

Sabbatical Information Session Takeaways

Last Update: September 2023

1) Dual purpose [2-3-1001(1)]:

- professional growth and renewal of tenured faculty members
- manifest, demonstrable benefit of the University

Note: leaves are “competitive in nature” and approved based on quality of proposal (cf. 1-1-309)

2) Appropriate Use [2-3-1001(3)]: related to *on-campus responsibilities* and have effect on

- i. faculty member’s professional growth
- ii. development of knowledge in the discipline
- iii. influence on students’ educational experience, and
- iv. enhancement of the university’s reputation

Proposals should address all four. Board Policy provides examples of acceptable and unacceptable uses [2-3-1001(3)(a) and (b)].

3) Compensation [2-3-1001(6)]:

- one semester at 100% pay or one year at 60% pay; may not receive overload (undermines purpose)
- “*sabbatical leave shall not be used as a means of augmenting personal income*” [2-3-1001(4)(e)]
- faculty on sabbatical may receive other compensation (grants, contracts, etc.) *only if*
 - ⇒ related to the purposes of the sabbatical leave project
 - ⇒ explained in the original proposal or an appendix
- all standard university policies regarding consulting and other outside activities apply (cf. 3-3-401)

4) Timing and Workload:

- Sabbatical leave is “entirety of workload” (15 units/semester or 30 units/year) [2-3-1001(7)]
 - ⇒ Barring exceptional circumstances approved during process, workload is 1.0 Professional Activity
 - ⇒ significantly affects relative workload weights/productivity expectations for relevant Annual/Biennial and Comprehensive Review periods
- Regular academic year only (Fall/Spring); 12-month library faculty excepted
- If University unable to fund any/all sabbaticals, approved proposals ranked as follows:
 - ⇒ Time-sensitive proposals ahead of non-time sensitive
 - ⇒ Previously postponed proposals ahead of brand-new proposals
 - ⇒ Faculty member’s length of time since previous sabbatical
- Approved sabbaticals may be postponed/delayed
 - ⇒ Faculty member may *request* one-year postponement. Request **must** be approved by unit leader/dean. *If request approved and sabbatical not taken within 1 year, must reapply* [See 2-3-1001(5)(e)].
 - ⇒ Dean may delay for maximum of *up to one year* [See 2-3-1001(5)(f)].

Be sure to address all three elements in your proposal/application!

Neither situation affects eligibility for next sabbatical leave (“eligibility for the next sabbatical leave will be calculated as if postponement had not occurred”)

5) Obligations of faculty who receive sabbatical leave:

- Fulfill goals/plan of *submitted* proposal unless a revision is approved.
 - ⇒ may submit a revision to any approved plan; *revision must be approved by unit leader and dean.*
- Submit an acceptable report within one year of completion of the leave. Unit leader and dean determine whether “acceptable.”
 - ⇒ *If report deemed unacceptable or late, ineligible for any subsequent sabbatical leave* [2-3-1001(8)]
 - ⇒ *Reports subject to open records requests/inspection by State* [2-3-1001(9)]
- Return to standard university workload for at least the full-time equivalent of one academic year after sabbatical is taken [2-3-1001(4)].

Eligibility, Process and Deadlines

See provost office [website](#) for links to Board Policy/U Regs and current year deadlines.

September: Dean notifies eligible faculty [details in 2-3-1001(2)]

- Must be tenured by time of sabbatical
- At least 6 years of full-time faculty service since last sabbatical or initial hire
 - ⇒ Leave without pay does *not* count as time in faculty service except with appeal.
 - ⇒ FMLA leave *does* count as time in faculty service.
 - ⇒ Administrative (non-faculty) service does not count on faculty clock; if part time admin/part time faculty, time toward sabbatical accrues according to percentage of faculty work.
 - ⇒ Faculty who are applying for tenure in 6th year may also apply for sabbatical (if proposal approved, sabbatical award contingent on successful achievement of tenure).

November: Eligible faculty submit applications to unit leader

- Unit leader convenes meeting of faculty who make a recommendation based on standards of discipline as well as resource/staffing issues.
- Faculty recommendation should be based on protocols developed by the department/school faculty and approved by the dean [2-3-1001(5)(a)].
- “Proposals not approved by the faculty for reasons of academic merit are disapproved and go no further in the process except for reporting purposes” [2-3-1001(5)(b)].
- Apply in Faculty Success. *Be sure to indicate service commitments that will need coverage/proxies.*

Early December: unit leader forwards own recommendation to the dean;

- If faculty did not approve, unit leader simply reports faculty decision to the dean.
- Unit leader recommendation must be based on standards of discipline as well as resource/staffing issues (may disagree with faculty).

Late December: dean forwards recommendations (including non-approval by faculty) to provost

- Dean recommendation based only on resource/staffing issues and whether proposal fulfills the “appropriate uses” (See Takeaway #2). Dean may disagree with faculty and/or unit leader.

January: Provost reports decisions to the President and notifies faculty members.

February: Provost reports decisions to the Board of Trustees.

General notes on process

1. Applications must indicate any additional compensation, time sensitivity, previous postponement and length of time since last sabbatical [see Regs 3-3-1001(1)(b)], as well as work to be completed and benefits to the university/how fulfills appropriate use (cf. Takeaway 2).
2. Applicant informed of recommendation by each level and *may* respond once at each level (responses reported to the level below and forwarded to level above). Provost decision is final.
3. If faculty do not approve for reasons of academic merit, sabbatical is denied but proposal still forwarded through all steps for reporting purposes *unless faculty member withdraws* (cf. Takeaway 5, above).
4. If faculty, unit leader or dean approve substance but do not recommend due to resource/staffing issues; proposal still goes to Provost (cf. Takeaway 4).
5. Provost makes final decision, informed but not bound by lower-level recommendations.