requirements in order to ensure accountability and productivity:

1. **Written Report** – All faculty must submit a one-to two-page report detailing how they met the goals of the sabbatical (as specifically laid out in the proposal) to the provost, the college dean, and the department chair

2. **Presentation** – Faculty must present a public seminar or lecture on the results of the leave; contacts note that the format of these presentations range from informal brown-bag lunches with students and colleagues to extensive lectures in front of the entire college community
Funding Sources at University B

Hybrid Department-College Funding Model

Department chairs are required to provide a detailed budget plan for how they will cover for the teaching loss before the provost will grant faculty sabbatical leaves. Because the department will not retain any salary savings if multiple faculty choose semester leaves at full pay, the college dean often draws from other units’ surplus savings in order to cover the teaching demand in the depleted department.

Informal Ranking of Proposals

About four years ago, the provost’s office ended its policy of requiring department committees and deans to rank sabbatical proposals. According to contacts, faculty were often offended that administrators prioritized other projects over their own. Coupled with the fact that the university rarely denied leave requests, it was apparent that there was little need for the ranking system.

When financially necessary, officials will informally rank proposals based on how time-sensitive the project is (i.e., if a faculty member is studying an election or a bird’s migration pattern, those projects would be prioritized over a topic that can be researched at any time). Contacts note, however, that this will only occur after all other options have been exhausted. For example, in order to allow as many faculty to go on leave as possible (while avoiding budgetary issues), chairs will encourage professors to take full year leaves at half pay.

Retention Tool – Set by the Board of Regents, the main prerequisite for faculty sabbatical eligibility is six years of full-time service to the university. The policy does not specify whether or not faculty must be tenured in order to be apply for leave and, according to contacts, this ambiguity is somewhat intentional. Due to the university’s location in a rural area, there are few professional opportunities for faculty spouses and other family members. Faculty with partners who are non-tenure track, are more likely to remain at the institution if their spouses are also eligible for certain perks, like sabbatical. The policy thus serves as a piece of the university’s overall faculty retention strategy.

Policy Not Broadcasted – Contacts note that departments tend not to publicize the fact that non-tenured faculty, such as lecturers and clinical instructors, are technically eligible for sabbatical. In general, these instructors are not required to produce the same level of scholarly work as their tenured counterparts, so it is often difficult for units to justify how a leave would have a positive impact on the institution. In some cases, non-tenured faculty argue that a sabbatical would allow them to enhance their teaching abilities. Review committees are usually skeptical of such claims because of the lack of tangible outcomes or evidence of a the return on investment.
III. University C

Evaluation Criteria for Leave Requests:

As established by the board of governors, there is one uniform sabbatical leave policy for faculty members at University C. Thus, while proposals are judged (and ranked) against other leave requests within the departments and colleges, all faculty are subject to the same level of scrutiny regardless of the home unit.

As with most contact institutions, the policy allows faculty to engage in research, writing, and other activities intended to contribute to their professional development and overall value to the university. The actual types of activities faculty may engage in– and thus the expectations– vary by discipline, but the overall criteria for review is the same across the university.

“The awarding of sabbatical leave is not automatic but shall depend upon the merits of the request and on conditions prevailing at the university at the time. Review of leave applications subsequent to an earlier leave will consider achievement during previous leaves.

– University C Sabbatical Policy

Sabbatical Proposal Review Process:

All faculty applicants are required to submit a detailed plan of the activity they propose to follow while on sabbatical. Proposals must outline how the sabbatical will function as a full-time assignment. The candidate for a sabbatical leave will forward the application to the department chair and the dean for review and endorsement. The review determines whether the leave will further the professional development of the applicant and whether it is in the best interest of the unit, taking into account the prevailing fiscal circumstances. In cases where multiple proposals are under review, these administrators must rank the requests in order of priority to the department and/or college. While faculty are rarely denied sabbatical, contacts state that any rejection would come at the department and college level. Fully-approved applications receive final authorization from the provost’s office after determining that equitable procedures and standards have been observed. The following flowchart outlines the steps of the formal review process:

While the provost is ultimately responsible for awarding sabbaticals (board of governors step serves as “rubber stamp” approval), contacts explain that the associate provost for academic personnel is the administrator charged with reviewing proposals and department/college recommendations to ensure that all leave requests meet the university-wide standards.

