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Guidelines and Criteria to be Used by Departments and Other College Units That Recommend Sabbatical Leaves

BE IT RESOLVED THAT

1. the attached recommended guidelines and criteria be adopted for the departmental peer review of sabbatical leave applications.

2. the President instruct the appropriate administrative officer to develop a set of guidelines to be sent to all faculty at least 30 days prior to the fall deadline for submission of sabbatical applications. These guidelines shall include at least the following type of materials:
   a. relevant sections of the POLICIES OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES
   b. the current College Mission Statement
   c. a complete list of the review guidelines and criteria
   d. the explanatory notes on the guidelines and criteria
   e. the description of the review procedures which will be used.

3. any future revisions by the Senate of sabbatical guidelines be supplied to all faculty at least 30 days prior to the deadline for submission of sabbatical applications.
GUIDELINES AND CRITERIA FOR PREPARATION AND REVIEW OF SABBATICAL PROPOSALS

It should be noted that there are some differences between these guidelines and criteria and those presented in May, 1982. These differences, however, are editorial in nature and not substantive. Some statements have been combined for clarity, others have been re-worded in order to allow for uniqueness among disciplines. Because of uniqueness among disciplines and differences among projects, some guidelines and criteria may apply more to some proposals than others. The guidelines and criteria are not presented in rank order.

A. Conceptualization and Presentation

1. Is the application complete and coherent?
2. Are the goals and expected outcomes well articulated?
3. Does the applicant justify the need for an extended period of time to conduct the project?
4. Does the proposal include necessary resources for completion of the project?
5. Does the proposal include firm arrangements?
6. Does the proposal comply well with the letter and spirit of the relevant provisions of the POLICIES OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES?
7. Where appropriate, has the proposal been endorsed by outside reputable experts in the area of the proposed work?
8. Where appropriate, has the applicant sought outside funding using procedures consistent with established College policy?

B. Potential Value to the Institution, Discipline and Applicant

1. Does the proposal seem likely to increase the applicant's effectiveness and/or value to the College?
2. Where appropriate, is the project likely to make a significant contribution to the applicant's scholarly discipline or professional area?
3. Is the project a logical and appropriate continuation of previous professional work or a sensible, well-considered effort to move into a new area of value to the College?
4. Does the proposal have relevance to the stated Mission of the College?
GUIDELINES AND CRITERIA (cont.)

5. Will the outcome of the project provide a new service or capability, or enhance existing capabilities?

C. Feasibility of the Proposal

1. Is the project clearly manageable and designed realistically to result in the completion of the project goals, with the means and resources specified?

2. Are the proposed time period, activities, and location for the project appropriate?

3. Does the application show clearly that the project lies within the applicant's field of professional specialization; or if it does not, does it justify the change?

4. Does the applicant's past performance (including previous sabbatical leaves, if any) indicate likelihood of successful completion of the project?

5. Does the application describe the methodology to be applied on the project in such a way as to permit comparison with standard methodology in the appropriate discipline?
EXPLANATORY NOTES TO GUIDELINES AND CRITERIA
(As devised by Ad Hoc Committee)

A.1. "Completeness" means that the proposal includes all elements necessary for a departmental committee of faculty members to understand the proposed activities and the expectations of the applicant with respect to the substance and significance of the results. This should include detailed information on the activities, on the applicant's special qualifications and preparation to carry out those activities, and on the professional significance of the expected results of the activities.

Completeness includes:

a. thorough explanation of project.
b. if publication - should include an outline.
c. if requires collaboration or commissioned work, should have letters of agreement.
d. vita showing logical progression of project and/or continuous productivity in the field.

"Coherence" means that the proposal is presented in a form that makes clear that the applicant has given it careful thought and has worked it out in such detail that all reasonable preparations and precautions have been taken to ensure success. The application should proceed through its explanations in a way that makes clear to the non-specialist that the applicant is sufficiently master of the project to be able to execute it successfully.