Evaluating the Sabbatical/Professional Development Leave Experience:

Written Report – Upon returning from sabbatical leave, all faculty must file a written report summarizing the scholarly activities undertaken while on leave. The one to two page document is reviewed by the provost’s office and used at the department level as part of the faculty member’s annual evaluation. Reports are also taken into consideration when faculty apply for future sabbatical leaves. According to contacts, assessment of sabbatical productivity is “more of an art than an exact science” in that there are no strict outcomes or evaluation criteria.
Broader Scope than Sabbaticals

Open to any full-time faculty, classified staff, or non-classified staff member who has completed four years of continuous service, the Professional Development Program (PDP) is broader in scope than sabbaticals and has a more flexible application process. Participants are able to take part in any activity or form of continuing education that contributes to the enhancement of their skills and the mission and goals of the department or university as a whole. Projects vary in length from one month to a full contract period, depending on the number of years of prior service to University C.

Evaluation Criteria

Unlike the university-wide standards for sabbatical review, the procedures criteria for selecting proposals differ between units. There are also two separate rounds of proposal review (as opposed to the one-time sabbatical application deadline), giving employees multiple opportunities throughout the year to apply for a PDP. Regardless of the specific evaluation criteria and department review committee structure, all leave requests are considered by the following university officials:

1. Peer Review Committee
2. Supervisor, Dean or Director
3. Appropriate Vice President
4. President

Note: Unlike sabbatical leave requests, PDP proposals do not have to be approved by the board of governors.

Funding Sources at University C

Funded by Individual Departments

All academic units are responsible for funding the salaries of faculty on sabbatical as well as any additional costs associated with hiring adjunct professors. Because the provost’s office allocates college and department budgets annually, it is possible that a unit could receive additional funding if the dean or chair demonstrated a compelling need. Colleges typically have enough contingency funding to cover the instructional needs of an academic unit, even if multiple faculty take one semester sabbaticals.

Note: Individual department heads are also responsible for providing or identifying funds to cover all costs (e.g., employee salary, temporary staff compensation, etc.) associated with PDP leaves.
Evaluation Criteria for Leave Requests:

All sabbatical leave requests at University D are evaluated based on whether the proposed project will achieve the following:

- Contribute to the professional growth of the faculty member
- Promote the faculty’s academic contribution to the university

The individual College Sabbatical Committees (see below) set discipline-specific criteria, but contacts note that these tend to relate to proposal format, page length, and overall presentation of the work plan.

Regardless of the home college, all faculty sabbatical proposals must include a detailed explanation of the intended objectives, activities, location, and timetable (including the beginning and ending dates) of the leave.

Sabbatical Proposal Review Process:

**College Sabbatical Committees** – As depicted in the flowchart below, the College Sabbatical Committee is the first step in the proposal review process. These committees are usually composed of four full-time tenured faculty members and one full-time non-tenured member of a school’s faculty. (The dean of the college serves as an ex officio member of the committee.)

The following is the formal sabbatical review process:

1. **College Sabbatical Committee**
2. **Dean of the College**
3. **Provost**
4. **President**

**Consideration of Past Performance** – In addition to evaluating the merit of a proposed project, College Sabbatical Committees take past performance into consideration when deciding whether or not to recommend the candidate for another leave.

**Request for Elaboration** – While the provost and president rarely reject sabbatical requests, it is not uncommon for the provost’s office to ask faculty to elaborate on their proposals and include more specific information on what exactly they hope to achieve while on leave. Contacts note that the administration would like to see more explicit commentary in the committee and dean-level recommendations regarding how the sabbatical will prepare a faculty member for promotion.
III. University D (cont.)

Evaluating the Sabbatical/Professional Development Leave Experience:

According to contacts, it is almost impossible to ensure that faculty will engage in productive sabbatical leaves. Nonetheless, the university has some systems in place to encourage strong outcomes:

- **Written Report** – All faculty must submit a one- to two-page summary of sabbatical activities to the department chair, the College Sabbatical Committee, and the dean.

- **Promotion Review** – Promotion review committees rarely deny promotions based on an expectation that a candidate was going to have produced more work while on sabbatical. However, faculty are not promotable if they are not productive in general, so in that sense, sabbatical performance is taken into consideration.

“Practically speaking, there are no repercussions for poor performance until faculty apply for another sabbatical, but there’s no strict rule that faculty can’t be granted leave if they weren’t productive last time.”

– Council Interview

---

### Funding Sources at University D

#### Funded by Individual Colleges

While University D is in the process of adopting a Responsibility-Centered Management budget model, contacts explain that the individual departments are not currently in the position to self-fund sabbatical leaves.

- **Part-time Stipends** – College deans often provide departments with stipends for part-time instructors to make up for the unit’s decreased teaching resources when multiple faculty choose to take shorter sabbaticals at full pay.

- **Salary Savings ≠ Adjunct Funds** – There is no direct correlation between a department’s salary savings and the funds used to hire adjunct faculty. For example, when faculty take three academic quarters leave at half pay, that salary savings generated does not necessarily cover the cost of funding temporary instructors.

- **No Proposal Ranking** – Due to this college-centric funding model, even in tough economic times, departments are not forced to rank proposals based on their ability to afford a certain number of sabbaticals per quarter.

- **Encourage Longer Leaves at Lower Pay** – Contacts note, however, that deans may consider asking some faculty to take longer leaves at a lower percentage of their salary if budget constraints were to become an issue.
Faculty Development Leave Program:

Texas state statute prohibits public universities from entitling any sort of sabbatical leave. Thus, before establishing the Faculty Development Leave Program less than a decade ago, the University E offered no form of professional development or sabbatical leave. Recognizing that the university was at a serious disadvantage in terms of competing nationally for top faculty talent, the faculty senate pressured the administration to develop the program as a way of enticing potential candidates to seek employment at University E.

As University E has a competitive program with limited capacity, less than half of all applicants are awarded leave each year (12-15/35). In order to be considered, eligible faculty must submit an abbreviated curriculum vitae and a detailed project proposal (no longer than two, single-spaced pages).

Evaluation Criteria for Leave Requests:

Regardless of the faculty member’s home unit, all leave proposals are reviewed by department, college, and university committees (see chart below) using the same criteria:

- Conception, definition, and design of the proposal
- Importance of the proposed research, creative activity, or teaching technique
- Prospects for successful completion
- Quality of the applicant’s previous work, or promise of quality (expressed in publications or creative work); or, in the case of new faculty, the potential for future development of high quality scholarly activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Features of the University-wide Faculty Development Leave Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eligibility:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Length & Salary:** | • One Semester = Full Pay  
• Two Semesters = Half Pay |
| **Return to Service:** | • Faculty must agree to return to the university for a minimum of two years  
• Faculty who resign before two years of service must refund all salary provided during leave |
| **Funding Sources:** | • The individual departments are responsible for funding leaves; however, any salary savings generated from two semester leaves are retained centrally at the college level and, if necessary, reallocated to units with multiple faculty on leave |

University Nominating Committee – Composed of seven members who serve two-year staggered terms, the committee is charged with reviewing and ranking leave proposals that have been recommended by the department and college research committees. The faculty senate and the president nominate faculty from across the university for the committee. Contacts note that members do not serve in an advocacy role for their colleges.

Evaluating the Sabbatical/Professional Development Leave Experience:

While participants are expected to submit a dossier containing evidence of accomplishments while on leave to the vice president of research, contacts explain that there is no formal assessment of the work produced. Dossiers may include, copies of publications resulting from the leave, information on extramural grants for proposals stemming from leave-supported projects, descriptions of creative activities and performances, evidence of the development of new teaching techniques, et cetera.
III. University F

Sabbatical Proposal Review Process:
As established by the board of regents, sabbatical leaves at the University F may be granted for the purposes of enhancing teaching, course and curriculum development, conducting research, or any other scholarly activities related to instructional programs within the field of expertise of the faculty member requesting leave.