A.2. "Goals" refers to the amount of accomplishment expected to be carried out during the sabbatical as well as the amount expected in the completed project. "Expected Outcome," refers to the character of that accomplishment and of that completed project. To be "well-articulated" they should be spelled out sufficiently clearly and concretely to provide a useful measure of eventual success.

A.3. The applicant should explain why the proposed project cannot be carried out during a normal teaching year with, if appropriate, released time from teaching. If the project involves work of the sort that usually is accomplished as part of normal professional responsibilities, the applicant should explain the exceptional circumstances that make it impossible or impractical in that case.

A.4. The application should describe in detail the resources required for successful completion of the project and how they will be provided. Resources should include sources of money. If project to be completed (or to end in results as stated) needs financial backing from an institution or individual, evidence of such backing should be included. Resources should also include statement concerning needed facilities which evidences prior research from applicant.
A.5. The application should show as concretely as possible that all necessary arrangements have been completed to ensure the provision of resources and to ensure such cooperation or collaboration as is required for successful execution of the project.

"Firm arrangements" includes some prior investigation of travel, room and board possibilities where applicable. Firm arrangements also include investigations showing interest in subject matter of publishing houses, galleries, or arrangements for performance of sabbatical work (i.e., music, theatre, dance) where applicable.

A.6. The proposal should address directly those provisions, explaining how it meets their requirements as expressed and intended.

A.7. If possible and appropriate, confidential evaluations of the project from experts in the discipline outside the College should supplement that of the department. Outside reputable experts include publishers, grant agencies, experts in the field.

A.8. The applicant should report, with appropriate documentation, on efforts made to obtain outside funding for the proposed project or explain why no such efforts have been made.

If project is dependent on such funding, evidence should be included as to the investigation of appropriate sources. Arrangements might be finalized or ongoing.

B.1. The application should show as directly and concretely as possible the relationship between the project and appropriate aspects of the College's mission and the applicant's responsibilities and academic specialization, specifying in appropriate detail how successful completion of the project would increase the applicant's professional effectiveness and value.

"Value" includes degree to which applicant's reputation would be enhanced locally, nationally, internationally; also degree to which Brockport's reputation would be enhanced locally, nationally, internationally.

"Effectiveness" would include ways in which the sabbatical project would give depth and breadth to the knowledge and experience of the applicant so that his/her offerings to students might become more compelling.

B.2. If the project lies within the applicant's present area of professional work, the application should explain how they are related in such a way as to make clear that the former builds on the latter and carries it forward. If the project lies in another area, the application should explain why the change is appropriate, justifiable, and well prepared. The proposal should successfully avoid a mere repetition of previous work.
B.3. If the project is similar to previous work of the applicant, the application should explain clearly and specifically how and to what extent it differs. In the Studio Arts, "repetition" has no risk, no personal ground-breaking. This does not mean one must do something "new" in order to avoid repetition, but ought to be dealing with the unknown in a significant way, either by going deeper into the familiar or through departure in experimentation.

B.4. The application should explain clearly and fully any concrete contributions the successfully completed project would make to the College's programs.

C.1. The application should include a detailed work schedule that will provide reviewers with a basis for reaching a judgment on the feasibility of completing the project in the time available. The work schedule should describe concretely the outcomes from each phase of the work.

Proposal should be written with accurate representation of semester or year-long goals. For example, if the project says "to publish a book," the applicant must follow that goal through within time period. If, on the other hand, the plan is to research a subject for eventual publication, then proposal should be written accordingly and evaluated on the appropriateness and quality of research.

C.2. In presenting that work schedule, the applicant should make clear the appropriateness to the project. Also, in describing the activities to be undertaken and in identifying the location at which the work is to be done, the application should explain how they are appropriate.

C.4. The curriculum vita that accompanies the application should present the applicant's relevant previous work in such a way as to make clear to reviewers its degree of success, and its relationship, if any, to previous sabbatical leaves.

Past performance ought to include the applicant's record, consistency of performance as seen in vita, annual reports, reports of previous sabbaticals.