Eligible faculty must submit a detailed proposal, which includes the following:

- An abbreviated curriculum vitae
- A description of the purpose of leave, the activities undertaken, and the anticipated benefits to the instructional mission of the department, program or college
- A list of all grants and pending awards to be used during the sabbatical

Evaluation Criteria for Leave Requests:
The board of regents also sets the criteria by which all faculty leave proposals are evaluated and ranked. Contacts note that these standards are constant across the university. All candidates for sabbatical are reviewed by the following committees and administrators:

Key Features of the University-wide Faculty Sabbatical Leave Policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eligibility</th>
<th>Length &amp; Salary</th>
<th>Return to Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty who have completed six or more full-time years of instructional service in the UW system and have not already taken sabbatical in that period</td>
<td>One Semester = Full Pay</td>
<td>Faculty must agree to return to the university for at least one year or repay any compensation received while on leave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Semesters = 65% Pay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluating the Sabbatical/Professional Development Leave Experience:
Within three months of returning to the university, faculty must submit a report to the department chair, dean, and provost, which outlines the accomplishments of the leave. Contacts explain, however, that there is little the university can do to ensure that faculty are actually productive while on sabbatical.

Funding Sources at University F

Funded Centrally through Salary Savings
The salary savings generated from faculty taking full year leaves at half-pay are collected centrally and used to cross-subsidize colleges across the campus. Each department receives $4,000 per course to hire an adjunct to teach the courses vacated by faculty on sabbatical. In disciplines like engineering where adjuncts command higher salaries ($5,000 per course), the colleges are expected to make up the difference in funding. However, if one college has more faculty on full-year sabbatical than another, any additional salary savings above those needed to cover internal teaching demands could be reallocated to another school to fund the excess instructional costs caused by an increase in one-semester leaves.
III. University G

Evaluation Criteria for Leave Requests:

While University G has a university-wide policy for granting sabbaticals, contacts note that the sophistication of faculty proposals and the level of scrutiny during the consideration process varies by academic unit. Each proposal is considered independent of all other requests and is granted based solely on a project’s merit. Because sabbaticals are not compared across disciplines, the standards for evaluation often evolve out of general departmental expectations.

Sabbatical Proposal Review Process:

All applicants must submit a proposal containing information on the goals of the sabbatical, including supporting materials, as well as a detailed plan for how their teaching responsibilities will be covered while on leave. Contacts note that faculty work with the department chair to devise a strategy for reassigning teaching responsibilities. The proposal is considered by the following officials:

1. Department Peer Review Committee & Chair
2. Dean of the College
3. Provost
4. President

Evaluating the Sabbatical/Professional Development Leave Experience:

University G has several methods for helping to ensure that faculty are productive while on sabbatical:

- **Written Report** – All faculty must file a written report with the department chair or college dean detailing professional activities accomplished during the leave period (this is not tracked centrally)
- **Presentation** – Many departments expect faculty to give a presentation on their achievements or sabbatical experience in general to colleagues from within the unit
- **Concrete Evidence** – Some departments require faculty returning from year-long leaves to produce artifacts (e.g., publications, artwork, musical compositions, seed money for future grants) to demonstrate what they accomplished while on sabbatical
- **Annual Review** – Regardless of whether or not they are returning from sabbatical, all faculty receive an annual performance review; when applicable, the department chair or designated review committee formally evaluates sabbatical accomplishments at this point
- **Effect on Future Leaves** – While it is uncommon for unproductive faculty to be granted future leaves, in units with frequent dean and department chair turnover, there is little institutional memory to enforce such a rule

### Key Features of the University-wide Faculty Sabbatical Leave Policy

| **Eligibility:** | • Tenured faculty who have completed at least six years of full-time service at the university
| | • Cannot have been on leave in previous six years
| **Length & Salary:** | • Full Year = Half Pay
| | • One Semester = Full Pay
| **Return to Service:** | • Faculty must return to regular service for at least one contract year or refund the remuneration received during leave

### Funding Sources at University G

**Funded by Individual Departments**

As alluded to on the previous page, the individual departments are responsible for funding faculty sabbaticals and any additional costs associated with their absence (e.g., hiring adjunct faculty). While there is no official limit on the number of faculty who can be away from campus at any one time, departments will only grant sabbaticals if they are able make up for the decrease in teaching capacity. Contacts note that current budget shortfalls and the lack of central funding have forced many academic units to limit the number of faculty leaves or suspend the program entirely.
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